

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA

TERRY GENE BOLLEA professionally
known as HULK HOGAN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 12012447CI-011

HEATHER CLEM et al.,

Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S AMENDED
ANSWER OF DEFENDANT NICK DENTON TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, Terry Gene Bollea, professionally known as Hulk Hogan, by counsel, and pursuant to Florida Rules of Civil Procedure 1.100, files his reply to the affirmative defenses alleged in Defendant Nick Denton's Amended Answer to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (the "Complaint"), and states as follows:

Reply to First Affirmative Defense

1. Defendant's first affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise denied.

Reply to Second Affirmative Defense

2. Defendant's second affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Third Affirmative Defense

3. Defendant's third affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Fourth Affirmative Defense

4. Defendant's fourth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Fifth Affirmative Defense

5. Defendant's fifth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Sixth Affirmative Defense

6. Defendant's sixth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Seventh Affirmative Defense

7. Defendant's seventh affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts

upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Eighth Affirmative Defense

8. Defendant's eighth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Ninth Affirmative Defense

9. Defendant's ninth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Tenth Affirmative Defense

10. Defendant's tenth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Eleventh Affirmative Defense

11. Defendant's eleventh affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twelfth Affirmative Defense

12. Defendant's twelfth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Thirteenth Affirmative Defense

13. Defendant's thirteenth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Fourteenth Affirmative Defense

14. Defendant's fourteenth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Fifteenth Affirmative Defense

15. Defendant's fifteenth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Sixteenth Affirmative Defense

16. Defendant's sixteenth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts

upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied

Reply to Seventeenth Affirmative Defense

17. Defendant's seventeenth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Eighteenth Affirmative Defense

18. Defendant's eighteenth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Nineteenth Affirmative Defense

19. Defendant's nineteenth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twentieth Affirmative Defense

20. Defendant's twentieth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts

upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twenty-First Affirmative Defense

21. Defendant's twenty-first affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twenty-Second Affirmative Defense

22. Defendant's twenty-second affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Further, this affirmative defense is barred because the referenced statute, as amended effective July 1, 2015, does not apply to the claims alleged in this case. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twenty-Third Affirmative Defense

23. Defendant's twenty-third affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twenty-Fourth Affirmative Defense

24. Defendant's twenty-fourth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon

which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law.

Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twenty-Fifth Affirmative Defense

25. Defendant's twenty-fifth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twenty-Sixth Affirmative Defense

26. Defendant's twenty-sixth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twenty-Seventh Affirmative Defense

27. Defendant's twenty-seventh affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law.

Otherwise, denied.

Reply to Twenty-Eighth Affirmative Defense

28. Defendant's twenty-eighth affirmative defense fails to state a valid defense to the claims alleged in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, fails to allege sufficient ultimate facts upon which this defense is based, and fails to state the matters of law upon which this defense is based with sufficient particularity, as required by Florida law. Otherwise, denied.

Dated: July 20, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kenneth G. Turkel

Kenneth G. Turkel, Esq.
Florida Bar No. 867233
Shane B. Vogt
Florida Bar No. 0257620
BAJO | CUVA | COHEN | TURKEL
100 North Tampa Street, Suite 1900
Tampa, Florida 33602
Tel: (813) 443-2199
Fax: (813) 443-2193
Email: kturkel@bajocuva.com
Email: svogt@bajocuva.com

-and-

Charles J. Harder, Esq.
PHV No. 102333
Jennifer J. McGrath, Esq.
PHV No. 114890
HARDER MIRELL & ABRAMS LLP
1925 Century Park East, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (424) 203-1600
Fax: (424) 203-1601
Email: charder@hmafirma.com
Email: jmcgrath@hmafirma.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by e-mail via the e-portal system this 20th day of July, 2015 to the following:

Barry A. Cohen, Esquire
Michael W. Gaines, Esquire
The Cohen Law Group
201 E. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 1950
Tampa, Florida 33602
bcohen@tampalawfirm.com
mgaines@tampalawfirm.com
jhalle@tampalawfirm.com
mwalsh@tampalawfirm.com
Counsel for Heather Clem

Gregg D. Thomas, Esquire
Rachel E. Fugate, Esquire
Thomas & LoCicero PL
601 S. Boulevard
Tampa, Florida 33606
gthomas@tlolawfirm.com
rfugate@tlolawfirm.com
kbrown@tlolawfirm.com
abcenc@tlolawfirm.com
Counsel for Gawker Defendants

David R. Houston, Esquire
Law Office of David R. Houston

Seth D. Berlin, Esquire
Paul J. Safier, Esquire

432 Court Street
Reno, NV 89501
dhouston@houstonatlaw.com
krosser@houstonatlaw.com

Michael Berry, Esquire
Levine Sullivan Koch & Schultz, LLP
1760 Market Street, Suite 1001
Philadelphia, PA 19103
mberry@lskslaw.com
*Pro Hac Vice Counsel for
Gawker Defendants*

Kirk S. Davis, Esquire
Shawn M. Goodwin, Esquire
Akerman LLP
401 E. Jackson Street, Suite 1700
Tampa, Florida 33602
kirk.davis@akerman.com
shawn.goodwin@akerman.com
Co-Counsel for Gawker Defendants

Timothy J. Conner
Holland & Knight LLP
50 North Laura Street, Suite 3900
Jacksonville, FL 32202
timothy.conner@hklaw.com

Charles D. Tobin
Holland & Knight LLP
800 17th Street N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20006
charles.tobin@hklaw.com
*Attorneys for Intervenors, First Look Media, Inc.,
WFTS-TV and WPTV-TV, Scripps Media, Inc.,
WFTX-TV, Journal Broadcast Group, Vox Media,
Inc., WFLA-TV, Media General Operations, Inc.,
Cable News Network, Inc., BuzzFeed and The
Associated Press.*

Alia L. Smith, Esquire
Michael D. Sullivan, Esquire
Levine Sullivan Koch & Schulz, LLP
1899 L. Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
sberlin@lskslaw.com
psafier@lskslaw.com
asmith@lskslaw.com
msullivan@lskslaw.com
*Pro Hac Vice Counsel for
Gawker Defendants*

Allison M. Steele
Rahdert, Steele, Reynolds & Driscoll, P.L.
535 Central Avenue
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
amstee@aol.com
asteelc@rahdertlaw.com
ncampbell@rahdertlaw.com
*Attorneys for Intervenor Times Publishing
Company*

/s/ Kenneth G. Turkel
Kenneth G. Turkel