EXHIBIT A

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

TERRY GENE BOLLEA, professionally known as HULK HOGAN,

Plaintiff, Case No.

12-012447-CI-011

VS.

HEATHER CLEM; GAWKER MEDIA, LLC, aka GAWKER MEDIA, et al.,

Defendants.

HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAMELA A.M. CAMPBELL

DATE: July 1, 2015

TIME: 1:36 p.m. to 5:10 p.m.

PLACE: Pinellas County Courthouse

545 1st Avenue North

Third Floor

St. Petersburg, Florida

REPORTED BY: Aaron T. Perkins, RPR

Notary Public, State of

Florida at Large

Volume 2

Pages 123 to 301

```
1
    APPEARANCES:
2
       CHARLES J. HARDER, ESQUIRE
3
       JENNIFER J. McGRATH, ESQUIRE
       Harder, Mirell & Abrams, LLP
4
       1925 Century Park East
       Suite 800
5
       Los Angeles, California 90067
6
               and -
7
       KENNETH G. TURKEL, ESQUIRE
       SHANE B. VOGT, ESQUIRE
8
       Bajo Cuva Cohen & Turkel, P.A.
       100 North Tampa Street
9
       Suite 1900
       Tampa, Florida 33602
10
            - and -
11
       DAVID R. HOUSTON, ESQUIRE
12
       The Law Office of David R. Houston
       432 Court Street
13
       Reno, Nevada 89501
14
15
            Attorneys for Plaintiff
16
17
18
19
     APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
    APPEARANCES CONTINUED AS FOLLOWS:
2
3
       SETH D. BERLIN, ESQUIRE
       MICHAEL D. SULLIVAN, ESQUIRE
4
       Levine Sullivan Koch & Schulz, LLP
       1899 L Street, N.W.
5
       Suite 200
       Washington, D.C. 20036
6
              and -
7
       MICHAEL BERRY, ESQUIRE
8
       PAUL J. SAFIER, ESQUIRE
       Levine Sullivan Koch & Schulz, LLP
       1760 Market Street
       Suite 1001
10
       Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
11
               and -
12
       RACHEL FUGATE, ESQUIRE
       Thomas & LoCicero, P.L.
13
       601 South Boulevard
       Tampa, Florida 33606
14
            Attorneys for Defendant Gawker Media, LLC,
15
            et al.
16
17
    ALSO PRESENT:
18
       Heather L. Dietrick,
19
            President and General Counsel for The Gawker
            Media Group
20
       Alison Steele, Esquire (for Media Outlets)
            Rahdert, Steele Reynolds & Driscoll, P.L.
21
            535 Central Avenue
            St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
22
23
24
25
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. My tab 5 says, Publisher 2 defendant's motion in limine to preclude plaintiff 3 from introducing evidence related to other Gawker 4 This is the articles. 5 good-for-goose-good-for-gander ruling we talked 6 about earlier. So each side is going to try to 7 the trash the other, and there is going to be 8 limits on it. 9 MR. BERLIN: It seems like that's consistent 10 with the ruling you gave earlier. And if you want 11 to hear more to that, we can speak to that. 12 THE COURT: I think everyone is going to 13 identify what kind of trash they want to bring in, 14 and it's going to be limited. So pick your best shot, because I'm going to limit it. 1.5 16 MR. TURKEL: Judge, all I would say is this: 17 And I think the way to handle it right now, 1.8 because I think you will see the context much 19 better --20 THE COURT: During the trial? 21 MR. TURKEL: Yeah, when we're crossing him. 22 But we're looking at the various exceptions under 23 404(b) that you're allowed to use other bad acts,

have their hard standards about publishing.

because this goes back to the idea that they don't

24

25

asked them what their discussions about the publication of the video was with counsel, and we couldn't get that. And so one of the places we go to discuss, you know, to try to establish what does it mean for Gawker? What are the standards? well, we have go to what they said publicly in other situations.

1.5

1.8

So if they went out and said, We abhor the idea that somebody would publish Erin Andrews, surreptitiously taking nudity video, well, that helps us understand what their mindset was and shows intent and knowledge and all the things you're allowed to. We're not just throwing much out there about them; there is a specific reason.

Now, that's what we're coming from. We've got the statements fairly well identified in our other papers, and so it's not just this free-for-all to show that they published a bunch of stuff. It shows the hypocrisy of what they say about other people publishing this stuff, but what they do is completely antithetical to that.

THE COURT: Some of that is going to be allowed.

MR. TURKEL: I would think it would be. It's not like we're just throwing every article that's

been written about Gawker saying they're bad out there. We have specific things that they have said about specific types of videos.

THE COURT: So all of you are going to meet at some point in time, midnight tonight or sometime, and you'll go through and see which ones you want to use.

MR. BERLIN: Yeah.

MR. TURKEL: If Mr. Sullivan is okay with us taking the discrete statements and doing what you're going to do with the other stuff and show the ones we're going to use, are we going to try to agree on it. Or we'll just wait until we cross him, and you can deal with it then.

MR. SULLIVAN: I think the field will be narrowed when we identify for each other the 50 real exhibits.

MR. TURKEL: Yeah. That's probably a good starting point. I don't think the field will be completely removed, but it will be narrowed.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

MR. TURKEL: But I wanted you to know, when this comes up, perhaps, contemporaneously with the witness examination, you know where we're coming from on this.

MR. BERLIN: In that regard, Your Honor, as I said, I thought your ruling on it was clear. I just wanted to give one cautionary note, which is -- well, maybe one and a half. The half is that, you know, Gawker witnesses may also testify about articles that they found more redeeming than to other articles. And we'll put that in the 50 exhibits that we're doing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The second is that one the issues -- and this, really, is an issue in this case, -- that each one of these articles is different in terms of its circumstances. And as you may remember up on the screen when I was here doing the summary judgment argument, we had two parts of the newsworthiness: content and context. And every one of these is different. And we'll -- if we don't limit that significantly, it's going to lengthen the trial, because the witness will be then entitled to explain: Well, in that circumstance, I said this about Erin Andrews because these were the circumstances there, and those are different than the circumstances here. And they need to be able to explain themselves. And that's where we're going to go. We just need to know that that's where we're headed.

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA
4	COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH
5	
6	I, Aaron T. Perkins, Registered Professional
7	Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the above hearing and that
8	the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.
9	
10	
11	I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	Dated this 2nd day of July, 2015.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Aaron T. Perkins, RPR
23	MALON I. LELKING, IVIV
24	
25	