Volume 1

PART I. DEFAMATION

CHAPTER 1. OVERVIEW

§ 1:1	Introduction
§ 1:2	History
§ 1:3	—Origins of defamation law
§ 1:4	—Ambivalence toward defamation
§ 1:5	—Modern defamation explosion
§ 1:5.50	Case study—Litigation arising from the 2020
	presidential election
§ 1:6	Cause of action prior to the New York Times decision
§ 1:7	—Strict liability tort
§ 1:8	—Basic elements
§ 1:9	—Modern British libel law
§ 1:9.50	Potential changes in Britain
§ 1:9.75	Defamation law in Canada
§ 1:9.80	Defamation law in Australia
§ 1:9.85	Defamation law in New Zealand
§ 1:9.90	Defamation law in South Africa
§ 1:10	Common-law libel/slander distinction
§ 1:11	—In general
§ 1:12	—Special problems in applying the distinction
§ 1:13	—Policies underlying the distinction
§ 1:14	—Special definitional problems
§ 1:15	—Special harm requirement
§ 1:16	Constitutionalization of modern defamation law
§ 1:17	—New York Times Co. v. Sullivan
§ 1:18	<i>—Walker</i> and <i>Butts</i>
§ 1:19	—Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.
§ 1:20	—Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.
§ 1:21	Protection of reputation—Purposes
§ 1:22	—Protection of relational interests
§ 1:23	—Compensation for economic injury
§ 1:24	—Compensation for emotional injury
§ 1:25	—Promotion of human dignity
§ 1:26	—Deterrent function
§ 1:27	—Check and balance function
§ 1:27.50	Protecting reputation in the internet and social media
	age

§ 1:28	Countervailing functions of free speech
§ 1:29	—Individual interests and social interests
§ 1:30	—Self-fulfillment function
§ 1:31	—Political self-governance function
§ 1:32	—Broader enlightenment function
§ 1:33	—First Amendment functions
§ 1:34	Elements of the modern cause of action

CHAPTER 2. PUBLIC FIGURE/PRIVATE FIGURE DICHOTOMY

§ 2:1	Starting point: New York Times Co. v. Sullivan
§ 2:2	—Background
§ 2:3	—Holding and rationale
§ 2:3.50	Judicial critiques of New York Times v. Sullivan
§ 2:4	Extension of New York Times to public figures
§ 2:5	—Harlan opinion
§ 2:6	—Warren opinion
§ 2:7	—Absolutists—Black and Douglas
§ 2:8	—"Box score"
§ 2:9	Short-lived "public interest" approach
§ 2:10	Modern approach
§ 2:11	—Background
§ 2:12	—Overview of Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.
§ 2:13	"Access to the media" rationale
§ 2:14	"Assumption of risk" rationale
§ 2:15	Subcategories of public figures
§ 2:16	"Vortex" or "limited purpose" concept
§ 2:17	—Firestone case
§ 2:18	Wolston case
§ 2:19	—Hutchinson case
§ 2:20	Practical application of the limited public figure standard
§ 2:21	—Elusive classification problem
§ 2:22	—"Public controversy" and "plaintiff involvement"
§ 2:23	—Multifactor tests
§ 2:24	—Relevant factors
§ 2:25	Bootstrap problem
§ 2:26	Preexisting controversy requirement
§ 2:27	—Problems attending investigative reporting
§ 2:28	—Flexible solution
§ 2:29	Interests of nonparticipants
§ 2:30	Plaintiff's voluntary involvement
§ 2:31	—In general
§ 2:32	—"Voluntary" participation vs. voluntary acceptance of media attention
§ 2:33	Can "involuntary" vortex public figures exist?
§ 2:34	—Involuntary status
§ 2:35	——Dameron decision

§ 2:35.50	——Case study: Lohrenz v. Donnelly
§ 2:36	—"All purpose" classification
§ 2:37	Access to counterspeech
§ 2:37.50	Merely responding to attacks does not make one a
9	public figure
§ 2:38	Public divisiveness
§ 2:39	—In general
§ 2:40	Wolston dicta
§ 2:41	—Critique of Wolston
§ 2:42	Plaintiff's efforts to influence
§ 2:43	Plaintiff's prominence in the controversy
§ 2:44	Effect of passage of time on public figure status
§ 2:45	—In general
§ 2:46	•
_	—Historical reporting vs. contemporaneous reporting
§ 2:47	—Critique of the distinction —Lower court treatment of the time issue
§ 2:48	
§ 2:49	—Can public figure status fade away?
§ 2:50	Extent of publication
§ 2:51	—"Context public figure"
§ 2:52	—Local all purpose public figure
§ 2:53	—Local vortex public figure
§ 2:54	—Litigation strategy
§ 2:55	Examples of limited public figures
§ 2:56	—Cautionary note
§ 2:57	—Differentiating limited purpose and all purpose public
8.0.70	figures
§ 2:58	—Candidates for public office
§ 2:58.50	—Political consultants
§ 2:59	—Entertainers and other "personalities"
§ 2:60	——Famous entertainers
§ 2:61	——Less famous entertainers
§ 2:62	—Sports figures
§ 2:63	——In general
§ 2:64	——Figures from the past
§ 2:65	——Scope of comment
§ 2:66	—Writers, artists, critics
§ 2:67	—Religious figures and organizations
§ 2:67.50	——Plaintiffs found not to be public figures
§ 2:68	—Corporate executives, business leaders,
	entrepreneurs, and inventors
§ 2:69	——In general
§ 2:70	——Tavoulareas holding
§ 2:71	——Summary
§ 2:71.50	—Restaurateurs
§ 2:72	—Professionals
§ 2:73	——Attorneys
§ 2:74	— —Ethical or disciplinary matters
§ 2:75	— Going beyond mere legal representation
§ 2:76	——Other professionals
0	F

§ 2:76.50	—Education officials
§ 2:77	Defining the "all purpose" public figure
§ 2:78	—Significance of the category
§ 2:79	—Rarity of the category
§ 2:80	Examples of all purpose public figures
§ 2:81	—In general
§ 2:82	—Political candidates
§ 2:83	—Entertainers and other "personalities"
§ 2:84	—Political, social, and consumer activists
§ 2:85	—Business and community leaders; major corporations
§ 2:86	—Political confidants and advisors
§ 2:87	—Writers, critics, and columnists
§ 2:88	—Religious figures and organizations
§ 2:89	—Attorneys
§ 2:90	—Persons associated with criminal activity
§ 2:91	—Publishers and major media outlets
§ 2:92	Corporate plaintiffs and the public figure/private figure
	dichotomy
§ 2:93	—In general
§ 2:94	—Diminished corporate interest in reputation
§ 2:95	—Dun & Bradstreet and commercial speech doctrines
§ 2:96	—Pervasive influence of corporations
§ 2:97	—Minority "public interest" approach
§ 2:98	—Majority "particularized" approach
§ 2:98.50	——Restaurants and food reviews
§ 2:99	Definition of public official
§ 2:100	—Not all public employees covered
§ 2:101	—No one single test
§ 2:102	—After the official leaves office
§ 2:103	Examples of public officials
§ 2:104	—Law enforcement personnel
§ 2:105	—Elected officials
§ 2:106	—Judicial, administrative, and military personnel
§ 2:107	—School personnel
§ 2:108	—Policy-making authority and access to the press
§ 2:108.50	Public officials who are not government employees
§ 2:109	Scope of comment on public officials
§ 2:110	—Application of the actual malice standard
§ 2:111	—Framework for analysis
§ 2:112	Absolute immunity for criticism of a public official
§ 2:113	—New York Times holding revisited
§ 2:114	—Other interpretations of New York Times
§ 2:115	—Assertions of absolute immunity in the Westmoreland
3 =1110	and Sharon cases
§ 2:116	Role of judge and jury in classifying plaintiffs
§ 2:117	—Public officials
§ 2:118	—Public figures and private figures
§ 2:119	Determining status on motions for summary judgment
§ 2:120	—In general
	U

§ 2:121 —"Evidentiary hearing" alternative

CHAPTER 3. FAULT REQUIREMENTS FOR DEFAMATION

Constitutional fault standards
—Dichotomy between public official/public figures and private figures
—Actual malice
—Negligence
—Strict liability
—Government defendants and the actual malice standard
Strict Liability in suits not involving matters of public concern
—Dun & Bradstreet
-Rejection of the media/nonmedia distinction
-Milkovich revisits the media/nonmedia distinction
The First Amendment principle disfavoring
discrimination among different means of communication
First Amendment doctrine eschews discrimination against media speakers
The free speech rights of corporations
The First Amendment and the dynamic nature of
modern media
The media/nonmedia distinction in light of the <i>Citizens United</i> decision
The Supreme Court's refusal to treat distinctions between media and nonmedia corporate speakers as valid under the First Amendment
Strict Liability in suits not involving matters of public concern—Does <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i> open the door to strict liability in private figure cases not involving issues of public concern?
"Matters of public concern" standard
—Dun & Bradstreet
—Dun & Bradstreet standard vs. the Gertz standard
Refitting of Rosenbloom
Does Dun & Bradstreet have any impact on public
official and public figure cases?
Chart summarizing fault standards after Dun & Bradstreet
Burden of proof in establishing actual malice and negligence
Special "convincing clarity" standard
—Clear and convincing evidence on summary judgment
Preponderance of the evidence standard
States are free to set standards of fault
—Private figure cases involving matters of public
concern

§ 3:29	—Private figure cases not involving matters of public concern
§ 3:30	States that have adopted some form of negligence as the standard for private figure cases
§ 3:31	States that have adopted actual malice in private figure
§ 3:32	cases Intermediate "gross irresponsibility" standard
§ 3:33	—Chapadeau test
§ 3:34	—Meaning of "gross irresponsibility"
§ 3:35	— <i>Chapadeau's</i> "sphere of legitimate public concern" standard
§ 3:36	—No media-nonmedia distinction applies
§ 3:37	Supreme court's actual malice test
§ 3:38	—Early supreme court statements
§ 3:39	—Butts and Walker elaborations
§ 3:40	—St. Amant v. Thompson
§ 3:41	—Masson dicta: suggestions for a new terminology
§ 3:42	Actual malice is a subjective standard, though "objective" evidence may be probative
§ 3:42.50	Actual malice is a subjective standard, though "objective" evidence may be probative—Proving actual malice when the defendant is an institutional entity and multiple individuals within the entity participate in the publication
§ 3:43	Actual malice is a subjective standard, though "objective" evidence may be probative—Standard is subjective
§ 3:44	—Objective data as probative of subjective state of mind
§ 3:45	—Cumulative impact question
§ 3:45.50	Actual malice is a subjective standard, though "objective" evidence may be probative—Actual malice and fabricated "first—hand" allegations of wrongdoing
§ 3:46	Distinguishing constitutional actual malice from common-law "ill-will" malice
§ 3:47	Common-law malice as probative of constitutional actual malice
§ 3:48	Failure to investigate
§ 3:49	—Lack of journalistic initiative alone not actual malice
§ 3:50	—Mere failure to check story against information in internal files not actual malice
§ 3:51	Failure to check obvious sources as evidence of actual malice
§ 3:52	—In general
§ 3:53	—Sharon v. Time, Inc.
§ 3:54	—Harte-Hanks Communications, Inc. v. Connaughton
§ 3:55	—When verification is impractical
§ 3:56	—Fact-checking by publications known for reliability
§ 3:57	Actual malice and reliance on sources and tips
§ 3:58	—In general
	6

§ 3:59	-Knowledge of a source's possible bias
§ 3:60	—Reliance on secondary sources
§ 3:61	—Reliance on information supplied by wire services,
	free-lance writers, and authors
§ 3:62	—Anonymous sources
§ 3:63	—Reckless reliance: the Carol Burnett litigation
§ 3:64	—Careful fact-checking as evidence to rebut actual
3 0.01	malice
§ 3:65	—Fabricated interviews: the <i>Clint Eastwood</i> litigation
§ 3:65.50	Role of denials by the plaintiff
§ 3:66	Actual malice and the reporting and editing process
§ 3:66.50	Deviations from standard journalistic practices
\$ 0.00.00	probative of actual malice
§ 3:67	Actual malice and the reporting and editing process—
\$ 0.01	Editorial point of view
§ 3:68	—Lack of balance
§ 3:69	—Choice of facts and resolution of inferences or
8 0.09	ambiguities may be probative of actual malice
§ 3:70	—Issues posed by Westmoreland v. CBS
§ 3.70 § 3:71	—Preconceived story lines
§ 3:72	—Doubt within the media organization
§ 3:73	—Cautionary note
§ 3:74	—Misleading sequencing of events in a story
§ 3:75	Effect of deadline pressures on actual malice
§ 3:76	—"Hot news" vs. time to investigate
§ 3:77	—Live broadcasts
§ 3:78	Bearing of a retraction on actual malice
§ 3:79	—Determination of actual malice made at time of
	publication
§ 3:80	—Failure to retract
§ 3:81	—Retraction as evidence to rebut actual malice
§ 3:82	Other issues bearing on actual malice
§ 3:83	—Faulty memory
§ 3:84	—Misuse of language or legal terminology
§ 3:85	—Republications and follow-up stories
§ 3:86	—Hostile investigation and questioning
§ 3:87	—Letters to the editor
§ 3:87.50	—"Ghostwriters" and "as told by" books
§ 3:88	Constitutional definition of negligence under <i>Gertz</i>
§ 3:89	"Professional malpractice" model of negligence
§ 3:90	—In general
§ 3:91	—Restatement's adoption of the professional model
§ 3:92	—Role of custom and expert testimony
§ 3.52	"Ordinary reasonable person" model of negligence
§ 3:94	Application of res ipsa loquitur
§ 3:95	Determination of negligence
§ 3:96	—Cost/benefit approach
§ 3:97	—Contexts in which negligence may arise
§ 3:98	—Typical recurring negligence problems

§ 3:99	Negligence arising from general failure to pursue further investigation
§ 3:100	Unreasonable reliance on sources as negligence
§ 3:101	—In general
§ 3:102	—Official sources
§ 3:103	Negligence in the formulation of conclusions, inferences, and interpretations
§ 3:104	—In general
§ 3:105	—Contradictory information
§ 3:106	Negligence in note taking and quoting of sources
§ 3:107	Negligence through misuse of language or legal terminology
§ 3:108	Negligence arising from mechanical errors or lapses in internal procedures
§ 3:109	—Mechanical errors
§ 3:110	—Failure to follow established policies and practices
§ 3:110.50	Negligence in failing to establish adequate training or vetting procedures
§ 3:111	Time pressures and deadlines
§ 3:112	Vicarious liability (respondent superior)
§ 3:113	—In general
§ 3:114	—Employee's fault is imputed to employer
§ 3:115	—Must the employee have editorial or policy-making responsibility?
§ 3:116	—Fault of independent contractors normally not imputed to employer
§ 3:117	—Punitive damages
§ 3:118	—Application to computer databases
CHAPT	
§ 4:1	Definition of defamatory
§ 4:2	Recipient approach
§ 4:2.50	Evidence of how actual recipients understood the statement is probative of how average or reasonable recipients could understand it
§ 4:3	Recipient approach—English approach
§ 4:4	—American approach
§ 4:5	—Limitations on the American position
§ 4:5.50	—The reasonable recipient may be less than perfect, and may not be in the "majority" of recipients exposed to the communication
§ 4:6	—Effect of the passage of time
§ 4:7	Name-calling, insults, epithets, and verbal abuse
§ 4:8	—Mere abuse
§ 4:9	—Abuse made actionable by context
§ 4:10	—Alternative statements
§ 4:11	Rhetorical hyperbole
§ 4:12	—Relation to the fact/opinion distinction
§ 4:13	—Greenbelt v. Bresler

0.1.1.	
§ 4:14	—Hustler v. Falwell
§ 4:15	—Jokes and parody
§ 4:16	Defamation through implication
§ 4:17	—Significance of context
§ 4:18	—Extrinsic facts—"Inducement" and "innuendo"
§ 4:19	—Examples
§ 4:19.50	—Denial of wrongdoing by implying one's accuser is a liar
§ 4:20	Rules of construction
§ 4:21	—Reasonable construction rule
§ 4:22	—Innocent construction rule
§ 4:23	—Single-instance rule
§ 4:24	Special contexts for defamatory meaning
§ 4:25	—Headlines, captions, "teases," and publicity efforts
§ 4:26	— —Jurisdictions that construe the headline independently
§ 4:27	——Jurisdictions that construe the headline in
	conjunction with the text
§ 4:28	——Distinguishing between normal and
	sensationalized headlines
§ 4:29	——Note on photograph captions
§ 4:30	—"Visual defamation"
§ 4:31	——Photographs
§ 4:32	——Broadcasts
§ 4:33	—Cartoons
§ 4:34	—Song lyrics
§ 4:35	—Misquotations
§ 4:36	—Future conduct
§ 4:37	—Use of social science evidence or linguistic experts
§ 4:38	Role of judge and jury
§ 4:39	Identity: the "of and concerning the plaintiff"
\$ 4.40	requirement
§ 4:40	—Reference need not be by name—Colloquium
§ 4:40.20	 — Photographs and captions linking a plaintiff to defamation
§ 4:40.50	—The constitutional status of the "of and concerning" requirement
§ 4:41	—Strict liability
§ 4.41 § 4:42	—Accidental reference
0	—Impact of Dun & Bradstreet
§ 4:43	•
§ 4:44	—Not everyone must identify the plaintiff
§ 4:45	—Fictional works
§ 4:46	——Problems in general
§ 4:47	——Factors used to establish identity in fiction
§ 4:48	— —Cross-reference to fault requirements, and a proposed framework for handling the special problems posed by fiction
§ 4:49	— — Case study: Polsby v. Spruill
§ 4:50	Group defamation
5 1.00	oroge gordingson

8 4.71	Design of heater an artificiant discount
§ 4:51	Racial, ethnic, or religious disparagement
§ 4:52	—Criminal liability for racial, ethnic, or religious group
8 4.50	defamation
§ 4:53	—Renewed interest in group defamation and criminal
8 4 5 4	libel as a means of combatting hate speech
§ 4:54	——First amendment doctrines that protect hate
8 4.55	speech
§ 4:55	— — Neutrality principle
§ 4:56	— — Emotion principle
§ 4:57	———Symbolism principle
§ 4:58	———Causation principle
§ 4:59	———Precision principle
§ 4:60	— — Circumstances in which hate speech may arguably
0 4 01	be punished
§ 4:61	— — Two-class theory
§ 4:62	— — Fighting-words doctrine
§ 4:63	———Protection of persons or property
§ 4:64	— — Discriminatory conduct
§ 4:65	——Theory of hate speech as a relational harm
§ 4:66	———Public speech/private speech dichotomy
§ 4:67	——Summary
§ 4:68	—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation
§ 4:69	——Size of the group
§ 4:70	——Reference to all or only part of a group
§ 4:70.50	Attempting to criminalize mere "lies"—The Stolen Valor
	rate and the contraction of the contract that the contract the contract that the contract the contract that the contract the contract that the contrac
	Act example
§ 4:71	Act example Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny
§ 4:71	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny
§ 4:71	-
§ 4:71 § 4:72	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of
	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test
§ 4:72	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue
§ 4:72 § 4:73	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead
§ 4:72 § 4:73 § 4:74	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation
§ 4:72 § 4:73 § 4:74 § 4:75	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81 \$ 4:82	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff —Publication through act of omission
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81 \$ 4:82 \$ 4:83	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff —Publication and online computer networks
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81 \$ 4:82 \$ 4:83 \$ 4:83	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff —Publication and online computer networks — —Cubby v. Compuserve decision
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81 \$ 4:82 \$ 4:83 \$ 4:84 \$ 4:84	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff —Publication through act of omission —Publication and online computer networks ——Cubby v. Compuserve decision —Prodigy decision
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81 \$ 4:82 \$ 4:83 \$ 4:83	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff —Publication and online computer networks — —Cubby v. Compuserve decision
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81 \$ 4:82 \$ 4:83 \$ 4:84 \$ 4:84	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff —Publication through act of omission —Publication and online computer networks ——Cubby v. Compuserve decision ——Prodigy decision ——Prodigy decision ——Federal immunity created by the Communications
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81 \$ 4:82 \$ 4:83 \$ 4:84 \$ 4:85 \$ 4:86	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff —Publication through act of omission —Publication and online computer networks ——Cubby v. Compuserve decision ——Prodigy decision ——Prodigy decision ——Federal immunity created by the Communications Decency Act
\$ 4:72 \$ 4:73 \$ 4:74 \$ 4:75 \$ 4:76 \$ 4:77 \$ 4:78 \$ 4:79 \$ 4:80 \$ 4:81 \$ 4:82 \$ 4:83 \$ 4:84 \$ 4:85 \$ 4:86	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test Who may sue —No defamation of the dead —No vicarious defamation —Corporations —Governmental entities Publication —General principles —Publication must be intentional or negligent —Defamation by will —Repetition by the plaintiff —Publication through act of omission —Publication and online computer networks ——Cubby v. Compuserve decision ——Prodigy decision ——Prodigy decision ——Federal immunity created by the Communications Decency Act Anonymity and the Internet

§ 4:89	—Fault still required
§ 4:90	—Wire service defense
§ 4:91	—Liability of originator
§ 4:92	—Distinction between primary and secondary publishers
§ 4:92.50	Vanity presses as media publishers
§ 4:93	Liability for republication—Single-publication rule
§ 4:93.50	——Single-publication rule and Internet publication
§ 4:93.60	—Single publication rule—Hyperlinks to previously published defamatory material
§ 4:93.70	— — Liability for material and substantive alterations to an existing Internet article
§ 4:94	—When publication occurs
§ 4:94.50	The laches doctrine and time limits in cases seeking equitable relief
§ 4:95	Liability for republication—"Procured publication"
§ 4:96	Neutral reportage privilege
§ 4:97	—Commentary: Weakness of the policy arguments supporting adoption of the privilege
§ 4:98	—Origins of the privilege: <i>Edwards v. National Audubon Society</i>
§ 4:99	—Elements of the privilege
§ 4:100	—Judicial acceptance of the concept
§ 4:100.50	—Judicial rejection of the neutral reportage privilege
§ 4:101	—Privilege in the context of private figure suits
§ 4:102	Criminal liability for false electioneering and false political advertising

CHAPTER 5. TRUTH AS A CONSTITUTIONAL DEFENSE

DEFENSE		
§ 5:1	Overview	
§ 5:2	—Early common law rules	
§ 5:3	—American position	
§ 5:4	Emergence of truth as a constitutional defense in public official and public figure cases	
§ 5:5	Truth as a constitutional defense in private figure cases	
§ 5:6	-Gertz and Dun & Bradstreet cases	
§ 5:7	—Cox Broadcasting case	
§ 5:8	—Firestone case	
§ 5:9	—Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc. v. Hepps	
§ 5:10	Truth issue in cases governed by Dun & Bradstreet	
§ 5:11	Burden of proving the truth	
§ 5:12	Burden of proof in public official and public figure cases	
§ 5:13	Burden of proof in private figure cases	
§ 5:14	Substantial truth test	
§ 5:15	—Specific defamatory charges	
§ 5:16	—Generalized defamatory charges	
§ 5:17	—Minor inaccuracies	
§ 5:17.50	—Falsity by omission of material facts	

§ 5:18	—Repetition of another's defamatory communication
§ 5:19	Substantial truth test: specific defamatory charges
§ 5:20	—Overview
§ 5:21	—Relationship to fault requirements
§ 5:22	Substantial truth test: generalized defamatory charges
§ 5:23	Minor inaccuracies in detail
§ 5:24	—Errors in terminology
§ 5:25	—Minor "literary" embellishments
§ 5:26	—Decision in Masson v. New Yorker Magazine, Inc.
§ 5:27	—Interpretations of <i>Masson</i>
§ 5:28	—Is the statement actually defamatory?
§ 5:29	Substantial truth and accurate repetition of another's
3 0.20	defamation
§ 5:30	Increasing use of truth as a defense
§ 5:31	—Traditional caution
§ 5:32	—New boldness in asserting the defense
§ 5:33	—Impact of modern fault rules
§ 5:34	—Modern examples
§ 5:35	—"Psychological cost" to the plaintiff
§ 5:36	—Risks
3 3.33	1420120
CHAPT	TER 6. OPINION AND FAIR COMMENT
§ 6:1	Introduction: elusive notions of "fact" and "opinion"
§ 6:2	New world after <i>Milkovich</i>
-	
0 h:3	Uriginal common law position—tair comment
§ 6:3 8 6:4	Original common law position—fair comment —Evolution of fair comment
§ 6:4	—Evolution of fair comment
§ 6:4 § 6:5	Evolution of fair commentPersons and institutions subject to the privilege
§ 6:4 § 6:5 § 6:6	Evolution of fair commentPersons and institutions subject to the privilegeComment must be "fair"
§ 6:4 § 6:5	Evolution of fair commentPersons and institutions subject to the privilege
§ 6:4 § 6:5 § 6:6 § 6:7	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to
§ 6:4 § 6:5 § 6:6 § 6:7 § 6:8	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich
§ 6:4 § 6:5 § 6:6 § 6:7 § 6:8 § 6:9	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy
§ 6:4 § 6:5 § 6:6 § 6:7 § 6:8 § 6:9 § 6:10	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding
§ 6:4 § 6:5 § 6:6 § 6:7 § 6:8 § 6:9 § 6:10 § 6:11 § 6:12 § 6:13	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision Facts
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16 \$ 6:17	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision Facts Procedural posture of the case
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16 \$ 6:17 \$ 6:18	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision Facts Procedural posture of the case Alignment of the justices in Milkovich
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16 \$ 6:17 \$ 6:18 \$ 6:19	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision Facts Procedural posture of the case Alignment of the justices in Milkovich Court's treatment of the common law
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16 \$ 6:17 \$ 6:18	-Evolution of fair comment -Persons and institutions subject to the privilege -Comment must be "fair" -Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich -Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy -Greenbelt v. Bresler -Gertz pronouncement -Letter Carriers holding -Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers -Hustler v. Falwell decision -Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision -Facts -Procedural posture of the case -Alignment of the justices in Milkovich -Court's treatment of New York Times and its
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16 \$ 6:17 \$ 6:18 \$ 6:19 \$ 6:20	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision Facts Procedural posture of the case Alignment of the justices in Milkovich Court's treatment of New York Times and its progeny
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16 \$ 6:17 \$ 6:18 \$ 6:19 \$ 6:20 \$ 6:21	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision Facts Procedural posture of the case Alignment of the justices in Milkovich Court's treatment of New York Times and its progeny Court's treatment of opinion
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16 \$ 6:17 \$ 6:18 \$ 6:19 \$ 6:20 \$ 6:21 \$ 6:22	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision Facts Procedural posture of the case Alignment of the justices in Milkovich Court's treatment of New York Times and its progeny Court's treatment of opinion Lower court interpretations of Milkovich
\$ 6:4 \$ 6:5 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:6 \$ 6:7 \$ 6:8 \$ 6:9 \$ 6:10 \$ 6:11 \$ 6:12 \$ 6:13 \$ 6:14 \$ 6:15 \$ 6:16 \$ 6:17 \$ 6:18 \$ 6:19 \$ 6:20 \$ 6:21	 Evolution of fair comment Persons and institutions subject to the privilege Comment must be "fair" Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to Milkovich Situation after Milkovich Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy Greenbelt v. Bresler Gertz pronouncement Letter Carriers holding Synthesis of Bresler, Gertz, and Letter Carriers Hustler v. Falwell decision Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co. decision Facts Procedural posture of the case Alignment of the justices in Milkovich Court's treatment of New York Times and its progeny Court's treatment of opinion

§ 6:25	— — — Court's state law analysis
§ 6:26	———Lessons of <i>Immuno</i>
§ 6:27	— — Other lower court decisions
§ 6:28	"Pure Opinion" vs. "Mixed Opinion": the Restatement
	Second approach
§ 6:29	—Pure opinion
§ 6:30	—Mixed opinion
§ 6:31	—Examples
§ 6:32	Elaborations on the Restatement
§ 6:33	—Deductive opinions
§ 6:34	—Evaluative opinions
§ 6:35	—Dishonestly maintained evaluative opinions
§ 6:36	——Proof problem
§ 6:37	——Compromise position
§ 6:38	—Informational opinions
§ 6:39	Judicial variations on the Restatement
§ 6:40	—Elaborations on "pure opinion"
§ 6:41	—"Hybrid" or "factually laden" opinions
§ 6:41.50	Factual statements embedded in opinions should be
3 0.11.00	construed "as a whole"
§ 6:42	Judicial variations on the <i>Restatement</i> —Examples
§ 6:43	—Loss of the absolute privilege for hybrid opinions
§ 6:43.50	— The underlying predicate facts must themselves be
3 0.10.00	true
§ 6:44	Verifiability factor
§ 6:45	—In general
§ 6:46	—Relationship to the burden of proof on falsity issue
§ 6:47	Totality of circumstances approach
§ 6:48	—Information Control three part version
§ 6:49	—Ollman v. Evans: a case study
§ 6:50	— —Factual background
§ 6:51	——Test set forth in Ollman
§ 6:52	———Common usage or meaning of the language
§ 6:53	— — Verifiability
§ 6:54	———Context and cautionary language
§ 6:55	——Broader social context of the speech
§ 6:56	——Ollman test applied
§ 6:57	—Political arena and public controversy factors
§ 6:58	——Judge Robert Bork's "political arena" innovation
§ 6:59	— — Usefulness of the political arena approach
§ 6:60	Defamatory opinions
§ 6:61	Role of the judge and jury
§ 6:62	—Majority position
§ 6:63	—Minority position
§ 6:64	—Comparison of majority and minority views
§ 6:65	Private figures vs. public officials and public figures; the
5 0.00	protection for opinion
§ 6:66	Fact/opinion distinction in specific situations
§ 6:67	—Lawyers and judges
5 0.01	Langers and Judges

§ 6:67.50	—Medical and psychological opinions
§ 6:67.60	Academic and scientific disputes
§ 6:68	Fact/opinion distinction in specific situations—Labor
	disputes
§ 6:69	—Political campaigns
§ 6:70	—Op-Ed articles, letters to the editor, and political
3 0.10	cartoons
§ 6:70.50	—Defamation on Twitter, Facebook, and other social
8 0.70.50	media
§ 6:71	
8 0:11	—Internet message boards—General trend protecting
S C.770	such expression
§ 6:72	——Exception to the trend: the <i>Hinerman</i> decision—A
0.0.00	case study
§ 6:73	—Ideologically amorphous statements
§ 6:74	—Religious opinion and the intersection of the First
	Amendment Speech and Religion Clauses
§ 6:74.50	——Lower court cases on religious opinion
§ 6:75	—Literary and artistic criticism
§ 6:76	— —Overview
§ 6:76.50	—Medical and psychological opinions
§ 6:77	—Literary and artistic criticism—Moldea v. New York
3 0	Times Co.
§ 6:78	———Text of the review
§ 6:79	— — Moldea's allegations
§ 6:80	———Court of appeals and the two <i>Moldeas</i>
•	
§ 6:81	———"Too much sloppy journalism"
§ 6:82	———Joe Namath and the inside information sheet
§ 6:83	————1958 Colts versus Giants Playoff
§ 6:84	————Warmed over hot stuff
§ 6:85	————Reviving the Carroll Rosenbloom story
§ 6:86	———Joe Namath's "sinister meeting" with Lou
	Michaels
§ 6:87	— — —Conclusion
§ 6:88	—Restaurant and food critiques
§ 6:89	—Allegations of criminal activity
§ 6:89.50	—Allegations of criminal activity—Denial of wrongdoing
\$ 0.00.00	by implying one's accuser is a liar
§ 6:90	—Abusive language, name-calling, ridicule, and jest
§ 6:91	—Commercial disputes
=	—Talk show banter
§ 6:92	
§ 6:93	Unique liability issues surrounding talk shows
§ 6:94	—Public/private distinction
§ 6:95	—Intentional infliction of emotional distress: Rejection of
_	the <i>Hustler</i> standard for private figures
§ 6:96	—Context
§ 6:97	—Religious broadcasts
§ 6:98	—"Shock jocks": Roach v. Stern
§ 6:99	Music Lyrics

Volume 2

CHAPTER 7. SPECIAL HARM—LIBEL AND SLANDER PER SE RULES

§ 7:1	Overview of Special Harm
§ 7:2	Special Harm, Actual Harm, and Presumed Harm
§ 7:3	—Actual harm
§ 7:4	—Presumed harm
§ 7:5	—Significance of the distinctions
§ 7:6	Constitutional minimums set by Gertz and Dun & Bradstreet
§ 7:7	—Constitution does not require special harm
§ 7:8	—Constitutional issues when state law does not require special harm
§ 7:9	Original common-law position
§ 7:10	Four common-law slander per se categories
§ 7:11	—Imputations of criminal conduct
§ 7:12	——In general
§ 7:13	— — Moral turpitude
§ 7:14	—Allegations tending to injure another in his or her trade, business, profession, or office
§ 7:15	——In general
§ 7:16	— — The nexus requirements
§ 7:17	—Imputations of loathsome disease
§ 7:18	—Imputations of unchastity
§ 7:19	Introduction of libel per quod
§ 7:20	—Use of "per se"
§ 7:21	—Emergence of libel per quod
§ 7:22	——Libel per se
§ 7:23	— —Libel per quod
§ 7:24	——Slander per se
§ 7:25	——Slander per quod
§ 7:26	Hybrids of the per se/per quod distinction
§ 7:27	—Combining the approaches
§ 7:28	—Requirement of fault regarding extrinsic facts
§ 7:29	—Multiple lines of precedent
§ 7:30	Proposal for a simplified, fair reform
§ 7:31	—Abolish libel/slander distinction
§ 7:32	—Eliminate all special harm rules
§ 7:33	—Require actual harm in all cases
§ 7:34	—Permit jury to weigh all factors
§ 7:35	Judicial arguments favoring retention of traditional

CHAPTER 8. COMMON-LAW PRIVILEGES

- § 8:1 Introduction: function of common-law privileges § 8:2 —Division between absolute and conditional privileges

§ 8:3	—"Fair report" privilege
§ 8:4	Absolute privilege of consent
§ 8:5	Absolute privilege for participants in judicial proceedings
§ 8:6	—Who is protected
§ 8:7	— —Judges
§ 8:8	— —Attorneys
§ 8:9	——Parties and statements in documents
§ 8:10	— —Witnesses
§ 8:11	— —Judicial personnel
§ 8:12	— —Jurors
§ 8:13	—Defamatory statement must be relevant to the judicial proceeding
§ 8:14	—What qualifies as a "judicial proceeding"
§ 8:15	— —Any governmental body or proceeding engaging in judicial or quasi-judicial function
§ 8:16	— Privilege extends to all aspects of the proceeding
§ 8:17	——Does not extend to press conference or other extra-
	judicial activity
§ 8:18	—Questions of law
§ 8:19	Absolute immunity for participants in legislative
8 0.00	proceedings —Federal rule
§ 8:20 § 8:21	— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
§ 8:22	——Addes and assistants ——Committee reports and staff
§ 8:23	— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
§ 8:24	—State legislators
§ 8:25	—Subordinate legislative bodies
§ 8:26	-Witnesses in legislative proceedings
§ 8:27	Absolute immunity for executive and administrative
3 0.21	officials
§ 8:28	—Federal officials
§ 8:29	—Scope of immunity
§ 8:30	—State officials
§ 8:31	——States that follow the federal model
§ 8:32	——States that limit absolute immunity to superior
	state officials
§ 8:33	——States that recognize no executive or administrative
	absolute immunity
§ 8:34	Miscellaneous absolute privileges
§ 8:35	—Spouses
§ 8:36	—Publication required by law
§ 8:36.50	Reports to government agencies
§ 8:37	—Sovereign immunity
§ 8:38	Conditional privileges: an overview
§ 8:39	—Conditional and absolute privileges compared
§ 8:40	—Relationship to modern constitutional fault rules
§ 8:41	— — Partial duplication of functions problem
§ 8:42	— Renewed significance of conditional privileges after
	Dun & Bradstreet

§ 8:43	——Solutions to the duplication problem in <i>Gertz</i> fault
8 0 44	cases
§ 8:44	——Solutions to the duplication problem in <i>Gertz</i> fault cases—Requiring fault greater than negligence to
	defeat the privilege
§ 8:45	——Solutions to the duplication problem in <i>Gertz</i> fault
3 0.10	cases—Alternative of discarding conditional privileges
	in Gertz fault cases
§ 8:46	"Interest-related" conditional privileges
§ 8:47	—Statements made to protect the publisher's interest
§ 8:48	—Statements made in furtherance of the interests of
	others
§ 8:49	—Requested vs. volunteered information
§ 8:50	——Credit reports
§ 8:51	— — Rules prior to Dun & Bradstreet
§ 8:52	———Potential influence of the <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i>
8.0.70	decision
§ 8:53	——Reports on employees
§ 8:54	——Petitions clause
§ 8:55	—Statements made to protect a common interest
§ 8:56 § 8:57	— —In general — —Family relationships
§ 8:58	——————————————————————————————————————
§ 8:59	—Cross-reference to the common law fair comment
8 0.00	privilege
§ 8:60	Abuse of privilege
§ 8:61	-Excessive publication
§ 8:62	—Publishing for reasons other than protection of the
0	interest giving rise to the privilege
§ 8:63	—Publication with common-law (ill-will) malice
§ 8:64	—Negligence
§ 8:65	—Actual malice, knowledge of falsity, recklessness
§ 8:66	"Fair report" privilege
§ 8:67	—Function and rationale
§ 8:67.50	—The attribution requirement
§ 8:68	—Proceedings covered
§ 8:69	— —Judicial proceedings
§ 8:70	— — Official action
§ 8:70.50	———Defeasance of the privilege through actual or
	common-law malice
§ 8:71	———Secret proceedings
§ 8:72	 —Arrests and other law enforcement activity
§ 8:73	——Legislative proceedings
§ 8:74	— Executive, administrative, and other public
	proceedings
§ 8:75	—Requirement of accuracy and fairness
§ 8:76	——Substantial accuracy test
§ 8:77	——Role of judge and jury
§ 8:78	Reports published with actual malice

CHAPTER 9. DAMAGES AND OTHER REMEDIES

§ 9:1	Overview
§ 9:2	—Linkage to substantive rules
§ 9:3	—Interest in reform
§ 9:4	—Terminology
§ 9:5	Nominal damages
§ 9:6	—Plaintiff's preference
§ 9.0 § 9:7	—Jury's judgment
§ 9.1 § 9:8	
§ 9.8 § 9:9	— Award of significant damages not appropriate— As a "peg" for punitive damages
§ 9.9 § 9:10	
	—Constitutional questions
§ 9:11	Compensatory damages
§ 9:12	—Types
§ 9:13	General damages
§ 9:14	—Types
§ 9:15	—Constitutional rules
§ 9:16	Presumed damages
§ 9:17	—Function and rationale
§ 9:18	—When constitutionally permissible
§ 9:19	— — When actual malice is established
§ 9:20	——Cases governed by Dun & Bradstreet
§ 9:21	——Not permitted in <i>Gertz</i> negligence cases
§ 9:22	Actual damages
§ 9:23	—When constitutionally required
§ 9:24	—Two subdivisions
§ 9:25	—Decisions restricting the award
§ 9:26	——Consistency with the common law tradition
§ 9:27	—Emotional distress as a free-standing component of actual damages
§ 9:28	——Firestone case
§ 9:29	——Practical result: presumed harm through the back door
§ 9:30	—Proving actual harm to reputation
§ 9:31	——Interference with existing relations
§ 9:32	——Interference with future relations
§ 9:33	— —destruction of favorable public image
§ 9:34	——Negative public image
§ 9:34.50	—Damages arising from defamation in social media
§ 9:35	Special damages
§ 9:36	Punitive damages
§ 9:37	—When constitutionally permitted: under <i>Gertz</i>
§ 9:38	—Under Dun & Bradstreet
§ 9:39	—First Amendment considerations
§ 9:40	Eighth Amendment does not apply
§ 9:41	—When permitted under state law
§ 9:41 § 9:42	— General tort principles
-	— — Defamation rules
§ 9:43	——Detamation rules

§ 9:44	— — —Common law malice
§ 9:45	— — Evidentiary standard
§ 9:46	— Other factors considered in assessing punitive
	damages
§ 9:47	— — Financial condition of defendant
§ 9:48	— — —Actual harm
§ 9:49	— — Reasonable proportionality to actual damages
§ 9:50	— — Defendant's failure to retract
§ 9:51	—Jurisdictions that do not permit punitive damages
§ 9:52	Chart of constitutional damages rules
§ 9:52.50	Damages recoverable when the plaintiff is a corporation or organization
§ 9:53	Factors in mitigation and aggravation
§ 9:53.50	Attorneys' fees and public relations expenses spent to mitigate
§ 9:54	Factors in mitigation and aggravation—Nature of the
3 0.01	defamation
§ 9:55	—Form and extent of publication
§ 9:56	Extent to which defamation believed by recipients
§ 9:57	—Plaintiff's prior reputation
§ 9:58	——Plaintiff's good reputation
§ 9:59	——Plaintiff's bad reputation
§ 9:60	— — Prior bad acts
§ 9:61	——"Libel-proof" plaintiff
§ 9:62	—Prior publication
§ 9:63	—Prior recoveries or settlements
§ 9:64	—Defendant's good faith or bad faith
§ 9:65	Evidence of provocation by the plaintiff
§ 9:66	—Retraction
§ 9:67	Judicial review of damages awards
§ 9:68	—Modern approach
§ 9:69	Judicial review of damages—Use of comparators in
3 0.00	reviewing jury verdicts
§ 9:70	Retraction
§ 9:71	—At common law
§ 9:72	—Proliferation of statutes
§ 9:73	—Variations in statutory approaches
§ 9:74	— — Media vs. nonmedia
§ 9:75	— —Notice provisions
§ 9:76	———Timing
§ 9:77	——Prerequisite to suit
§ 9:78	——Prerequisite to certain types of damages
§ 9:79	——Effect of retraction
§ 9:80	——Aspects of a retraction
§ 9:81	———Content
§ 9.81 § 9:82	— — — Content — — — Form and placement
	— — — Form and pracement — — — Timing
§ 9:83	_
§ 9:84	—Failure to retract as justification for punitive damages
§ 9:85	Equitable relief

§ 9:86	—The role of First Amendment prior restraint doctrine
§ 9:87	—Rationales supporting the granting of injunctive relief
§ 9:88	—Injunctions are permissible to enjoin future repetition
	of defamatory statements after an adjudication of
	liability
§ 9:89	—Injunctive relief: equity will not enjoin a libel—
8 0 00	Recharacterizing the harm
§ 9:90	—Right of reply and compulsory retraction
§ 9:91	— Right of reply
§ 9:92	——Compulsory retraction
§ 9:93	—Declaratory judgments
§ 9:94	—Annenberg libel reform proposal
§ 9:95	——Summary of Annenberg proposals
§ 9:96	— — Text of Annenberg Libel Reform Act
§ 9:97	——Conclusion
§ 9:98	—Iowa project
§ 9:99	——How the program works
§ 9:100	——Summary of libel dispute resolution procedures
§ 9:101	——Neutrals
§ 9:102	——Cost
§ 9:103	——Iowa libel research project
§ 9:104	——American Arbitration Association
§ 9:105	—Uniform law commissioners proposal
§ 9:106	Recent trends in damages awards—a statistical
	summary
§ 9:107	SLAPP suits and anti-SLAPP legislation
§ 9:108	SLAPP suits and media defendants
§ 9:109	Variations among SLAPP statutes
§ 9:110	SLAPP statutes and potential conflicts with the Federal
	Rules of Civil Procedure
§ 9:111	SLAPP statutes and choice of law conundrums
§ 9:112	Monetary settlements in defamation and related cases
§ 9:113	Liability of corporate officers or directors in shareholders
	derivative actions

PART II. INVASION OF PRIVACY AND RELATED TORTS

CHAPTER 10. INVASION OF PRIVACY

§ 10:1	Overview
§ 10:2	—Prosser's four part subdivision of the law of privacy
§ 10:3	—Vicarious invasion of privacy
§ 10:4	—Special note on the right of publicity
§ 10:4.50	——Appropriation and trade names
§ 10:5	— —First Amendment tensions with the right
§ 10:6	— —Commercial vs. noncommercial uses
§ 10:6.25	Relationship to copyright law

§ 10:6.30	Fantasy sports leagues
§ 10:6.40	Right of publicity claims arising from video games
0.10.000	based on real people
§ 10:6.50	Assignability and descendability
§ 10:6.75	Prior restraints in appropriation and right of publicity
0.10 =	cases
§ 10:7	False light invasion of privacy
§ 10:8	—Overview
§ 10:9	—Relationship to defamation
§ 10:10	——Problem of distinguishing the torts
§ 10:11	— —False light claim need not involve defamatory speech
§ 10:12	——Statement must be highly offensive to a reasonable
	person
§ 10:13	——How can a nondefamatory statement be offensive?
§ 10:14	—First Amendment fault standards
§ 10:15	— — Ambiguities
§ 10:16	——Division among lower court decisions
§ 10:17	—Types of false light claims
§ 10:18	——False association
§ 10:19	——Distortion or exaggeration
§ 10:20	— — —Photographs
§ 10:21	———Film and broadcast footage
§ 10:22	——Printed matter
§ 10:23	—Minor and insubstantial errors
§ 10:24	—Fiction and the false light tort
§ 10:25	——Identity issues
§ 10:26	——Special First Amendment considerations
§ 10:27	— —Survival
§ 10:28	—Renwick case as an assault on the false light tort
§ 10:28.50	Other rejections of the false light tort
§ 10:29	Intrusion
§ 10:30	—Activities covered
§ 10:31	——Essence of intrusion
§ 10:32	——Paparazzi and the aftermath of the death of
0	Princess Diana
§ 10:33	—Intrusion and trespass in news gathering
§ 10:34	——Defining seclusion; public vs. private matters
§ 10:34.50	— ——Intrusion into business and commercial settings
§ 10:35	——Consent
§ 10:36	——"Ambush" interview techniques
§ 10:36.50	— — Media "ride-alongs"
§ 10:36.60	——Intrusion caused by improper inducement by a
§ 10.30.00	third party to persuade another to reveal private information
8 10.96 70	
§ 10:36.70	 — Media and government partnerships in surreptitious surveillance
§ 10:37	Publication of private facts
§ 10:38	—There must be a public disclosure

§ 10:39	—Facts must be private
§ 10:39.50	— — Distinction between revelation of a private "fact" and revelation of video, audio, or images with graphic
	depictions of private facts
§ 10:39.75	——Protest activity involving surveillance and video or
	photographs
§ 10:40	— —Breach of confidential relationship
§ 10:40.10	——Revenge porn
§ 10:41	——Breach of promise by reporter
§ 10:42	—Disclosure offensive to a reasonable person
§ 10:43	—Constitutional law restrictions
§ 10:43.50	Is there a constitutional right to informational privacy?
§ 10:44	Publication of private facts—Constitutional law restrictions—Public records
§ 10:45	———Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn
§ 10:46	— — — After Cox—The access cases
§ 10:47	———Definition of public record
§ 10:48	——Butterworth decision and evolving First
3 10/10	Amendment standards
§ 10:48.50	Prior restraints and privacy for inadvertently released material in sexual abuse cases—The <i>Kobe Bryant</i> case
§ 10:49	Publication of private facts—Constitutional law restrictions—Newsworthiness privilege
§ 10:50	———Privilege is broadly defined
§ 10:51	— — Nexus requirement
§ 10:52	———Balancing newsworthiness against intrusiveness
§ 10:53	———Effect of the passage of time
§ 10:54	———Public disclosure in the 1990s—A comment on
	AIDS and outing
§ 10:54.50	Privacy and autopsy photographs: the <i>Favish</i> Vince Foster case
§ 10:54.60	Privacy and funerals
§ 10:55	Liability for surreptitious newsgathering
§ 10:56	—Undercover reporting
§ 10:56.50	Illegally intercepted electronic material—The <i>Barnticki</i> v. Vopper decision
§ 10:56.70	——Elaborations on <i>Bartnicki</i> : subsequent interpretations on when the First Amendment does and does not bar trafficking in truthful information, and what is meant by information "lawfully obtained"
§ 10:57	—Emergency rescue shows
§ 10:58	—Antipaparazzi legislation
-	2 2

CHAPTER 11. EMOTIONAL DISTRESS, INJURIOUS FALSEHOOD, AND NEGLIGENT PUBLICATION

§ 11:1 Emotional distress
 § 11:2 —Intentional infliction of emotional distress, or "outrage"

§ 11:3	——Elements
§ 11:4	— — —Intentional or reckless conduct
§ 11:5	———Extreme and outrageous conduct
§ 11:6	— ——Severe emotional distress
§ 11:7	———Causation
§ 11:8	——Application to media cases
§ 11:9	— — Hustler v. Falwell litigation
§ 11:10	— — —Lower court decisions
§ 11:11	— — —Analysis of the fourth circuit holding
§ 11:12	— — Supreme court's decision
§ 11:13	——Private figure cases
§ 11:13.50	Military funeral protests and emotional distress—
	Snyder v. Phelps
§ 11:14	Emotional distress—Future of the intentional infliction
	of emotional distress tort
§ 11:15	——Nonspeech cases
§ 11:16	— — Problems of a simplistic division
§ 11:17	— — Nonspeech masquerading as speech
§ 11:18	——Emotional distress for the content of speech
§ 11:19	— — Modern examples
§ 11:20	— — Use of other torts
§ 11:21	— ——Sexual harassment
§ 11:22	———Firestone case example
§ 11:23	——Multitiered solution for the future
§ 11:24	— — Scale of liability factors
§ 11:25	— — Logic of the scale
§ 11:26	— — — Applying the scale
§ 11:27	— — Lax standard for private figure/private speech
	cases
§ 11:28	— — —Conclusion
§ 11:29	—Negligent infliction of emotional distress
§ 11:30	——Recovery for mental disturbance
§ 11:31	——Physical manifestation position
§ 11:32	——Emergence of "pure" emotional distress recovery
§ 11:33	——Applicability to media
§ 11:34	Injurious falsehood
§ 11:35	—Elements of the cause of action
§ 11:36	— —Falsity
§ 11:37	——Injury to pecuniary interests
§ 11:38	——Publication
§ 11:39	——Special harm
§ 11:40	— —Intent, malice, or fault
§ 11:40.50	Case study: the Suzuki v. Consumers Union litigation
§ 11:41	—Common law privileges
§ 11:42	—Constitutional privileges
§ 11:43	—Relationship between defamation and injurious
-	falsehood
§ 11:44	—Remedies
§ 11:45	——Damages for pecuniary loss

§ 11:46	——Punitive damages
§ 11:47	 — Availability of injunctive relief
§ 11:48	Negligent publication
§ 11:49	—Faulty instructions and misinformation
§ 11:50	—Inducement of self-destructive behavior
§ 11:50.50	—Violent material and children
§ 11:51	—Liability for publication of criminal solicitations
§ 11:52	Aiding and abetting criminal activity
§ 11:53	—Case study: The <i>Hit Man</i> litigation
§ 11:54	——Legal arguments
§ 11:55	——Court of appeals decision in <i>Rice v. Paladin Press</i>
§ 11:56	—Liability for violent films—the Natural Born Killers
	litigation
§ 11:57	—"Surprise television" and the Jenny Jones case
§ 11:58	—Liability for violent Internet postings

PART III. LITIGATION, COUNSELING, AND STRATEGY

CHAPTER 12. LITIGATION

§ 12:1	Subject matter jurisdiction
§ 12.1 § 12:2	—State courts
§ 12.2 § 12:3	—Federal court limitations
•	
§ 12:4	—Federal court subject matter jurisdiction over
0.10.7	defamation and privacy cases
§ 12:5	— — Diversity of citizenship—Nonmedia cases
§ 12:6	— — — Media cases
§ 12:7	— Rule of complete diversity
§ 12:8	—Attempts to manufacture diversity
§ 12:9	In personam jurisdiction
§ 12:10	—Lack of jurisdiction
§ 12:11	—Due process limitations
§ 12:12	— — Minimum contacts requirement: physical presence
§ 12:13	———International Shoe and its progeny
§ 12:14	—— — World-Wide Volkswagen formulation
§ 12:15	— Relevance of the First Amendment: the pre-1984
	split of authority
§ 12:16	— — Supreme Court's resolution in Calder v. Jones
	and Keeton v. Hustler Magazine, Inc.
§ 12:17	 —Factors that influence in personam jurisdiction
	determinations
§ 12:18	— — — Circulation level
§ 12:19	———Nexus between the story and the forum state
§ 12:20	———Plaintiff's residence and contacts in forum
§ 12:20.50	———Treating authors separately from publishers
§ 12:21	——News gathering
§ 12:22	— — —Advertising and solicitation efforts
· ·	

§ 12:23	— — —Freelance writers
§ 12:24	—Long arm statutes
§ 12:24.50	—Jurisdiction in Internet cases
§ 12:24.60	Identifying defendants' identities in anonymous
	Internet defamation cases
§ 12:25	Conflicts of laws
§ 12:26	—Relationship to in personam jurisdiction
§ 12:27	—Forum shopping
§ 12:28	—Vulnerability to abusive forum shopping
§ 12:29	——Double counting the first amendment
§ 12:30	—Approaches to conflicts problems
§ 12:31	—Territorialist approaches
§ 12:32	——Place of the wrong
§ 12:33	— — Relation to single publication rule
§ 12:34	——Practical result of territorialist approach
§ 12:35	—Most significant relationship approach
§ 12:36	—Better rule approach
§ 12:37	—Governmental interests analysis
§ 12:38	—Forum law approach
§ 12:39	—Constitutional limitations on choice of law decisions
§ 12:40	——Impact of <i>Keeton</i>
§ 12:41	— —Enforcement of foreign judgments
§ 12:41.30	Foreign judgments and the American SPEECH Act
§ 12:41.50	Foreign judgments and the Internet; the Australian
	Gutnick litigation
§ 12:42	Removal, transfer, and Forum non conveniens
§ 12:43	—Removal from state court to federal court
§ 12:44	—Transfer
§ 12:45	—Forum non conveniens
§ 12:46	—First amendment considerations
§ 12:47	Pleading considerations
§ 12:48	—Defamatory meaning and the "of and concerning"
	requirement
§ 12:49	—Required fault level
§ 12:50	—Special damages
§ 12:51	—Other considerations
§ 12:51.50	—Issues generated by anti-SLAPP legislation
§ 12:52	Special discovery issues
§ 12:53	—Inquiry into editorial process
§ 12:54	——Scope of the inquiry
§ 12:55	— Relationship to confidential source privilege
§ 12:56	—Confidential sources
§ 12:56.50	Motion to compel discovery when confidential source
Ü	privilege invoked
§ 12:57	Special discovery issues—Confidential sources—
	Qualified First Amendment privilege
§ 12:58	———Lower court interpretations of Branzburg
§ 12:59	———Balancing test

§ 12:59.50	——Portents of demise of the privilege: The <i>Judith Miller</i> litigation
§ 12:60	——State shield laws
§ 12:61	———Absolute immunity
§ 12:62	———Qualified immunity
§ 12:62.50	——Determining who may invoke a reporter's privilege
§ 12:62.60	Diminished protection for non-confidential journalistic
3 12.02.00	material
§ 12:63	Special discovery issues—Confidential sources—
	Sanctions for failure to reveal sources
§ 12:64	— — —Contempt
§ 12:65	— — Striking of pleadings and entry of default
	judgment
§ 12:66	— — Preclusion of reliance on source or presumption
_	that no source existed
§ 12:66.50	—Protective orders and third-party discovery
§ 12:67	—Breach of contract for revealing sources
§ 12:68	—Confidential sources and tortious interference with
8 10 00 50	contract
§ 12:68.50	—Discovery in SLAPP motions
§ 12:69	Summary judgment practice
§ 12:70	—Competing First Amendment tensions
§ 12:71	—Burger footnote in <i>Hutchinson v. Proxmire</i>
§ 12:72	—Post-Hutchinson split and the neutrality principle
§ 12:73	——Analogy to Calder and Keeton
§ 12:74	——Summary judgment should not be especially "favored" or "disfavored"
§ 12:75	—Defeating a summary judgment motion in public figure cases: actual malice obstacle
§ 12:75.50	Summary judgment and SLAPP motions
§ 12:76	—Negligence standard cases
§ 12:77	——Impact of Dun & Bradstreet
§ 12:78	Directed verdicts and J.N.O.V.'s
§ 12:79	—As devices for jury control
§ 12:80	—General standards
§ 12:81	—First amendment concerns applied to summary
	judgment motions
§ 12:82	—Relationship to independent review doctrine
§ 12:83	Appeals and the doctrine of independent judicial review
§ 12:84	—Reaffirmation of the doctrine in <i>Bose v. Consumers Union</i>
§ 12:85	—Does Bose swing "both ways"?
§ 12:86	- "Preliminary" facts vs. "ultimate" facts
§ 12:87	Trials and evidence
§ 12:88	Non-disclosure and non-disparagement agreements
§ 12:89	Default judgments in defamation and related cases
	J G

CHAPTER 13. COUNSELING AND STRATEGY

§ 13:1 Counseling media clients

6 10.0	Danis and small and of maliculation
§ 13:2	Dominant problems of media litigation
§ 13:3	—High costs of defense
§ 13:4	—Chilling effect on free speech
§ 13:5	Preventative counseling
§ 13:6	—Legal advice vs. journalistic or artistic judgment
§ 13:7	—Special role of regular counsel
§ 13:8	Cost reduction in litigation
§ 13:9	—Some cost control devices
§ 13:10	——Budget reports
§ 13:11	——Periodic strategy assessments
§ 13:12	 — Holding back on aggressive early discovery
§ 13:13	 — Sharing and "cross-fertilization" of legal research
§ 13:14	Media counterclaims against plaintiffs
§ 13:15	Should reporters destroy notes, records, tapes, or files?
§ 13:16	When the press sues the press
§ 13:17	Role of the plaintiff's lawyer
§ 13:18	—Realism about litigation
§ 13:19	—Skeletons in the closet
§ 13:20	——Substantial truth
§ 13:21	—Invasion of privacy suits
§ 13:22	—Advantage of prudent disclosures
§ 13:23	Litigation strategy in a federal system
§ 13:24	—Interplay of evolving constitutional and common law
	rules
§ 13:25	—Freedom of states within the constitutional framework
§ 13:26	—Some practical strategic considerations arising from the
	interplay of constitutional and common law rules
§ 13:27	— —Forum shopping
§ 13:28	— — Defense considerations
§ 13:29	—Independent and adequate state grounds
§ 13:30	Publicity surrounding media trials

CHAPTER 14. [Reserved] Insurance

CHAPTER 15. DEFAMATION IN THE WORKPLACE

§ 15:1	Growing significance of employee/employer defamation suits
§ 15:2	—Increasing prevalence
§ 15:3	——Reference letters and other communications to third parties
§ 15:4	——Communications within the company
§ 15:5	—Overview of special problems for workplace defamation
§ 15:6	Publication
§ 15:7	—Internal communications
§ 15:8	— —Minority no-publication position

§ 15:9	——Majority publication position
§ 15:9.50	Publication by one corporate employee to another when the employee is sued in an individual capacity
§ 15:10	Publication—Compelled self-publication
§ 15:11	——Overview
§ 15:11.50	The clear and convincing evidence question
§ 15:12	Publication—Compelled self-publication—Authority supporting the doctrine
§ 15:13	— — Lewis v. Equitable Life decision
§ 15:14	——Competing interests
§ 15:14.50	—No compelled self-publication when no repetition to a third party has occurred
§ 15:14.60	—Compelled self-publication—Authority rejecting the compelled self-publication doctrine
§ 15:15	Defamatory meaning and opinion
§ 15:16	—Defamatory meaning
§ 15:17	—Fact/opinion distinction
§ 15:18	Per se and per quod special harm rules
§ 15:19	Truth
§ 15:20	—Substantial truth
§ 15:21	—Burden of proof
§ 15:22	Vicarious liability
§ 15:23	—Respondeat superior
§ 15:24	— —Libel/slander distinction
§ 15:25	——Punitive damages
§ 15:26	Fault considerations
§ 15:27	—Constitutional requirements
§ 15:28	—Common-law requirements
§ 15:29	——Absolute privileges
§ 15:30	——Conditional privileges
§ 15:30.50	 —Privileges arising from legal reporting duties
§ 15:31	—Argument for actual malice as the governing privilege standard
§ 15:32	—Damages and causation
§ 15:33	Government defamation as a violation of civil rights
§ 15:34	Relation to workers' compensation statutes

CHAPTER 16. FOOD DISPARAGEMENT LAWS

- § 16:1 Proliferation of food disparagement laws
- § 16:2 Compendium of food disparagement laws
- § 16:3 Case study: Oprah Winfrey litigation
- § 16:4 Commentary: the case against food disparagement laws

Table of Laws and Rules

Table of Cases

Index