

Table of Contents

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 <i>New York Times</i> 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	— <i>New York Times Co. v. Sullivan</i>
§ 1:18	— <i>Walker and Butts</i>
§ 1:19	— <i>Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.</i>
§ 1:20	— <i>Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.</i>
§ 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: <i>New York Times Co. v. Sullivan</i>
§ 2:2	—Background
§ 2:3	—Holding and rationale
§ 2:3.50	Judicial critiques of <i>New York Times v. Sullivan</i>
§ 2:4	Extension of <i>New York Times</i> 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 <i>Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.</i>
§ 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	— <i>Firestone</i> case
§ 2:18	— <i>Wolston</i> case
§ 2:19	— <i>Hutchinson</i> 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	— — <i>Dameron</i> decision

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 2:35.50	— — Case study: <i>Lohrenz v. Donnelly</i>
§ 2:36	— “All purpose” classification
§ 2:37	Access to counterspeech
§ 2:37.50	Merely responding to attacks does not make one a public figure
§ 2:38	Public divisiveness
§ 2:39	— In general
§ 2:40	— <i>Wolston</i> dicta
§ 2:41	— Critique of <i>Wolston</i>
§ 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
§ 2:48	— Lower court treatment of the time issue
§ 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 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	— — <i>Tavoulareas</i> 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

- § 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
 - In general
 - Diminished corporate interest in reputation
 - Dun & Bradstreet* and commercial speech doctrines
 - Pervasive influence of corporations
 - Minority “public interest” approach
 - Majority “particularized” approach
 - Restaurants and food reviews
 - Definition of public official
 - Not all public employees covered
 - No one single test
 - After the official leaves office
 - Examples of public officials
 - Law enforcement personnel
 - Elected officials
 - Judicial, administrative, and military personnel
 - School personnel
 - Policy-making authority and access to the press
- § 2:108.50 Public officials who are not government employees
 - Scope of comment on public officials
 - Application of the actual malice standard
 - Framework for analysis
 - Absolute immunity for criticism of a public official
 - New York Times* holding revisited
 - Other interpretations of *New York Times*
 - Assertions of absolute immunity in the *Westmoreland* and *Sharon* cases
 - Role of judge and jury in classifying plaintiffs
 - Public officials
 - Public figures and private figures
- § 2:119 Determining status on motions for summary judgment
 - In general

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 2:121 —“Evidentiary hearing” alternative

CHAPTER 3. FAULT REQUIREMENTS FOR DEFAMATION

- § 3:1 Constitutional fault standards
- § 3:2 —Dichotomy between public official/public figures and private figures
- § 3:3 —Actual malice
- § 3:4 —Negligence
- § 3:5 —Strict liability
- § 3:6 —Government defendants and the actual malice standard
- § 3:7 Strict Liability in suits not involving matters of public concern
- § 3:8 —*Dun & Bradstreet*
- § 3:9 —Rejection of the media/nonmedia distinction
- § 3:10 —*Milkovich* revisits the media/nonmedia distinction
- § 3:11 The First Amendment principle disfavoring discrimination among different means of communication
- § 3:12 First Amendment doctrine eschews discrimination against media speakers
- § 3:13 The free speech rights of corporations
- § 3:14 The First Amendment and the dynamic nature of modern media
- § 3:15 The media/nonmedia distinction in light of the *Citizens United* decision
- § 3:16 The Supreme Court’s refusal to treat distinctions between media and nonmedia corporate speakers as valid under the First Amendment
- § 3:17 Strict Liability in suits not involving matters of public concern—Does *Dun & Bradstreet* open the door to strict liability in private figure cases not involving issues of public concern?
- § 3:18 “Matters of public concern” standard
- § 3:19 —*Dun & Bradstreet*
- § 3:20 —*Dun & Bradstreet* standard vs. the *Gertz* standard
- § 3:21 —Refitting of *Rosenbloom*
- § 3:22 Does *Dun & Bradstreet* have any impact on public official and public figure cases?
- § 3:23 Chart summarizing fault standards after *Dun & Bradstreet*
- § 3:24 Burden of proof in establishing actual malice and negligence
- § 3:25 Special “convincing clarity” standard
- § 3:25.50 —Clear and convincing evidence on summary judgment
- § 3:26 Preponderance of the evidence standard
- § 3:27 States are free to set standards of fault
- § 3:28 —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 cases
- § 3:32 Intermediate “gross irresponsibility” standard
- § 3:33 —*Chapadeau* test
- § 3:34 —Meaning of “gross irresponsibility”
- § 3:35 —*Chapadeau*’s “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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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 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 probative of actual malice
§ 3:67	Actual malice and the reporting and editing process—Editorial point of view
§ 3:68	—Lack of balance
§ 3:69	—Choice of facts and resolution of inferences or ambiguities may be probative of actual malice
§ 3:70	—Issues posed by <i>Westmoreland v. CBS</i>
§ 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	— <i>Restatement's</i> adoption of the professional model
§ 3:92	—Role of custom and expert testimony
§ 3:93	“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 (respondeat 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

CHAPTER 4. DEFAMATORY MEANING

§ 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	— <i>Greenbelt v. Bresler</i>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 4:14	— <i>Hustler v. Falwell</i>
§ 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” 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
§ 4:42	—Accidental reference
§ 4:43	—Impact of <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i>
§ 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: <i>Polsby v. Spruill</i>
§ 4:50	Group defamation

§ 4:51	—Racial, ethnic, or religious disparagement
§ 4:52	—Criminal liability for racial, ethnic, or religious group defamation
§ 4:53	—Renewed interest in group defamation and criminal libel as a means of combatting hate speech
§ 4:54	— —First amendment doctrines that protect hate 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 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 Act example
§ 4:71	Group defamation—Factors used to establish or deny civil liability for group defamation—Intensity of suspicion test
§ 4:72	Who may sue
§ 4:73	—No defamation of the dead
§ 4:74	—No vicarious defamation
§ 4:75	—Corporations
§ 4:76	—Governmental entities
§ 4:77	Publication
§ 4:78	—General principles
§ 4:79	—Publication must be intentional or negligent
§ 4:80	—Defamation by will
§ 4:81	—Repetition by the plaintiff
§ 4:82	—Publication through act of omission
§ 4:83	—Publication and online computer networks
§ 4:84	— — <i>Cubby v. Compuserve</i> decision
§ 4:85	— — <i>Prodigy</i> decision
§ 4:86	— —Federal immunity created by the Communications Decency Act
§ 4:86.50	Anonymity and the Internet
§ 4:87	Liability for republication
§ 4:88	—Expressions of disbelief

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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

§ 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	— <i>Gertz</i> and <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i> cases
§ 5:7	— <i>Cox Broadcasting</i> case
§ 5:8	— <i>Firestone</i> case
§ 5:9	— <i>Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc. v. Hepps</i>
§ 5:10	Truth issue in cases governed by <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i>
§ 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 *Masson*
- § 5:28 —Is the statement actually defamatory?
- § 5:29 Substantial truth and accurate repetition of another's 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

CHAPTER 6. OPINION AND FAIR COMMENT

- § 6:1 Introduction: elusive notions of "fact" and "opinion"
- § 6:2 New world after *Milkovich*
- § 6:3 Original common law position—fair comment
- § 6:4 —Evolution of fair comment
- § 6:5 —Persons and institutions subject to the privilege
- § 6:6 —Comment must be "fair"
- § 6:7 —Continued vitality of the privilege—Stuation prior to *Milkovich*
- § 6:8 —Situation after *Milkovich*
- § 6:9 Supreme court and the fact/opinion dichotomy
- § 6:10 —*Greenbelt v. Bresler*
- § 6:11 —*Gertz* pronouncement
- § 6:12 —*Letter Carriers* holding
- § 6:13 —Synthesis of *Bresler*, *Gertz*, and *Letter Carriers*
- § 6:14 —*Hustler v. Falwell* decision
- § 6:15 —*Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.* decision
- § 6:16 ——Facts
- § 6:17 ——Procedural posture of the case
- § 6:18 ——Alignment of the justices in *Milkovich*
- § 6:19 ——Court's treatment of the common law
- § 6:20 ——Court's treatment of *New York Times* and its progeny
- § 6:21 ——Court's treatment of opinion
- § 6:22 —Lower court interpretations of *Milkovich*
- § 6:23 ——*Immuno* decision
- § 6:24 ——Court's First Amendment analysis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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 <i>Restatement Second</i> approach
§ 6:29	—Pure opinion
§ 6:30	—Mixed opinion
§ 6:31	—Examples
§ 6:32	Elaborations on the <i>Restatement</i>
§ 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 <i>Restatement</i>
§ 6:40	—Elaborations on “pure opinion”
§ 6:41	—“Hybrid” or “factually laden” opinions
§ 6:41.50	Factual statements embedded in opinions should be 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 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	— <i>Information Control</i> three part version
§ 6:49	— <i>Ollman v. Evans</i> : a case study
§ 6:50	— —Factual background
§ 6:51	— —Test set forth in <i>Ollman</i>
§ 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	— — — <i>Ollman</i> 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 protection for opinion
§ 6:66	Fact/opinion distinction in specific situations
§ 6:67	—Lawyers 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 cartoons
- § 6:70.50 —Defamation on Twitter, Facebook, and other social media
- § 6:71 —Internet message boards—General trend protecting such expression
- § 6:72 ——Exception to the trend: the *Hinerman* decision—A 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 Times Co.*
 - § 6:78 ——Text of the review
 - § 6:79 ——Moldea's allegations
 - § 6:80 ——Court of appeals and the two *Moldeas*
 - § 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 by implying one's accuser is a liar
- § 6:90 —Abusive language, name-calling, ridicule, and jest
- § 6:91 —Commercial disputes
- § 6:92 —Talk show banter
- § 6:93 Unique liability issues surrounding talk shows
- § 6:94 —Public/private distinction
- § 6:95 —Intentional infliction of emotional distress: Rejection of the *Hustler* standard for private figures
- § 6:96 —Context
- § 6:97 —Religious broadcasts
- § 6:98 —“Shock jocks”: *Roach v. Stern*
- § 6:99 Music Lyrics

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 defamation per se rules

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
 - Judges
 - Attorneys
 - Parties and statements in documents
 - Witnesses
 - Judicial personnel
 - 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 proceedings
 - Federal rule
 - Aides and assistants
 - Committee reports and staff
 - Holding in *Hutchinson v. Proxmire*
 - State legislators
 - Subordinate legislative bodies
 - Witnesses in legislative proceedings
- § 8:27 Absolute immunity for executive and administrative officials
 - Federal officials
 - Scope of immunity
 - State officials
 - States that follow the federal model
 - States that limit absolute immunity to superior state officials
 - 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
 - Partial duplication of functions problem
 - Renewed significance of conditional privileges after *Dun & Bradstreet*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:43	— —Solutions to the duplication problem in <i>Gertz</i> fault 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 cases—Alternative of discarding conditional privileges in <i>Gertz</i> 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 <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i>
§ 8:52	— — —Potential influence of the <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i> decision
§ 8:53	— —Reports on employees
§ 8:54	— —Petitions clause
§ 8:55	—Statements made to protect a common interest
§ 8:56	— —In general
§ 8:57	— —Family relationships
§ 8:58	—Statements to those who act in the public interest
§ 8:59	—Cross-reference to the common law fair comment privilege
§ 8:60	Abuse of privilege
§ 8:61	—Excessive publication
§ 8:62	—Publishing for reasons other than protection of the 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
- § 9:7 —Jury's judgment
- § 9:8 ——Award of significant damages not appropriate
- § 9:9 ——As a “peg” for punitive damages
- § 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 *Gertz* 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
 - — *Firestone* case
 - — 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 *Gertz*
- § 9:38 —Under *Dun & Bradstreet*
- § 9:39 —First Amendment considerations
- § 9:40 —Eighth Amendment does not apply
- § 9:41 —When permitted under state law
- § 9:42 ——General tort principles
- § 9:43 ——Defamation rules

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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 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 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
§ 9:82	— — —Form and placement
§ 9:83	— — —Timing
§ 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—
 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 10:6.30	Fantasy sports leagues
§ 10:6.40	Right of publicity claims arising from video games based on real people
§ 10:6.50	Assignability and descendability
§ 10:6.75	Prior restraints in appropriation and right of publicity 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	— <i>Renwick</i> 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 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 third party to persuade another to reveal private information
§ 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 Amendment standards
- § 10:48.50 Prior restraints and privacy for inadvertently released material in sexual abuse cases—The *Kobe Bryant* 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 *Favish* 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 *Barnticki v. Vopper* decision
- § 10:56.70 —— —— Elaborations on *Barnticki*: 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

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

- § 11:1 Emotional distress
- § 11:2 —Intentional infliction of emotional distress, or “outrage”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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	— — <i>Hustler v. Falwell</i> litigation
§ 11:10	— — <i>Hustler v. Falwell</i> litigation—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— <i>Snyder v. Phelps</i>
§ 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	— — — <i>Firestone</i> 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 <i>Suzuki v. Consumers Union</i> 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 <i>Natural Born Killers</i> 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
§ 12:2	—State courts
§ 12:3	—Federal court limitations
§ 12:4	—Federal court subject matter jurisdiction over 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	— — — <i>International Shoe</i> and its progeny
§ 12:14	— — — <i>World-Wide Volkswagen</i> formulation
§ 12:15	— —Relevance of the First Amendment: the pre-1984 split of authority
§ 12:16	— — —Supreme Court’s resolution in <i>Calder v. Jones</i> and <i>Keeton v. Hustler Magazine, Inc.</i>
§ 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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 <i>in personam</i> 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 <i>Gutnick</i> 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 privilege invoked
§ 12:57	Special discovery issues—Confidential sources—Qualified First Amendment privilege
§ 12:58	— — —Lower court interpretations of <i>Branzburg</i>
§ 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 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 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- <i>Hutchinson</i> split and the neutrality principle
§ 12:73	— — Analogy to <i>Calder</i> and <i>Keeton</i>
§ 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 <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i>
§ 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 <i>Bose</i> 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

CHAPTER 13. COUNSELING AND STRATEGY

§ 13:1 Counseling media clients

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 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	— — — <i>Lewis v. Equitable Life</i> 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