

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: *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

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>Tavoulaareas</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
 - § 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* 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

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	— <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i>
§ 3:9	—Rejection of the media/nonmedia distinction
§ 3:10	— <i>Milkovich</i> 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 <i>Citizens United</i> 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 <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i> 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	— <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i>
§ 3:20	— <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i> standard vs. the <i>Gertz</i> standard
§ 3:21	—Refitting of <i>Rosenbloom</i>
§ 3:22	Does <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i> have any impact on public official and public figure cases?
§ 3:23	Chart summarizing fault standards after <i>Dun & Bradstreet</i>
§ 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 <i>res ipsa loquitur</i>
§ 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 Independent contractors, agents, and partners
- § 3:117 Vicarious liability (*respondeat superior*)—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 —*Greenbelt v. Bresler*

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	Defamatory headlines
§ 4:26	Defamatory headlines are independently actionable
§ 4:27	Defamatory headlines—“Fair index” truth defense
§ 4:28	—Ambiguity creates a jury issue
§ 4:29	Special contexts for defamatory meaning—Headlines, captions, “teases,” and publicity efforts—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 — —*Cubby v. Compuserve* decision
- § 4:85 — —*Prodigy* 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
- § 4:89 —Fault still required

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 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: *Edwards v. National Audubon Society*
- § 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 —*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 *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—Situation 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
- § 6:25 — — —Court’s state law analysis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 6:26	— — —Lessons of <i>Immuno</i>
§ 6:27	— —Other lower court decisions
§ 6:28	“Pure Opinion” vs. “Mixed Opinion”: the <i>Restatement</i> <i>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

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
- § 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 proceedings
- § 8:20 —Federal rule
- § 8:21 — —Aides and assistants
- § 8:22 — —Committee reports and staff
- § 8:23 — —Holding in *Hutchinson v. Proxmire*
- § 8:24 —State legislators
- § 8:25 —Subordinate legislative bodies
- § 8:26 —Witnesses in legislative proceedings
- § 8:27 Absolute immunity for executive and administrative 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*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:43 — — Solutions to the duplication problem in *Gertz* fault cases

§ 8:44 — — Solutions to the duplication problem in *Gertz* fault cases—Requiring fault greater than negligence to defeat the privilege

§ 8:45 — — Solutions to the duplication problem in *Gertz* fault 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 *Dun & Bradstreet* 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
- § 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 *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
§ 10:30.50	—Unconsented recording
§ 10:31	—Activities covered—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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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	— — — <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 *Hit Man* litigation
- § 11:54 — — Legal arguments
- § 11:55 — — Court of appeals decision in *Rice v. Paladin Press*
- § 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
- § 12:2 — 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 — — — *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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 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 <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 *Judith Miller* 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 *Hutchinson v. Proxmire*
- § 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 *Bose v. Consumers Union*
- § 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

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 — — —*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