

NICK DENTON: MEDIA ASSASSIN!

Hulk Hogan's lawyer stated to reporters: *"Gawker will do anything, say anything, and attempt anything to disguise what amounts to reprehensible conduct. What they did is apparent. All excuses aside it is time for them to come to terms with their conduct and be held accountable. Their continued efforts to excuse their conduct by distraction will not work with this jury and should not work with the general public."*

Were the Google/Gawker attacks on Hulk Hogan, XP Vehicles, Aptera and others, political "hit jobs" Gawker was hired to execute by the DNC beneficiaries of the ATVM and LG DOE Funding Programs?

The financial tracking and communications relative to the transfer of monies says: "Yes"!

- Fact: Hulk Hogan's brand used to carry tens of millions of voter attention metrics
- Fact: Hulk Hogan was being considered as a spokesperson for some Republican candidates
- Fact: Gawker Media has received tens of millions of dollars from DNC, DNC run Google, and DNC-backing campaign financiers, now uncovered in recent leaks
- Fact: Gawker Media has previously been charged with engaging in hundreds of media "hit-jobs", and almost every one of their attacks was against a person the DNC was in opposition with
- Fact: It is an election year
- Fact: Hulk Hogan is acting as a proxy for all of those who were targeted and attacked by Nick Denton, owner of Gawker Media, at the direction of powerful politicians
- Fact: Many very powerful people believe Gawker Media is a "cesspool of tabloid exploitation"

Where will this end up? Stay Tuned:

[Legal News](#)

Hulk Hogan, Journalist Sue Gawker Media



By [Teresa Lo](#)

Summary: *Writer Ashley Terrill is the latest to sue media giant, Gawker, who is also being sued by wrestler and reality TV star Hulk Hogan.*

Gawker is [another media company](#) that has been plagued with lawsuits. This time writer [Ashley Terrill is seeking \\$10 million in damages](#), The Daily Beast reports. In her lawsuit that was filed last week in New York, she claims Gawker "published a false and highly defamatory hit-piece about Terrill" that hurt her reputation.



Terrill was referring to a November 23, 2015, article written by Sam Biddle called, [Tinder Confidential: The Hookup App's Founders Can't Swipe Away the Past](#). In the article, Biddle describes the legal battles and inner turmoil inside of Tinder, the company behind the popular dating app, and he names Terrill specifically as a columnist who was “on an obsessive, possibly unhinged pursuit” of digging up dirt on Tinder’s former vice president Whitney Wolfe.

Terrill claims that she contacted Gawker to remove and retract the story, but her request was denied. To write his piece, Biddle had been in contact with Terrill and the Tinder subjects, and Terrill appeared to believe the fact that they were talking to Tinder executives was “concealed.”

Terrill is represented by Los Angeles attorney Charles Harder, who is also representing Terry Bollea, a.k.a Hulk Hogan, in a suit against Gawker. Hulk Hogan is suing Gawker for publishing a grainy video of Hulk Hogan having consensual sex with the wife of his friend, Bubba the Love Sponge. Hogan said he had no knowledge of being filmed.

Hulk Hogan’s lawsuit is seeking \$100 million, and he is suing Gawker and its majority stakes owner and found Nick Denton. Gawker Media, a collection of gossip and lifestyle sites, is privately held and reportedly makes \$40 million a year.

Hogan’s case is scheduled to begin March 7 in Florida. The case will appear before Florida Circuit Court Judge Pamela Campbell. The Daily Beast reports that Gawker’s legal fees for the Hulk Hogan case has already reached seven figures.



Screenshot courtesy of the [ABC Action News YouTube channel](#)

Hulk Hogan v Gawker: \$100m lawsuit puts first amendment to the test again

A federal court sided with the media company in a previous clash but the former wrestler continues the battle and claims defamation and loss of privacy

Hulk Hogan has challenged Gawker to a rematch in a local civil court in Florida.

Nicky Woolf For The Guardian
@nickywoolf

Gawker begins the legal fight of its life on Monday with opening statements in a lawsuit between the

New York media company and the moustachioed wrestling and reality TV star Hulk Hogan over the publication of his sex tape.

At issue is a post Gawker ran in October 2012 that included a video showing the wrestler, then 58, appearing to have sex with a woman called Heather Clem, who at the time was married to Hogan's best friend, talk radio DJ Bubba "the Love Sponge" Clem.

The post, which was titled *Even for a Minute, Watching Hulk Hogan Have Sex in a Canopy Bed is Not Safe For Work but Watch it Anyway*, included not only the video but an accompanying essay describing the intercourse in not-entirely-flattering terms.

Hogan, who was fired by the WWE last year for a racist outburst caught on tape, is asking for \$100m in damages for defamation, emotional pain and loss of privacy. He is approaching the trial with the over-the-top bombast for which he became known during his days in the WWE. The day before jury selection began, he tweeted: "Time for the real main event! I AM going to slam another Giant! Hogan vrs Gawker! Watcha Gonna Do Gawker? Only Justice Brother."

— Hulk Hogan (@HulkHogan) March 1, 2016

Time for the real main event!"I AM" going to slam another Giant! Hogan vrs Gawker! Watcha Gonna Do Gawker? Only Justice Brother HH

"Look, this is a serious legal case, with constitutional implications," Gawker founder Nick Denton told the Guardian. "It's not a cage match except for those that see everything through the prism of fake wrestling."

There are privacy laws in the US, but they can be superseded by the first amendment and public interest – which Denton argues applies in this case, because Hogan had said publicly that he had not slept with Heather Clem. They will also argue that Hogan talked nearly incessantly about his sex life in the media in any case.

This trial is in fact a rematch. Hogan and Gawker have fought this suit before, in a federal court which sided with Gawker and affirmed its first amendment right to publish.

But then, Hogan refiled the case in a local civil court in Florida. The problem is that high-minded arguments about the nominally almost ironclad nature of American protections for freedom of speech under the first amendment to the constitution may mean little to this jury, which was drawn from a local pool in St Petersburg, Hogan's hometown, where he owns a beachside memorabilia shop and is a proud fixture of local life. Such a jury may react strongly against Gawker, whom Floridians could see as representing a snarky New York media elite.

If he wins, it is likely that the case will later be thrown out on appeal by a higher court. But the problem for Gawker is that relief might come too late. Under Florida law, if the jury finds in favour of Hogan, Gawker is on the hook for the money immediately as bond while it appeals, \$100m is more than the company has on hand, and under Florida law the court can ask for any sum in damages, above and beyond even the amount Hogan set.

This means that Gawker could either have to file for bankruptcy, or find a backer with extremely deep pockets. In fact, there already may be a contingency plan in place: in January, Denton announced that

he was planning to sell a minority stake in Gawker Media to the investment company Columbus Nova Partners, in part to bolster the company against the potential \$100m hit.

David Houston, Hogan's litigation counsel, framed the \$100m claim as a deterrent. "If organisations such as Gawker and their ilk are to be stopped and discouraged, one of the best ways to do it is to have a substantial verdict that in and of itself warns or deters anyone out there from doing the same thing," he said.

However, Denton said that the \$100m figure was "a big round number plucked out of the air".

"There's no logic to it," he continued. "It would represent \$11m for every second of sex on the excerpt that we included to illustrate the story. For Hogan to get such a giant payday for his indiscretion: that would be entirely without precedent."

The motivation to run the story, Denton told the Guardian, was "to close the gap between what was being talked about and what was in the media, and actually what he'd been saying himself, the image he'd been putting out himself about his sex life".

Houston denied that this was a cut and dry first amendment question, however. "Because: we have never objected to the story being told, or words being used to tell the story. What we have objected to is Gawker's use of a video that was taken without Terry Bollea's consent or knowledge," he said, using Hogan's given name. He called Gawker's first amendment defence "a prostitution" of the concept.

But Denton, after having been in court for the first few days of jury selection, seemed confident. "It will be easier to make a public interest defense, because Hulk himself generated so much attention through discussion of his own sex life," he said.

"We're fighting for the principle that a public person can't open a topic when it suits them, and then close it down when they're called out," he added.

Related Items: [Ashley Terrill](#), [Charles Harder](#), [Florida](#), [Gawker](#), [Gawker Media](#), [hulk hogan](#), [Judge Pamela Campbell](#), [Nick Denton](#), [Sam Biddle](#), [Terry Bollea](#), [Tinder](#)