## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY OWENSBORO DIVISION

FORBA HOLDINGS, LLC,

NO. 4: 08-CV-137-M

PLAI NTI FF

**DEFENDANT** 

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

BEFORE E. ROBERT GOEBEL UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 

APPEARANCES:

DEBBIE HAGAN

VS.

For the Plaintiff: Thor Y. Urness

> Bradley Arant Boult Cummings 1600 Division Street, Ste. 700

Nashville, TN 37203

For Defendant: Pro Se

Debbi e Hagan

4453 Stričkland Drive Owensboro, KY 42301

Michelle E. Kerr Reported by:

Official Court Reporter

423 Frederica Street, Rm. 307

Owensboro, KY 42301 (270) 689-4417

Proceedings reported by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer.

```
1
                 THE COURT:
                             Madam Clerk, please call the
2
    next matter on the Court's docket.
3
                 THE CLERK:
                             Civil Action
4
    No. 4: 08-CV-137, Forba Holdings, LLC, v. Debbie
5
    Hagan.
6
                 THE COURT:
                             Appearances, please, for
7
    FORBA Holdings.
8
                 MR. URNESS: Yes, Your Honor.
                                                 Thor
9
    Urness on behalf of the plaintiff.
10
                 THE COURT:
                             Ms. Hagan, correct?
11
                 MS. HAGAN:
                             Yes.
12
                 THE COURT:
                             All right.
                                         What the Court
13
    has before it this morning is plaintiff's motion for
14
    sanctions against the defendant in this case,
15
    Ms. Debbie Hagan, to enforce a consent injunction to
16
    show cause as to why the defendant should not be
17
    held in contempt -- or to hold the defendant in
18
    contempt and for an award of attorney's fees, the
19
    imposition of fines and other relief.
20
                 Ms. Hagan has filed a document in this
21
    case in response to the plaintiff's motion for
22
    sanctions and has included in her response her own
23
    motion to quash and a motion to dismiss the consent
24
    injunction.
25
                 Are the parties ready to proceed?
```

1 Mr. Urness? 2 MR. URNESS: Yes, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Ms. Hagan? 4 MS. HAGAN: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: If you will. All right. 6 MR. URNESS: May it please the Court. 7 I'm Thor Urness and I represent the plaintiff in this action. This is a motion for 8 9 We are basically seeking three parts of sancti ons. 10 relief. 11 We are seeking sanctions for the 12 violations of the Court's order that have already 13 We are seeking a prospective sanction to i ncurred. 14 try to avoid having to come back on a serial basis, and we are also seeking relief in the form of 15 16 essentially discovery. Answers to the discovery 17 were served previously in the case so that we could 18 learn the identities of any persons who are current 19 or former employees of our client who have been 20 providing information to Ms. Hagan for posting of 21 the blog in contravention of their agreements with 22 our client. 23 We have prepared a notebook of the blog 24 entries that are subject to the motion. If I could 25 pass that forward, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: You may. 2 MR. URNESS: And Ms. Hagan already has a 3 сору. 4 May I approach? Yes, you may. 5 THE COURT: 6 Thank you. 7 MR. URNESS: These are simply the 8 printouts of the different some 20 blog entries that 9 were the subject of our briefing, and I won't go 10 into those in detail really, other than to point out 11 organizationally that the group A, those are the 12 blog entries that Ms. Hagan appears to have taken 13 down since we filed the motion, and then group B, 14 and these are numbered corresponding to the manner 15 in which we briefed them. Those are the blog 16 entries that appear to remain on her site as of the 17 27th of September. 18 This is something of a game, catch me if 19 you can, we've had to play ever since the consent 20 injunction was entered into. There is a program 21 that we subscribed to that tells us every time there 22 is a change made to her site, and we have to go look 23 at the site and see what sort of information has 24 been posted. 25 At some points in the past after the

injunction was entered, Ms. Hagan has agreed to take down some information. But it's just continued to be an issue for our client with confidential and internal information, which she agreed and the Court ordered that she not post to the blog, continuing to appear in the blog. All we want is for this to stop.

We think a sanction for the purposeful and -- well, repeatedly purposeful violations of the court order is in order, and we think a prospective sanction is the only way that we are likely to see any meaningful relief. And then, most importantly, because she does appear to be getting information from one or more persons at our company in violation of confidentiality agreements, the policies of our client with its employees and the internet posting policies, we think it is appropriate that those people be identified, so that we can put a stop to whoever is providing information to her in contravention of the obligations to our client.

We have cited the Immunomedics case as the authority in that regard. There is simply no protection for somebody who is violating their own agreement with their employer and providing internal confidential information to a third party that is

posted on the internet.

Now, I do want to be clear, and we've been very clear with Ms. Hagan, we're not here to interfere with her first amendment rights at all. Her blog posting, if the Court has had a chance to look at it, is voluminous. We are focused on discreet parts of that blog that are violations of an order that she agreed to and this Court has ordered. So that's the relief we are seeking.

And, again, we think the most important relief, perhaps, for our client is to determine what the source is of this information that is being provided to her. Because it's internal, it's not supposed to be provided to her, and she is grossly mischaracterizing any snippet of information she is able to obtain improperly from the company.

She is entitled to make a fair comment on her blog site. This is not about that. We have made it very clear to her notwithstanding what she said in portions of her response, we're not here to abridge her first amendment rights. We just want her to abide by the orders she agreed to in the Court's order. So our position is that.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

```
1
                 Ms. Hagan, do you wish to address the
2
    Court at this time?
3
                 MS. HAGAN:
                             Yes, please.
4
                 THE COURT:
                             You may.
                 MS. HAGAN:
5
                             Excuse me if I'm a little
6
    nervous.
7
                 THE COURT:
                             Before we go on, Mr. Urness,
8
    I'm assuming that you intend to produce evidence,
9
    sworn testimony at this hearing regarding these
10
    matters; is that correct, sir?
11
                 MR. URNESS: Your Honor, we did not
12
    understand this to be an evidentiary hearing.
13
    have an affidavit in the record, and we have the
14
    blog entries that are referenced in the record.
15
    They are on the internet. They are authenticated
16
    essentially through the citations in the record,
17
    and, again, we have them printed out. We did not
18
    understand this to be --
19
                 THE COURT: The Court anticipated this
20
    as an evidentiary hearing.
21
                 MR. URNESS: All right.
                                          Well, Your
22
    Honor, we have --
23
                 THE COURT: I'm assuming what you would
24
    do at that point in time is you would put the
25
    gentleman on the witness stand who made this
```

```
1
    declaration and subject him to cross-examination
2
    both by Ms. Hagan and by the Court.
 3
                MR. URNESS:
                             Your Honor, I looked at
4
    your order. I didn't understand that this was to
5
    be --
6
                 THE COURT:
                             Maybe we were not clear
7
    enough.
8
                 MR. URNESS:
                             Well, I'm not saying that.
9
                             Well, maybe we were not
                 THE COURT:
10
    clear enough. I'm serious.
                                  Maybe we were not clear
11
    enough in indicating that this would be an
12
    evidentiary hearing. I don't really see how you can
13
    go about proving she has violated this consent
14
    injunction without sworn testimony in this case.
15
                 Now, you say you have an affidavit, but
16
    the Court has in mind testimony that is subject to
17
                        And I'm particularly concerned
    cross-exami nati on.
18
    in this situation with -- I'm assumming you had no
19
    intention of making this presentation to the Court.
20
    The Court thinks it's necessary for you in an
21
    evidentiary hearing essentially to prove that the
22
    documents Ms. Hagan is purporting to quote or
23
    posting on this website, this web blog are, in fact,
24
    internal documents, confidential documents, such as
25
     that and such as you have alleged and Mr. Cruse has
```

```
1
    alleged in his declaration, so that the Court can
2
    compare the postings in this situation with the
 3
    actual documents themselves to prove that they are,
    in fact internal, confidential-type documents, which
 4
5
    she is prohibited from posting in this case.
6
                MR. URNESS: I understand, Your Honor.
7
    And, in fact, the blog entries themselves include
8
    those entries. And one thing I can do is I can
9
    cross-examine Ms. Hagan, because I think she will
10
    have to admit that she received this information
11
    from the -- company.
12
                 THE COURT: Well, you can call Ms. Hagan
13
    as if on cross in this situation, but I'm a little
14
    bit disappointed that we don't have this
15
    presentation ready to go. I don't really think you
    can prove your case simply with an affidavit in the
16
17
    record in this case. I think we need evidence,
18
    sworn testimony in this case.
19
                When we get through with this matter,
20
    I'm under an obligation to -- I make no ruling in
21
                I merely make a report and
    this case.
22
    recommendation to Judge McKinley in this matter.
23
    And then you folks, of course, then have an
```

25 my recommendations and my factual findings and my

opportunity to file objections to my report and to

1 legal conclusions. 2 And Judge McKinley has to have a record 3 before him in which I think is complete. without sworn testimony subject to 4 5 cross-examination, I don't think this record can in 6 any way, shape or form be complete. Now, I'm 7 prepared at this time to continue this hearing to 8 another day and to bring the parties back here, both 9 parties as it were prepared to make any presentation 10 of sworn testimony that you wish. 11 But, again, I apologize that the Court 12 was not clear as to what the Court expected at this 13 heari ng. 14 MR. URNESS: Well, no apology is 15 necessary. I have looked back over it, and 16 certainly we would have had Mr. Cruse if we had 17 understood --18 THE COURT: I think it's necessary. 19 Ms. Hagan ought to have the opportunity to 20 cross-examine the declarant in this situation should 21 she wish to do so. You obviously have the 22 opportunity and right to call her as if on cross, 23 but I think just to call her as if on cross in this 24 situation would be somewhat incomplete. She has no

ability in this situation, I don't think, to

1 characterize your documents as internal, 2 confidential or whatever. 3 I mean, there are documents and then 4 there is documents. There is some that would be 5 confidential, some that would be internal things 6 that would be the subject of this consent 7 injunction, but at the same time, it's incomplete without sworn testimony in this case as to what 8 9 documents are or are not. 10 I'm expecting in this situation for each 11 entry, each declaration made, a posting on the blog, 12 and then a corresponding document, internal document 13 or copyrighted document or confidential document, 14 marketing strategies, whatever it is that you're 15 claiming these things are, so that the Court can 16 actually look at your internal document and the 17 posting blog and make a determination that a 18 violation has occurred. 19 MR. URNESS: Fair enough. We can do 20 that, Your Honor. 21 Now, some of these -- there are 22 references to information, and those will have to be

addressed somewhat differently. Therefore, there is a particular document that is posted, for example, the first blog entry as part of a fable, and some of

23

24

```
1
    them make references to I heard such and such about
2
    the company, and those are pieces of information
3
    that are explained in the affidavit, and Mr. Cruse
4
    can testify more completely as to whether they would
5
    only be available to someone who has had access to
6
    internal information.
7
                 For example, the fact that the general
8
    counsel had been hired. Nobody knew that until it
9
    was publicly announced, and it showed up on the
10
    bl og.
11
                 THE COURT: I understand.
12
                              But we can do that, Your
                 MR. URNESS:
13
    Honor.
            And I apologize again for any inconvenience
14
    we have caused the Court or Ms. Hagan for not having
15
    Mr. Cruse here.
                             Your Honor, may I something,
16
                 MS. HAGAN:
17
    pl ease?
18
                 THE COURT:
                             Just one minute, if you
19
    will.
20
                 MR. URNESS: One other point that really
21
    relates to the third point that I missed, which is
22
    the identity of the people posting this information,
23
    that's not privileged at all. That's information
24
    that we requested in discovery and wasn't provided.
25
                 THE COURT:
                             Well, first of all,
```

regarding it being requested in discovery and not provided, if I'm not mistaken, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but your civil action against Ms. Hagan has been dismissed.

MR. URNESS: That's right.

THE COURT: The only thing that we have in this case is a direct order from Judge McKinley in this case that this consent injunction itself remains in full force and effect. And you tell me how we take formal discovery in a case that has been dismissed?

MR. URNESS: Well, I was going to ask for direction from the Court on that. I think one way to do it would be to file a motion for us to reopen the case, and that this discovery would be an aid at execution in terms of enforcing an injunction to which the parties have agreed. So it would be no different than if to say that if we had an agreed judgment for \$10,000, and it wasn't paid, we would have the right post judgment to engage in discovery as to assets of the defendant.

THE COURT: I would be inclined to allow you to do just that, to reopen discovery here in this situation and to obtain from Ms. Hagan the information that you would be able to acquire

```
1
    during the process of discovery. You did an
2
    admirable job of pointing out to the Court the law
3
    which you believe applies to injunctions, violations
    of injunctions, the penalties associated with the
4
5
    violations of injunctions.
6
                 But when you came to the task of saying
    to the Court that you believe as a part of your
7
    remedy for violation of the injunction that you're
8
9
    entitled to seek direct identity from her of certain
10
    named individuals within your client's company, I
11
    notice no law in that situation. You recited to me
12
    no I aw.
             I certainly think as a part and parcel of
13
    discovery in this situation that you would be
14
    entitled to do that.
15
                MR. URNESS:
                              Fair enough. We will file
16
    a motion to reopen the case for purposes of
17
    discovery. It was not in the motion as you pointed
18
          It is in the reply.
                              There is a footnote that
19
    notes the Immunomedics case in terms of that
20
    information. You're right, we did not brief it in
21
    the context of we're entitled to it, but we can do
22
    that.
23
                THE COURT:
                             Ms. Hagan, I will hear from
24
    you at this time.
```

MS. HAGAN:

Okay.

Thank you, Your

1 Honor. 2 On September the 23rd, I sent 3 Mr. Urness a letter asking for him to bring witnesses, like, for instance, Todd Cruse. 4 5 THE COURT: We are going to be doing 6 that. 7 MS. HAGAN: 0kay. And he never 8 Last week I sent him a reminder e-mail. responded. 9 And last night at 6:14, I get a letter saying the 10 hearing is not an evidentiary hearing, and we will 11 not be bringing any witnesses. So it was up until 12 then, I prepared for evidence, because I thought I 13 should be able to, you know, like I said --14 THE COURT: Sure. 15 MS. HAGAN: As far as revealing the 16 identities, there is case law for that, Management 17 Information Technologies v. Alyeska Pipeline 18 Services, where the judge felt that it would be 19 nothing but for retaliation against the employees. 20 And I do have a copy of that. 21 His client is under a federal corporate 22 integrity agreement for medicaid fraud, abusing 23 children --24 THE COURT: What does that have to do 25 with what we're doing here today?

1 MS. HAGAN: Well, their corporate 2 integrity agreement lines out they are not to 3 retaliate against any of their employees. It lines 4 it out in at least six sections about non-retaliation, non-retribution of employees that 5 6 want to come forward and tell what's going on to 7 keep them honest. 8 Also under the corporate integrity 9 agreement, they are supposed to make anything 10 available to their lawyer, because the Office of the 11 Inspector General has them monitored, and everything 12 is supposed to be pretty much open so that the 13 monitor can check. So by limiting me to be able to 14 speak, then that limits also the monitor to be able 15 to speak with me. So I would just like to point 16 that out. 17 THE COURT: Anything further, Ms. Hagan? 18 I think that's it for right MS. HAGAN: 19 But would you like this case? now. 20 THE COURT: Okay. We will go ahead and 21 mark that in this case. The Court will go ahead and 22 hang onto this notebook of blog entries, and we will 23 identify it as -- actually, I guess it's now known 24 as Church Street Health Management. You folks did 25 indicate that there has been a change of name

1 effective December 31 of 2010. So we will note for 2 the record that effective name change. 3 And I believe you acknowledged that in 4 your response, did you not, Ms. Hagan, that they had 5 changed their name? 6 MS. HAGAN: Yes. Yes, as of January of 7 this year. 8 We will note that. THE COURT: We will 9 keep this as Church Street's Health Management 10 Exhibit 1 in this case. You may go ahead and tender to the Court Defense Exhibit No. 1, that case, and 11 12 you may file that with the Clerk here in this case. 13 Now, what to do next. The Court is 14 going to suggest that within 14 days from the day 15 that you file your motion to reopen this case --16 Ms. Hagan, you need to pick up a copy of the local 17 rules, okay, because these local rules essentially, 18 I believe, gives some 21 days to file a response, 19 and then there is some 14 days in which they have a 20 right to file a reply. 21 Let me ask you this, Ms. Hagan. At this 22 point in time, do you object on any grounds 23 whatsoever known to you, do you object to the 24 reopening of this case for the purposes of taking 25 discovery in this matter?

1 MS. HAGAN: Yes, I do object to that. 2 THE COURT: All right. We will give you 3 an opportunity then to file your written objection 4 to it. 0kay. 5 Okay. After he files -- I MS. HAGAN: 6 have two weeks --7 THE COURT: You essentially have 21 days to file your response, and then they have 14 days 8 9 after that to file a reply. And what we will do is, 10 I would suggest that in your motion to reopen, you 11 go ahead and include their, perhaps, interrogatories 12 and requests for production of documents that you would intend to file by way of formal discovery. 13 14 And you may also wish, of course, to 15 take Ms. Hagan's deposition in this matter. 16 Certainly I would expect that in the process of 17 discovery that you would ask to do that. 18 I don't think it's worth our while at 19 this point in time to reset the hearing since we 20 have these motions to reopen. I would suggest that 21 the Court rule on that, and in the process of 22 reopening sets it for a hearing somewhere in the 23 future. 24 Now, the hearing that I'm going to set 25 next time, so that there is no mistake about it,

will be an evidentiary hearing where the Court will receive and accept proof in this case. I suspect --well, I'm not going to indicate what I would expect, but certainly I've indicated the nature of the proof I expect -- how you intend to put it on and to what manner, I leave to you.

Ms. Hagan, you also are entitled to put on proof of your own. One of the things that you're going to have to understand, Ms. Hagan, is in this situation that you've got to understand what is the issue before this Court, and it's a lot narrower than I think you believe it to be in this situation. My concerns are, did you, in fact, violate this consent injunction, did you violate it, and if so, what are we going to do about it.

On your motion to dismiss, frankly, you offered the Court no law whatsoever in this case on your motion to dismiss. And you better be prepared to argue the law on your motion to dismiss this consent, one that you've already signed, one which Judge McKinley has already put in the record as saying it's in full force and effect as against you. So you better be putting some law, some authority, some legal authority for this position of dismissing or quashing this consent injunction, you better be

```
1
    putting some law in the record on that.
2
                 MS. HAGAN:
                             Okay.
3
                             All right. Anything further
                 THE COURT:
4
    at this time? I suspect what we will be doing is
5
    probably getting to an evidentiary hearing in this
6
    case in February or somewhere in that neighborhood.
7
    I would suspect that if the Court does allow
8
    discovery in this case, that you get to it pretty
9
    quick so that we can go forward with the hearing in
10
    this matter.
11
                 The suspected discovery you want is some
12
    answering of interrogatories and whatnot, maybe
13
    production of documents, but certainly take the
14
    deposition of this person should the Court reopen
    it.
15
                             Will I have the opportunity
16
                MS. HAGAN:
17
    to take depositions?
18
                             Do you know how to take a
                 THE COURT:
19
    deposition? Do you know what's involved?
                                                Do you
20
    know the expense involved in doing that?
21
                 MS. HAGAN:
                             So you're saying --
22
                             Oh, you're entitled.
                 THE COURT:
23
    certainly am not going to limit discovery in this
24
    case to one side. You may take discovery in this
25
    case as well.
```

1 I'm assuming what the -- Mr. Urness, could you pronounce your last name for me? 2 3 MR. URNESS: I answer to just about 4 anythi ng. Urness. 5 THE COURT: Okay. I just wanted to make 6 sure that we were addressing you properly here in 7 this situation. 8 It rhymes with furnace. MR. URNESS: 9 THE COURT: Is it your intention to --10 what is it your intention to reopen, just the issue related to consent injunction, because you had a 11 12 Count 3 of your original complaint that dealt with 13 defamation? 14 MR. URNESS: No. 15 THE COURT: You're leaving defamation 16 al one? 17 MR. URNESS: We're happy just to have an 18 injunction in place that's abided by, so we would 19 want discovery for the purposes to determine -- now 20 I understand that there will be a full evidentiary 21 I think we are going to want to take heari ng. 22 Ms. Hagan's deposition before that hearing to obtain 23 very limited answers to interrogatories and 24 documents and communications she's had with third 25 parties that are the basis of our motion, because I

1 think we can prove through that testimony, as well 2 as Mr. Cruse's testimony that -- violations. 3 would want that to happen. 4 THE COURT: 0kay. And, Ms. Hagan, you 5 need to do two things. Get a copy of the local 6 rul es. Ask our Clerk out here how to do that. 7 I believe these rules are available on a website, are they not? 8 9 LAW CLERK: Yes, they are. 10 THE COURT: Apparently, you know how to 11 work your way around on the internet, so these are 12 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, avai I abl e. 13 you need to get a copy of those. Specifically, you 14 need to familiarize yourself with Civil Rules 26 15 through 37. These are the rules that basically 16 pertain to discovery in a civil action. 0kay. Get 17 yourself familiar with those. 18 Is it my understanding that MS. HAGAN: 19 the main thing they want is who talks to me or where 20 I get my information? Is that the main objective? 21 One of the things they will THE COURT: 22 be asking for in this situation is for you to 23 identify the sources of information, your sources of 24 information whereby you acquired information to post 25 on the web, who are you talking to or who is talking

In this discovery, they are going to want 1 to you. 2 that. 3 Now, if you intend to resist that, you 4 better be able to explain legally why you are 5 entitled to resist it. 6 MS. HAGAN: Okay. And I should do that 7 in my objection, right? 8 THE COURT: I also advise you if you can 9 to have an attorney represent you in these matters. 10 Obviously, you're entitled to represent yourself 11 should you wish the do so, but you're hamstrung in 12 this situation by not having a legal education, and 13 you're hamstrung by not knowing how the rules of 14 court operate. 15 Your motion to dismiss, frankly, is going to be difficult for you to sustain in this 16 17 case because of these -- because of some of the 18 problems you have with respect to lacking necessary 19 training and education to deal with it. So I'm just 20 going to suggest that you do that if you can. 21 We'll try to get this matter back to a 22 hearing as quickly as possible in this case. Al I 23 right. 24 MR. URNESS: Your Honor, I think 25 actually she may have an attorney. I spoke with

1 Mr. Flaherty. I don't know the nature of their 2 relationship is other than he has called me and 3 talked to me about it. 4 THE COURT: I'm just suggesting that he 5 helps her in going -- from this point forward to 6 have an attorney to help represent you in this 7 matter. Again, it's not required by law, but the problem is you're required -- whether you have an 8 9 attorney or not, you're required essentially to know 10 and understand and be able to apply the rules of 11 law, cases and things. 12 One other thing. MR. URNESS: 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MR. URNESS: I did get this letter that 15 Ms. Hagan referred to with nine people listed and 16 she said have these people at the hearing. 17 have Mr. Cruse here, and I don't anticipate having 18 anyone else. Obviously, if she wants to subpoena 19 people --20 THE COURT: If you want to have the 21 people here at the hearing in this case, ma'am, you 22 are required to subpoena them. 23 MS. HAGAN: Okay. 24 THE COURT: And anyone that you want at 25 the hearing must be subpoenaed. Be sure that --

you've got to be sure in this situation that you 1 2 don't get too far afield with your factual inquiries 3 of people. 4 MS. HAGAN: Yes, sir. 5 THE COURT: Again, I want to emphasize 6 this hearing will be fairly limited in scope. 7 MR. URNESS: In that regard, Your Honor, on this issue of retaliation, she is right, there is 8 9 a corporate agreement in place with the government 10 in which the company is following strictly. There 11 is no intent to retaliate at all. 12 There is simply an intent to understand 13 who is abiding by a company's policies and who is 14 not, so that we don't have problems that are created 15 by the company unwittingly and that doesn't have 16 anything to do with the corporate integrity. 17 Integrity has everything to do with the reasons as 18 to why we filed this lawsuit several years ago. 19 That's all we have, Your Honor. 20 Ms. Hagan, do you have any THE COURT: 21 other questions before we adjourn this? 22 MS. HAGAN: I don't think so. 23 THE COURT: All right. Once again --24 and you may fire this gun as guickly as you wish. 25 You don't have to wait your 14 days, but once it's

```
1
    filed, then you've got 21 days to respond.
2
                 MR. URNESS:
                             I forgot.
                                         The blog
3
    entries, we would like to have those sealed just
4
    because we don't -- we have complained about them
5
    being on the internet.
                             She has taken down 12 of
6
    them.
7
                 THE COURT:
                             That's a good point.
    going to order that the notebook of blog entries,
8
9
    Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 1, be placed in the record
10
    under seal.
11
                 MR. URNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
12
                             And the reason that is being
                 THE COURT:
13
    done, Ms. Hagan, placing it under seal, it keeps it
14
    unavailable to public eyes in this case.
                             That means I should take it
15
                 MS. HAGAN:
    down from the internet since it is being sealed; is
16
17
    that correct?
18
                 THE COURT:
                             Ms. Hagan, if you have got
19
    any of this material on the internet, and it's in
20
    violation of the consent injunction, I suggest you
21
    take it down.
                    I will leave it to you at this point
22
               But if it's in violation of the consent
    in time.
23
    injunction in this case -- going over that
24
    injunction, mainly looking --
25
                             Maybe that's what my
                 MS. HAGAN:
```

confusion is is what is --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I would suggest that THE COURT: you look at the consent injunction that was entered in this case, and I know you've looked at it, and you've probably gone over it many times trying to understand it. You seem to be a person who is very fluent with the English Language. You write well and you apparently understand documents very well. You have a lot of information that is contained on your blog. I have looked at it. Get your consent injunction in front of Do you have it there? you there. MS. HAGAN: Got it.

THE COURT: Now, this consent injunction does not pertain to things you've necessarily done in the past, it also prohibits you from doing certain things in the future. The paragraph marked capital A, 1, you are basically restrained and enjoined from publishing or posting at your internet websites or at any other location or in any other manner or making available for access to any other persons, a, any internal and/or copyrighted documents or other information of FORBA obtained directly or indirectly through access through the FORBA website.

1 Now, that pertains probably to what they 2 claim in their initial complaint, that you had 3 posted from your website or you posted on your 4 website as taken from their website. 5 Subpart B goes on to say and, and/or 6 any, any other internal and/or confidential FORBA 7 documents or information. And you can read FORBA at this point in time to read Church Street Management 8 9 since it has changed its name. 10 And for using or disclosing any 11 documents or information constituting trade secrets 12 including FORBA's marketing materials, of FORBA, 13 marketing strategy information, budgeting materials, 14 recruitment strategy information, spread sheets and 15 facility information lists. That's a pretty 16 all-inclusive list of things that you need to be 17 careful about posting. 18 MS. HAGAN: I'm not supposed to even 19 speak about it, right? 20 THE COURT: You may not -- it says using 21 or disclosing any documents or information which 22 constitutes trade secrets, including their marketing 23 materials. Just read it at face value in this

You know, at this point in time, I have

to leave it to you to decide if you have any

24

25

si tuati on.

```
1
    information or not at this point in time that
2
    violates this.
                     0kay.
3
                 MS. HAGAN:
                             I will read it and reread
4
    it.
5
                             All right.
                 THE COURT:
                                         Like I said,
6
    once I reset this matter for a hearing, I certainly
7
    am going to set it as an evidentiary hearing. And I
8
    will be really plain about it next time.
                                                It will
9
    essentially be a show cause hearing where the
10
    plaintiff has to put on evidence. You are allowed
11
    to put on evidence, not compelled, but allowed.
12
                 The plaintiff expects me to sustain
13
    imposition, they're going to have to put on
14
    evi dence.
                But you are entitled, it's a situation
15
    where you are not obligated to put on any evidence
16
    in this case, but you are certainly entitled to if
17
    you wish.
18
                 All right.
                             Anything else occur to
19
    either party in this case to ask the Court about?
20
                 MR. URNESS:
                              No.
                                   Thank you, Your Honor.
21
                 MS. HAGAN:
                             I don't think so.
22
                 THE COURT:
                                         Then this matter
                             All right.
23
    is adjourned.
24
                 (End of proceedings.)
25
```

		00
1	CERTIFICATE	
2	I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT	
3	TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE	
4	ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.	
5	s/Michelle E. Kerr, RPR	October 24, 2011
6	Michelle E. Kerr, RPR Court Reporter	DATE
7	court reporter	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		