



Carrie A. Goldberg @cagoldberglaw Wed Apr 07 18:55:23 +0000 2021

Today my client, @RepKatieHill, lost against perverted Daily Mail, a website that peddles in humiliation and monetizes sexual privacy invasions of women.

DM said, and the court agreed, that Katie's nudes were their free speech.

We think the appellate court will disagree. 1/

The court dismissed Katie's civil case at the earliest stage on anti-SLAPP grounds which is intended for nuisance defamation lawsuits against legit publications.

This is maybe the first time an Anti-SLAPP has been used to throw out a nonconsensual pornography civil suit. 2/

Dismissing Katie Hill's case on ANTI-SLAPP grounds sets a dangerous precedent for victims of nonconsensual pornography everywhere. Anybody who dares enter the public eye should now have legitimate concern that old nude and sexual images can be shared 3/

widely and published by any person or media purporting to have journalistic intentions. This ruling has the exact opposite effect California's revenge porn intended – which was to reduce and not amplify or promote nude images without consent. 4/

Katie Hill suffered a sexual privacy violation of a historic and unprecedented size. Daily Mail published 16 articles about Hill showcasing her nude images to their global audience. In one instance, Daily Mail acknowledged the images were provided by Hill's ex and that one 5/

of the nude images was taken illegally without Hill's knowledge or consent. In that article the Daily Mail made joke of the fact that the images were supplied in defiance of an order of protection Hill had obtained against her ex just three days prior. 6/

Just last month Daily Mail publicly apologized to Meghan Markle for publishing a private letter to her father. Make no mistake, though, Daily Mail is not sorry. Today it defended its right to have a business model that peddles in women's humiliations and privacy invasions. 7/

Daily Mail could have made the exact same points about Hill – through screenshots of text messages and clothed images – but they instead chose to publish the gratuitous nude images just for the clickbait and cause injury. 8/

Daily Mail claims, and the Court sadly agrees, that publishing nude images of Hill was newsworthy. Yet, the majority of the images were published after Hill had already left office. And by repeatedly publishing the same images in different stories, 9/

any purported newsworthiness diminishes. Plus, the regular due diligence we might see in news – fact checking, verifying sources – was not there. There is virtually no precedent where somebody suing for revenge porn has had their case dismissed on grounds of ANTI-Slapp. 10/

We insist – and will bring it up in appeal – that revenge porn lawsuits are not speech-based lawsuits. They center around the conduct of nonconsensual sharing – and this is not speech.

ANTI-SLAPP laws were designed to curtail nuisance lawsuits against the media for 11/

publishing legitimate speech. Today we have victims of revenge porn who are being frozen out – who are losing access to our judicial system and the freedom to dream big if they have anybody in their past with nude images they can share.

12/

It's total bullsh*t that our congressional floor can be used by Matt Gaetz to share nude images of unknowing women, but that our courts aren't there to give ALL victims justice if that happens. 13/

This is just phase 1 of the fight. There's much more in store. Daily Mail may have won this motion, but they will go down in history as a woman-terrorizing sicko publication. And this will get reversed. 14/14

And huge 🍀❤️🍀 to @AdamMasseyLaw @AnnieSeifullah and Ashley Parris for their brains and stamina in this epic fight. 🍀🍀🍀

Oh! And if you are interested in this very worthy legal fight and want to throw money at it, we love you!!!

And you can contribute toward legal costs here,

<https://t.co/bRFvMp97PG>