

1                                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                                    FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3  
4 TABITHA TOTAH,

No. C 10-05956 CW

5                                    Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION  
FOR MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

6                                    v.

7 DONALD BIES,

8                                    Defendant.

9  
10 \_\_\_\_\_/

11                                    Plaintiff Tabitha Totah alleges a single cause of action  
12 against sole Defendant Donald Bies, accusing him of defamation.  
13 Having considered all of the parties' submissions and oral  
14 argument, the Court grants his motion for summary judgment on the  
15 merits.  
16

17                                    BACKGROUND

18                                    Lucasfilm Entertainment Company Ltd. hired Totah in 2004 and  
19 she was promoted to the position of "Markets Events Manager" in  
20 2006. Bies is a model maker and first began working for  
21 Industrial Light and Magic (ILM), a division of Lucasfilm, in  
22 1987. Bies Dec. at ¶ 2. Bies worked with Lucasfilm or an  
23 affiliated agency from then until 2007. Id. In 2006, the ILM  
24 model shop in which Bies worked was sold to a group of private  
25 investors. Id. Bies, however, continued to work with Lucasfilm  
26 on a consulting basis. Id. Some of this consulting work included  
27  
28

1 working on the set-up, artifact repair, and de-installation of  
2 Lucasfilm international exhibitions. Id. Bies and Totah worked  
3 together on three different Lucasfilm exhibitions, first in Korea,  
4 then in Brussels, and later in Madrid.

5 Totah claims that Bies defamed her by telling others that she  
6 was sexually promiscuous and slept around, and by making various  
7 false statements relating to her job performance. He made the  
8 allegedly defamatory statements about Totah to two individuals,  
9 first to Stacey Cheregotis and then to Howard Roffman. Cheregotis  
10 is a director of global product development for Lucas Licensing.  
11 Cheregotis had working relationships with both Totah and Bies, and  
12 Cheregotis and Bies were friends. Roffman is the President of  
13 Lucas Licensing, and has held that position for approximately ten  
14 years.  
15

16 In October 2008, Bies and Cheregotis, accompanied by their  
17 families, went to a pizza parlor for dinner. Over the course of  
18 the meal, they had a conversation about their work with Lucasfilm,  
19 which included a discussion about Totah's conduct while on the  
20 job. Declaration of Steven Robinson, Ex. F, Bies Dep. I at 68:3-  
21 5. Bies testified about the comments he made during the course of  
22 his conversation with Cheregotis. He said he probably told  
23 Cheregotis that "it was a bit of a joke . . . among the crew.  
24 That [Totah] was, in quotes, 'loose,' unquote." Id. at 57:3-12.  
25 Bies also told Cheregotis that Totah engaged in excessive drinking  
26  
27  
28

1 and partying while traveling on Lucasfilm business. Id. at 58:1-  
2 4, 9.

3 Cheregotis relayed to Roffman her conversation with Bies. On  
4 December 3, 2008, Roffman called Bies and questioned him about  
5 Totah's conduct. Robinson Dec., Ex. H, Roffman Dep. I at 50:9-  
6 51:22. According to Roffman, Bies told him that Totah "was not a  
7 good representative of Lucasfilm on the road," and that she was  
8 responsible for errors in text panels at the exhibition in Korea.

9 Id. at 53:24-25; Roffman Dec. at ¶ 9. Roffman also testified that  
10 Bies

11  
12 talked about [Totah's] temper, talked about fights that  
13 she had gotten into with different partners, he talked  
14 about her superficial knowledge of a lot of the things  
15 that she was dealing with. He talked about her  
16 reputation for sleeping around with people on the crew  
17 to the point that it was a joke among people working on  
18 the exhibition. He talked about her excessive partying  
19 and drinking that was preventing her from attending  
20 events. He talked about her lack of polish with the  
21 press.

22 Id. at 54:10-19.<sup>1</sup> Roffman denied that Bies told him that Totah  
23 was sexually promiscuous or had a reputation for being so.

24 Roffman Dec. at ¶ 11. Finally, Roffman attested,

25  
26 When Don Bies told me about Tabitha Totah, he told me  
27 among other things, that she slept with people on the  
28 crew of the business partners responsible for setting

---

25 <sup>1</sup> Roffman also stated that Bies had told him that Totah  
26 "seemed to have an adversarial relationship" with employees of the  
27 Lucasfilm Archives Division, in particular Laela French and Joanee  
28 Honour. Bies Dec. at ¶ 9. In her opposition, Totah does not  
assert that this particular statement is part of her claim for  
defamation.

1 up the exhibits and that this was well known among  
2 crewmembers, to the point it was openly joked about.

3 Roffman Supp. Dec. at ¶ 3.

4 Bies testified that he also told Roffman that Totah was  
5 flirtatious with a crewmember during a business trip to Belgium,  
6 that the crewmember was removed to prevent further contact with  
7 Totah, and that she was known as "loose" among the crew.

8 Robinson, Ex. F, Bies Dep. I at 51:11-52:13, 56:22-57:12.

9 The basis for Bies' statements about Totah's sexual conduct  
10 and reputation included the following. Bies witnessed her  
11 flirtatious behavior with the crewmember in Brussels, and Totah  
12 told him about her interest in the crewmember. Simerly Dec., Ex.  
13 H, Bies Dep. I at 51:11-21. Jose Araujo, the senior  
14 representative of UAU International, an event production company  
15 and client of Lucasfilm, told Bies that he thought Totah was  
16 sleeping with a UAU crewmember, and that Totah had a reputation  
17 for being "loose" with crewmembers. Id. at 111:3-5; Ex. G, Bies  
18 Dep. II at 152:22-25. Araujo's testimony corroborates this. He  
19 stated that it was common knowledge among the UAU crew that Totah  
20 and a crewmember named Ricardo slept together and that the crew  
21 often joked about Totah, guessing whom she would sleep with next.  
22 Declaration of José Araujo at ¶ 5-6. Bies testified that he never  
23 received confirmation that Totah had a sexual relationship with  
24 Ricardo; he characterized the allegation as a rumor. Bies Dep. II  
25 at 143:19-24. Finally, Bies testified that a different Jose from  
26  
27  
28

1 UAU, apparently Jose Poeira, told him that Totah had a reputation  
2 for being "loose" with crewmembers. Simerly Dec., Ex. G., Bies  
3 Dep. II at 151:15-152:25.

4 When asked whether she "had sexual relations with any  
5 employees of Lucasfilm partners while traveling on Lucasfilm  
6 business," Totah admitted to having sex with one person, Ricardo,  
7 a UAU crewmember.<sup>2</sup> Simerly Dec., Ex. A, Totah Dep. II at 227:14-  
8 228:12, 230:17-21. Totah further admitted to sleeping with a  
9 person named Dado during a Lucasfilm business trip to Brazil. Id.  
10 at 228:17-229:6. She testified that Dado was affiliated with a  
11 third-party vendor to Lucasfilm that managed a store. Id. at  
12 230:5-12. Totah did not consider Dado a crewmember. Id. at  
13 230:5-16.  
14

15 Bies' statement that Totah had a temper and fought with  
16 business partners was based on the following. Bies witnessed a  
17 heated exchange in Brussels between Totah and a Frenchman involved  
18 in the exhibition, and he was told about an argument she had with  
19

20  
21 <sup>2</sup> Bies argues that Totah admitted to having sexual relations  
22 with crewmembers in the plural, but this is incorrect. Totah's  
23 testimony was as follows:

24 Q: Well, let me ask you this: Have you had sexual  
25 relations with any employees of Lucasfilm partners  
26 while traveling on Lucasfilm business?

27 A. With crew members?

28 Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

Q. How many?

A. One.

Simerly Dec., Ex. A, Totah Dep. II at 227:14-21.

1 the director of a museum in Madrid. Simerly Dec., Ex. G, Bies  
2 Dep. II at 27:1-21; 98:18-23.

3 Bies stated that he told Roffman that Totah had superficial  
4 knowledge of her job due to errors that appeared on panels used in  
5 the Korea exhibition and because, on a number of occasions, Totah  
6 asked him to speak with certain individuals because he was more  
7 knowledgeable about Star Wars films than she was. Id. at 99:20-  
8 100:12. Totah admitted to misspelling the names of Star Wars  
9 characters and locations on the panels. Simerly Dec., Ex. A,  
10 Totah Dep. II at 154:5-14.

11  
12 The basis for Bies' statements about Totah's drinking and  
13 missed meetings, according to Bies, was that he was informed that  
14 Totah had missed a meeting in Germany because she was too "hung  
15 over" from drinking and socializing the previous night. Simerly  
16 Dec., Ex. G, Bies Dep. II at 118:10-18. The meeting involved a  
17 museum that was a potential place for an exhibition. Id. at  
18 118:22-24. Bies testified that a Jose from UAU told him about  
19 this incident. Both Jose Poeira and Jose Aruajo corroborate this  
20 testimony. Poeira Dec. at ¶ 8; Aruajo Dec. at ¶ 8. Totah denied  
21 that she ever missed meetings. Simerly Dec., Ex. A, Totah Dep. II  
22 at 152:25-153:8. However, she admitted to being drunk while  
23 attending one or more tradeshows or licensing shows on behalf of  
24 Lucasfilm. Simerly Dec., Ex. B, Totah Dep. I at 118:2-119:9. She  
25 did not recall the exact number of times, but stated that it was  
26 not more than five times. Id.  
27  
28

LEGAL STANDARD

Summary judgment is properly granted when no genuine and disputed issues of material fact remain, and when, viewing the evidence most favorably to the non-moving party, the movant is clearly entitled to prevail as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56; Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986); Eisenberg v. Ins. Co. of N. Am., 815 F.2d 1285, 1288-89 (9th Cir. 1987).

The moving party bears the burden of showing that there is no material factual dispute. Therefore, the court must regard as true the opposing party's evidence, if supported by affidavits or other evidentiary material. Celotex, 477 U.S. at 324; Eisenberg, 815 F.2d at 1289. The court must draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the party against whom summary judgment is sought. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986); Intel Corp. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co., 952 F.2d 1551, 1558 (9th Cir. 1991).

Material facts which would preclude entry of summary judgment are those which, under applicable substantive law, may affect the outcome of the case. The substantive law will identify which facts are material. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986).

DISCUSSION

"The tort of defamation is an invasion of the interest in reputation." Witkin, 5 Summ. of Cal. L., Torts, § 529 (10th Ed.

1 2005). Defamation may be libel or slander. Cal. Civ. Code § 44.  
2 A claim for defamation requires the following elements: (a) a  
3 publication that is (b) false, (c) defamatory, (d) unprivileged  
4 and that (e) has a natural tendency to injure or cause special  
5 damages. Taus v. Loftus, 40 Cal. 4th 683, 720 (2007).

6 The defamatory matter must be "published," that is,  
7 communicated "to some third person who understands the defamatory  
8 meaning of the statement and its application to the person to whom  
9 reference is made." Ringler Associates, Inc. v. Maryland Cas.  
10 Co., 80 Cal. App. 4th 1165, 1179 (2000).

11 "The sine qua non of recovery for defamation is the existence  
12 of a falsehood." Baker v. Los Angeles Herald Examiner, 42 Cal. 3d  
13 254, 260 (1986). "In all cases of alleged defamation, whether  
14 libel or slander, the truth of the offensive statements or  
15 communication is a complete defense against civil liability,  
16 regardless of bad faith or malicious purpose." Ringler, 80 Cal.  
17 App. 4th at 1180. "It is the defendant's burden to 'justify' or  
18 show the truth of the statements." Id. "It is sufficient if the  
19 substance of the charge is proven true, irrespective of slight  
20 inaccuracies in the details, so long as the imputation is  
21 substantially true so as to justify the gist or sting of the  
22 remark." Id. at 1180-81 (emphasis in original and internal  
23 quotation marks omitted).

24 California Code of Civil Procedure section 46 provides, in  
25 relevant part, that slander may be a false and unprivileged  
26



1 statement that "tends directly to injure" a person with respect to  
2 his or her "office, profession, trade or business," or "a want of  
3 chastity." Cal. Civ. P. § 46(3) and (4).

4 Finally, under California Civil Code section 47(c), a  
5 publication is privileged when it is made in

6 a communication, without malice, to a person  
7 interested therein, (1) by one who is also interested,  
8 or (2) by one who stands in such a relation to the  
9 person interested as to afford a reasonable ground for  
10 supposing the motive for the communication to be  
11 innocent, or (3) who is requested by the person  
12 interested to give the information.

13 Cal. Civ. Code § 47(c). Section 47(c) applies "where the  
14 communicator and the recipient have a common interest and the  
15 communication is of a kind reasonably calculated to protect or  
16 further that interest." Deaile v. General Telephone Co. of  
17 California, 40 Cal. App. 3d 841, 846 (1974)<sup>3</sup> (citing Fairfield v.  
18 Hagan, 248 Cal. App. 2d 194 (1967), overruled on other grounds by,  
19 Lundquist v. Reusser, 7 Cal. 4th 1193 (1994)). "The word  
20 'interested' as used in the statute refers to" an interest that is  
21 related to the defendant's efforts to protect "his own pecuniary  
22 or proprietary interest;" the relationship between the parties to  
23 the communication must be contractual, business or similar in  
24 nature, "such as between partners, corporate officers and members  
25 of incorporated associations;" and the communication must have

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>3</sup> Deaile addressed California Civil Code section 47(3), which  
28 was renumbered as section 47(c) in 1990. 1990 Cal. Stat. 1491  
(A.B. 3765).

1 been "in the course of the business or professional relationship."  
2 Rancho La Costa, Inc. v. Superior Court, 106 Cal. App. 3d 646,  
3 664-65 (1980).

4 Under section 47(c), "defendant generally bears the initial  
5 burden of establishing that the statement in question was made on  
6 a privileged occasion, and thereafter the burden shifts to  
7 plaintiff to establish that the statement was made with malice."  
8 Taus, 40 Cal. 4th at 721. Taus explains that the

9  
10 malice necessary to defeat a qualified privilege is  
11 "actual malice" which is established by a showing that  
12 the publication was motivated by hatred or ill will  
13 towards the plaintiff or by a showing that the  
14 defendant lacked reasonable ground for belief in the  
15 truth of the publication and thereafter acted in  
16 reckless disregard of the plaintiff's rights.

17 40 Cal. 4th at 721 (quoting Sanborn v. Chronicle Pub. Co., 18 Cal.  
18 3d 406, 413 (1976)).

19 Unlike a purported statement of fact, a statement of opinion  
20 generally does not support a claim for defamation. Taus, 40 Cal.  
21 4th at 720. California law applies a "totality of the  
22 circumstances" test to determine whether an alleged defamatory  
23 statement is one of fact or of opinion. Baker, 42 Cal. 3d at 260.  
24 "First, the language of the statement is examined . . . Next, the  
25 context in which the statement was made must be considered." Id.  
26 at 260-61. "If it is plain that the speaker is expressing a  
27 subjective view, an interpretation, a theory, conjecture, or  
28 surmise, rather than claiming to be in possession of objectively  
verifiable facts, the statement is not actionable." Standing

1 Committee on Discipline of U.S. Dist. Court for Cent. Dist. of  
2 California v. Yagman, 55 F.3d 1430, 1441 (9th Cir. 1995) (holding  
3 that an allegation of "dishonesty" does not imply facts capable of  
4 objective verification and is not actionable).

5 As noted earlier, Totah argues that Bies defamed her by  
6 telling others that she was sexually promiscuous and slept around,  
7 and making several false statements with respect to her  
8 performance on the job. Specifically, she argues that Bies  
9 defamed her by stating the following: (1) she had a reputation for  
10 being sexually promiscuous, (2) she was in fact sexually  
11 promiscuous, (3) she slept around, (4) she was a bad  
12 representative of Lucasfilm, (5) she was responsible for errors in  
13 a text panel at the Korea exhibition, (6) she lacked polish with  
14 the press, (7) she lacked knowledge about her job, (8) she was  
15 quarrelsome with business partners, (9) she partied and drank too  
16 much, and (10) she missed meetings while traveling on Lucasfilm  
17 business.  
18  
19

20 Totah alleges that Bies defamed her by stating that she had a  
21 reputation for being sexually promiscuous. There is no evidence  
22 that Bies used that phrase. Bies testified that he told  
23 Cheregotis that it was a joke among the crew that Totah was  
24 "loose." Roffman stated that Bies told him that Totah had a  
25 reputation for sleeping around with people on the crew to the  
26 point that it was a joke. Bies asserts that these statements were  
27 substantially true. Araujo's declaration confirms that Totah had  
28

1 such a reputation. Totah relies on testimony from Paulo Dias, the  
2 owner of UAU, that he was not aware of any sexual indiscretion by  
3 Totah, of her attraction to Ricardo, or of any UAU crewmember  
4 joking about her sexual behavior. This testimony does not  
5 constitute evidence that Totah did not have the reputation Bies  
6 described. It simply establishes that Dias was unaware of it.

7  
8 Furthermore, Bies' statements about Totah's reputation to  
9 Cheregotis and Roffman are privileged. Even though Bies'  
10 statement to Cheregotis was made in a social setting, Bies and  
11 Cheregotis shared an interest in the success of Lucasfilm business  
12 endeavors and Bies' statement was reasonably calculated to protect  
13 Lucasfilm's interests. Bies' statement pertained to Totah's  
14 reputation with Lucasfilm business partners and, thus, related  
15 directly to the company's interest in maintaining its business  
16 relationships. It is undisputed that Roffman, the President of  
17 Lucas Licensing, had an interest in information about Totah's  
18 conduct while on business travel and that he elicited the  
19 information from Bies. Totah has pointed to no evidence that Bies  
20 made these statements with malice, or that he lacked reasonable  
21 grounds to believe them to be true.

22  
23 Totah also claims that Bies defamed her by stating that she  
24 was in fact sexually promiscuous. Again, there is no evidence  
25 that Bies used that phrase. Totah contends that Bies "at least"  
26 told Cheregotis that Totah "slept around." However, only Roffman  
27 testified that Bies made such a statement to Cheregotis, and his  
28

1 testimony is inadmissible hearsay. Cheregotis testified that she  
2 refused to let Bies tell her any details.

3 There is no evidence that Bies told Roffman that Totah in  
4 fact "slept around." According to Roffman, Bies told him that  
5 Totah "slept with people on the crew of the business partners  
6 responsible for setting up the exhibits." Bies asserts as a  
7 defense that his statement is substantially true, and he carries  
8 the burden to establish this. As noted earlier, the truthfulness  
9 of a statement is sufficiently demonstrated if the substance of  
10 the charge is proven true, regardless of slight inaccuracies. It  
11 is simply required that "the imputation is substantially true so  
12 as to justify the gist or sting of the remark." Ringler, 80 Cal.  
13 App. 4th at 1180-81.

14  
15 Here, the imputation of Bies' remark is that Totah slept with  
16 employees of Lucasfilm business partners. Totah admitted to  
17 having sex with one UAU crewmember, and with another individual,  
18 affiliated with a third-party vendor to Lucasfilm, during a  
19 business trip to Brazil. Although Totah did not sleep with more  
20 than one crewmember, she slept with a second person who was  
21 likewise involved in Lucasfilm business. This evidence  
22 demonstrates the substantial truth of Bies' remark, such that it  
23 justifies the gist of it. Therefore, Bies may not be held liable  
24 for this statement.  
25

26  
27 Nevertheless, Totah argues that a jury must determine whether  
28 Bies impliedly communicated that she was promiscuous. However,

1 when the underlying facts are not in dispute, as in this case, the  
2 Court may determine whether the statement at issue is  
3 substantially true. See Gilbert v. Sykes, 147 Cal. App. 4th 13,  
4 27-29 (2007) (affirming, in the context of an anti-SLAPP motion,  
5 the trial court's determination that the representations at issue  
6 were substantially accurate and not defamatory as a matter of  
7 law). In Maheu v. Hughes Co., 569 F.2d 459, 465-67 (9th Cir.  
8 1977), a case cited by Totah, the court refused to overturn the  
9 jury verdict on appeal, rejecting the defendant's substantial  
10 truth defense and finding that defamation claims were  
11 appropriately submitted to the jury because the facts upon which  
12 the defendant relied were disputed. There is no similar factual  
13 dispute that the jury must resolve.

15 This case is similar to Terry v. Davis Community Church, 131  
16 Cal. App. 4th 1534 (2005). There the plaintiffs alleged in their  
17 complaint that a false report accused one of the plaintiffs, an  
18 assistant to a church youth group, of being a sexual predator and  
19 having a sexual relationship with a girl, and the other plaintiff,  
20 the leader of the youth group, of being involved in the  
21 relationship. Id. at 1539. The report, however, included no such  
22 direct accusation. Rather the report included the assistant's own  
23 words to the girl, stated that the leader was aware of the  
24 correspondence, and opined that the relationship was  
25 inappropriate. Id. at 1553. The plaintiffs, however, asserted  
26 that the report implied a sexual relationship, and that the  
27  
28

1 implied statement was defamatory. The court found that the report  
2 "raise[d] the question of whether [the assistant] is a sexual  
3 predator," but held that the allegedly implied statement was not  
4 actionable because it was undisputed that the assistant wrote the  
5 emails and other correspondence to the girl and the leader was  
6 aware of the correspondence. Id. The statements that provided  
7 the basis for inferring that a sexual relationship existed were  
8 not false.  
9

10 Likewise, here, there is no evidence that the purported  
11 implication of promiscuity was based on anything other than the  
12 substantially true statement that Bies made to Roffman, that Totah  
13 had sex with employees of Lucasfilm business partners while  
14 representing Lucasfilm abroad. Therefore, even if Bies' statement  
15 implies that Totah was promiscuous it is not actionable because  
16 the implication arises from a statement that is substantially  
17 true. Finally, as explained earlier, Bies' statement was  
18 privileged because Roffman had an interest knowing about Totah's  
19 conduct during Lucasfilm business travel, and Bies shared the  
20 information at Roffman's request. Again, Totah cites no evidence  
21 of malice.  
22

23 In addition to complaining of Bies' statements related to her  
24 sexual reputation and behavior while on business travel, Totah  
25 alleges that he defamed her by impugning her job performance.  
26 Bies told Roffman that she was responsible for errors in text  
27 panels at the Korea exhibition. However, Totah admitted to the  
28

1 errors. Thus, this alleged statement does not support a claim for  
2 defamation.

3 Bies told Roffman that Totah "was not a good representative  
4 of Lucasfilm on the road." Such a statement is not a matter of  
5 objectively verifiable fact. It is a statement of opinion akin to  
6 the statement in Yagman, 55 F.3d at 1441, that the judge was  
7 "dishonest." Furthermore, Bies made the statement when Roffman  
8 questioned him about Totah's conduct on the job. There is no  
9 dispute that Roffman was a person with a legitimate interest in  
10 such information, within the meaning of section 47(c). Nor has  
11 Totah produced evidence that Bies maliciously made the statement.  
12 Thus, even if Totah were able to establish that Bies' statement  
13 was actionable, it was privileged communication under section  
14 47(c).  
15

16 Bies also allegedly defamed Totah by telling Roffman that she  
17 lacked "polish with the press." This likewise is a statement of  
18 opinion that does not amount to an objectively verifiable fact.  
19 Furthermore, the statement is privileged under section 47(c)  
20 because Roffman elicited it by inquiring about Totah's conduct on  
21 the job. Totah has failed to produce evidence of malice, and  
22 fails to point to any evidence that Bies lacked grounds for his  
23 opinion. Reliance on her positive performance reviews is  
24 inadequate.  
25

26 Bies also told Roffman that Totah had "superficial knowledge  
27 of a lot of the things that she was dealing with." This statement  
28



1 is also one of opinion. The statement is privileged under section  
2 47(c) because Bies made the statement when Roffman questioned him  
3 about Totah's conduct on the job. Again, it is not disputed that  
4 Roffman had a legitimate interest in the information. There is no  
5 evidence that Bies spoke with malice or without factual basis.

6 Totah contends that Bies defamed her by saying that she had a  
7 temper and had fights with Lucasfilm partners. Bies testified  
8 that he had witnessed a heated exchange between Totah and a  
9 Frenchman involved in the Brussels exhibition and that he was told  
10 about an argument she had with a museum director in Madrid. Totah  
11 has not presented evidence that these fights did not occur or that  
12 she did not have fights with Lucasfilm partners. Totah's positive  
13 performance reviews are too general to negate Bies' testimony  
14 regarding the arguments. According to the Dias declaration, upon  
15 which Totah relies, he was only present at "various times" during  
16 the exhibitions in Brussels and Madrid. Although Dias testified  
17 that he never heard from Lucasfilm employees that Totah was  
18 unprofessional in any way, he did not specifically address whether  
19 Totah argued with Lucasfilm partners in Brussels or Madrid. He  
20 was not necessarily present when the fights occurred. Ricardo  
21 Comissoli, upon whose declaration Totah also relies, was only  
22 personally present for Totah's trips to Brazil and Chile.  
23 Comissoli did not address whether Totah argued with business  
24 partners in Brussels or Madrid. Furthermore, like the statements  
25 above, Bies' representations to Roffman on these points are  
26  
27  
28

1 privileged. Totah lacks evidence that the statements were made  
2 with malice.

3 Totah also claims that Bies defamed her by stating that she  
4 partied and drank too much, and missed business meetings. Bies  
5 told Cheregotis that Totah engaged in excessive drinking and  
6 partying while traveling on Lucasfilm business, although he  
7 apparently did not mention missed meetings to her. Totah admitted  
8 to being drunk while attending trade shows or licensing shows on  
9 behalf of Lucasfilm. Thus, Bies is entitled to the substantial  
10 truth defense as to his statement that Totah drank and partied  
11 excessively while on business travel. In addition, this statement  
12 is privileged and Totah lacks evidence that Bies spoke with  
13 malice.  
14

15 Bies also told Roffman about Totah's excessive partying and  
16 drinking, and that it prevented her from attending Lucasfilm  
17 activities. Totah denies that she missed meetings. Even assuming  
18 that this amounts to evidence that the latter statement was not  
19 substantially true, Bies' communication was privileged. It is  
20 undisputed that Roffman is an interested person and the statement  
21 was made in response to his questioning. Nor has Totah produced  
22 evidence of malice on Bies' part, or evidence that Bies lacked  
23 reasonable grounds for belief in the truth of his statement.  
24

25 None of the statements that are the subject of Totah's  
26 defamation claim is actionable, either because they are  
27 substantially true, because they are opinions, or because they are  
28

1 privileged communications made without evidence of malice, or all  
2 three.

3 CONCLUSION

4 In sum, Totah has failed to raise a disputed issue of fact  
5 material to her claim for defamation based on any statement that  
6 there is evidence Bies made. Therefore, Bies' motion for summary  
7 judgment is GRANTED. The Clerk shall enter judgment for Bies.  
8 Bies shall recover his costs from Totah.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: 3/8/2012

11   
12 CLAUDIA WILKEN  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28