

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

MEANITH HUON,	)	
	)	
	)	
v.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO.: 1: 11-cv-3054
	)	
	)	
	)	
ABOVETHELAW.COM, et. al.	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants	)	

**PLAINTIFF’S OBJECTION TO THE ABOVE THE LAW DEFENDANTS’ MOTION  
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Plaintiff, Meanith Huon, states as follows:

1. The Above the Law (“the ATL”) Defendants omit the complete text of the Court’s order. On November 30, 2011, the Court ordered: “Plaintiff’s Amended Motion to Strike Exhibit B to Defendants’ Memorandum [50] is granted to . . . The transcript shall be stricken from the record under Rule 12(f) with leave to refile a redacted transcript.” (Docket 74).
2. But Exhibit B, the 173 page trial truncated transcript was not immediately re-filed and the Defendants seemed to abandon Exhibit B.
3. A week before Mr. Huon’s Response brief was due, Defendants re-filed the 173 page Exhibit B. Mr. Huon had to rewrite his arguments to address the offending transcript—in addition to responding to Defendants’ 22 page brief and 6 page chart and other exhibits.
4. Defendants also omit other orders that were modified by the December 5, 2011 order entered by the Court.
5. On September 30, 2011, Mr. Huon filed a motion to present the Jezebel Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for hearing. In his prayer for relief, he asks for leave to file a

Response brief in excess of 15 pages to 27 pages to respond to the Jezebel Defendants' 27 page Motion to Dismiss. (Docket No. 59).

6. Mr. Huon recalls the Magistrate Judge granting him this motion for leave to file a 27 page Response Brief to the Jezebel Defendants' Motion to Dismiss but is unable to locate a Docket Text Order. The Court had previously granted Mr. Huon leave to file a 22 page brief to the ATL Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Docket Nos. 56 and 74)

7. On November 30, 2011, Mr. Huon filed his 33-page Response brief to the Above the Law Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and a Motion for leave to file 33 pages instead of 22 pages and for a one week extension to file his Response Brief to the Jezebel's Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

8. The reason for the Motion was because the Jezebel Defendants raised issues not connected related to the litigation, falsely accusing him of having pending criminal charges and of being a sex offender. Moreover, both Defendants spent pages arguing issues where the case law was against them. For example, the ATL spent pages discussing the reporter's privilege but at the end of its Memorandum cited Cook v. Winfrey, which held that the District Court committed reversible error by dismissing plaintiff's defamation claim on a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6)." 141 F.3d 322, 330-31 (7th Cir. 1998)." The Jezebel Defendants argued that the anti-SLAPP statute applied when there are no allegations that calling Mr. Huon a rapist and a sex offender "further one's right to participate in government". Defendants do not bring to the attention of the Court that a simple search of Westlaw would provide a result of cases by other judges in the Northern District of Illinois that dismissal is not appropriate at this stage, since Mr. Huon is entitled to discovery, Doctor's Data, Inc. v. Barrett, 2011 WL 5903508 (N.D.Ill.,2011), or that the Act does not apply. Trudeau v. ConsumerAffairs.com, Inc., 2011 WL

3898041, N.D.Ill., September 06, 2011 (NO. 10 C 7193).

9. As on other occasions, the Jezebel Defendants immediately objected to Mr. Huon's motion for a 1-week extension.

10. On December 5, 2011, the Court entered the following order:

Plaintiff is granted leave to file a responsive brief of no more than 23 pages to the Above The Law Defendants Motion to Dismiss on or before December 12, 2011 2.

As to all Memoranda relating to Above The Law Defendants Motion to Dismiss heretofore filed or scheduled to be filed, all parties shall file on or before December 12, 2011, a summary of no more than 15 pages of their respective Memoranda and a summary of no more than 15 pages of any exhibits to said Memoranda. (For further details, see Order in separate docket entry). The motion hearing set for 12/6/11 is stricken. Judicial staff mailed notice (gl, )

11. Mr. Huon interpreted the order to mean that the Court had had enough of the lack of civility between the parties and their attorneys and did not want the parties to continue filing more pages of motion on a straightforward motion to dismiss at the pleading stage. He interpreted the order to mean that the Court wanted any Memorandum relating to the Motions to Dismiss to be filed by December 12, 2011 with a page limitation of 15 pages. After all, Mr. Huon can file a motion to amend the complaint or seek to re-plead. Defendants didn't have to write War and Peace to get its point across.

12. Interpreted any other way, the December 5, 2011 wouldn't make any sense that the Court would order the parties to file a Summary and then allow Defendants leave to file a Reply, after limiting Mr. Huon 27 page Response Brief to the Jezebel Defendants down to 15 pages.

13. With less than a week to file a 23 page Response Brief and a 27 page Response Brief, Mr. Huon called the Courtroom Deputy and asked for clarification as to what the Court meant by "Summary". Did the Court want Mr. Huon to file a 27 page Response Brief to the

Jezebel Motion to Dismiss, a 23 page Response Brief to the Above the Law Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, and two 15-page Summaries? Mr. Huon was advised that Mr. Huon and the Jezebel Defendants were to file their respective Memorandum or Response Briefs by December 12, 2011 not to exceed 15 pages.

14. In the remaining week, Mr. Huon endeavored to convert his 33 page Response Brief to the Above the Law's Motion to Dismiss into a 23 page Response Brief and to convert his 27 page Response Brief to the Jezebel Defendants' Motion to Dismiss into a 15 page Response Brief.

15. It would be patently unfair for the ATL Defendants to be given leave to file a Motion to Dismiss and a 22-page Memorandum of Law with Exhibits in Excess of 170 pages, leave to file a Summary, and now leave to have more time to file a Reply brief.

16. Mr. Huon tried calling counsel for the ATL Defendants directly on at least two days but it went to voice mail. The email attached to the ATL Defendants' Motion for Extension on the day it filed its motion is evidence of the kind of lack of response that Mr. Huon receives when he makes an effort to resolve outstanding issues by reaching out with a meaningful conference. Counsel for the ATL Defendants do not respond to Mr. Huon. Counsel for the Jezebel Defendants called him a serial sex offender—with no basis in fact.

17. The Jezebel Defendants and its attorneys' ongoing objections to routine motions for extensions created this misunderstanding or situation.

18. Mr. Huon has never had any problems dealing with the attorneys for the Madison County Defendants, Hinshaw and Culbertson and the City of Chicago Corporation Counsel, in Huon v. Mudge, et. al. 11-cv-3050. Counsels in that case return calls and agree to extensions of time.

19. Defendants' argument that the defamatory blog posts are innocent are undermined by the treatment Mr. Huon has received in litigating this case where counsel for one Defendant does not return his calls and counsel for a second Defendant calls him a serial offender with pending criminal charges in a judicial pleading, with no factual basis. Mr. Huon does not receive the same treatment by the Madison County Defendants or its attorneys, who would actually have more knowledge of the official proceedings than bloggers.

20. The inescapable conclusion is that the blog posts are defamatory. As evidence, even the attorneys defending the Defendants perceive Mr. Huon as a sex offender who should not be extended the courtesy of extensions of time or meaningful conferences to resolve differences and where the Jezebel Defendants' attorneys have engaged in personal attacks of Mr. Huon in a Response brief.

21. The ATL Defendants do not offer anything new in their Rely brief, after spending more than 22 pages trying to apply the reporter's privilege to bloggers who wrote about a news article—not an official proceeding.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Meanith Huon, requests that this Honorable Court:

1. Deny the Above the Law Defendants' Motion for Extension of time.
2. Alternatively, Mr. Huon asks that the Court modify the entire briefing schedule to allow Mr. Huon his original page limitation of 27 pages to amend his Response brief to the Jezebel Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, time to file an Amended Response with the 27 page limitation, and time to file his Summaries to both Defendants.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Meanith Huon  
Meanith Huon

Meanith Huon  
ARDC No.: 6230996  
PO Box 441  
Chicago, IL 60690  
312-405-2789  
huon.meanith@gmail.com

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

MEANITH HUON,	)	
	)	
	)	<b>Plaintiff,</b>
v.	)	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO.: 1: 11-cv-3054</b>
	)	
	)	
	)	
ABOVETHELAW.COM, et. al.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	<b>Defendants</b>

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Under penalties of law, I attest the following documents or items have been or are being electronically served on all counsel of record for all parties on December 18, 2011:

**PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION TO THE  
THE ABOVE THE LAW DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

Respectfully submitted,  
/s/ Meanith Huon  
Meanith Huon  
PO Box 441  
Chicago, Illinois 60690  
Phone: (312) 405-2789  
E-mail: huon.meanith@gmail.com  
IL ARDC. No.: 6230996

