

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

MEANITH HUON,
Plaintiff,
v.
CIVIL ACTION NO.: 1: 11-cv-3054
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
ABOVETHELAW.COM, DAVID LAT,
DAVID LAT, ELIE MYSTAL,
BREAKINGMEDIA.COM, JOHN LERNER,
DAVID MINKIN, BREAKING MEDIA,
JOHN DOES 1 to 100, GAWKER MEDIA
a/k/a GAWKER.COM, JEZEBEL.COM,
NICK DENTON, IRIN CARMON,
GABY DARBYSHIRE, JOHN DOES 101to 200,
LAWYERGOSSIP.COM, JOHN DOE NO. 201,
,NEWNATION.ORG
a/k/a NEWNATION.TV a/k/a
NEW NATION NEWS, JOHN DOE NO. 401,
JOHN DOE NO. 402, JOHN DOE NO. 403,
Defendants

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Meanith Huon, complains of the Defendants as follows:

CAUSE OF ACTION

1. This a diversity action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1332 for
defamation, defamation per se, false light invasion of privacy, intentional infliction of emotional
distress, civil conspiracy, cyberstalking and cyberbullying.

2. This action arises out of Defendants dissemination of knowingly false
statements about Plaintiff, Meanith Huon, in a variety of national and international media as well
as on the Internet. To wit, Defendants falsely depicted Mr. Huon as, among other things, a rapist,
a serial rapist, a lawyer who posed as a supervisor and a talent scout to meet women, as someone
who got away with rape, as a sexual deviant, as a Cambodian "invasive species", as "nigger
depravity". Defendants statements' were intended to, and were in fact, read by many in the

United States and people worldwide, including potential business employers and clients and family and friends of Mr. Huon.

3. Defendants' statements about Mr. Huon are untrue and were made with knowledge of falsity or with reckless disregard to the truth of such statements. Defendants wrote and published, and intended for republication, the statements with malice and a conscious disregard for the truth for the purpose of furthering Defendants' own agenda of generating ad revenue, generating website traffic, publishing newspapers, preserving Defendants' influence in social media, and/or securing material business and economic advantage.

4. By its conduct, Defendants engaged in cyberbullying and/or cyberstalking of Mr. Huon. On information and belief, Defendants have engaged in cyberbullying and/or cyberstalking other individuals and/or entities. Instead of reading, investigating, and truthfully reporting on the false arrests, malicious prosecution, or injustice that Mr. Huon or other individuals suffer, Defendants seek to make false statements and cyberbully Mr. Huon or other individuals for Defendants' own agenda.

5. Defendants' broad dissemination of defamatory statements about Mr. Huon has caused severe economic, competitive and reputational harm to Mr. Huon. The success of Mr. Huon derives from his professional reputation as an attorney and standing in the community. Plaintiff has experienced lost business or employment opportunities. Additionally, Mr. Huon personally has suffered humiliation and embarrassment as a result of the dissemination of the false statements by Defendants.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1332, as a result of the diversity of the parties, and pursuant to the Court's supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. Section 1367(a). The matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interest.

7. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 (b). A substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred within the district.

### **THE PARTIES**

8. Plaintiff, Meanith Huon (hereinafter referred to as "Mr. Huon"), was at all relevant times a citizen of the United States and a resident of Cook County, Illinois.

9. On information and belief, Defendant, Breaking Media and Breakingmedia.com, disseminates news worldwide on the Internet. Defendant, Breaking Media owns and operates the websites, Abovethelaw.com and Breakingmedia.com, as well as other websites that disseminate news worldwide on the Internet.

10. On information and belief, Defendant, David Lat, is a citizen of New York. Defendant Lat is the managing editor of Abovethelaw.com website. On information and belief, Defendant, John Lerner, is a citizen of New York and CEO of Abovethelaw.com and Breaking Media. On information and belief, Defendant, David Minkin, is a citizen of New and publisher of Abovethelaw.com website and Breaking Media. . On information and belief, Defendant, Elie Mystal, is a citizen of New York. Defendant Mystal is a writer and editor for Abovethelaw.com.

11. On information and belief, Defendant, Abovethelaw.com, is a website that disseminates news worldwide on the Internet.

12. On information and belief, Defendants, John Does 1 to 100, including, John Doe No. 1 a/k/a LatherRinseRepeat, are registered users, writers, or editors of Abovethelaw.com who posted defamatory comments regarding Mr. Huon.

13. On information and belief, Defendant, Gawker Media a/k/a Gawker.com disseminates news worldwide on the Internet. Defendant Gawker Media owns and operates the websites, Jezebel.com and Gawker.com, as well as other websites that disseminates news worldwide on the Internet. All Gawker articles are licensed on a Creative Commons attribution-Non Commercial license.

14. On information and belief, Defendant, Nick Denton is a citizen of New York City and owns Gawker Media, Gawker.com, and Jezebel.com. On information and belief, Defendant, Gaby Darbyshire, is Chief Operating Officer of Gawker Media, Gawker.com and Jezebel.com.

15. On information and belief, Defendant, Irin Carmon , is a citizen of New York and is a writer for Jezebel.com.

16. On information and belief, John Does 101 to 200, are registered users, writers, editors of Jezebel.com who posted defamatory comments regarding Mr. Huon. On information and belief, Defendant, John Doe No. 101 a/k/a Andpreciouslittleofthat, John Doe No. 102 a/k/a Sarahmc, Defendant, John Doe No. 103 a/k/a Dinosaurs and Nachos, girlfriend!, Defendant, John Doe No. 104 a/k/a SorciaMacnasty, Defendant John Doe, No. 105 a/k/a deafblindmute, Defendant, John Doe No. 106 a/k/a CassandraSays, Defendant, John Doe No. 107 a/k/a lanboy, Defendant, John Doe No. 108 a/k/a JadeSays, Defendant, John Doe No. 109, rachel723 a/k/a, Defendant, John Doe No. 110 a/k/a vikkitikkitavi, Defendant, John Doe No. 111 a/k/a tomsomething, Defendant, John Doe No. 112 a/k/a cool\_as\_KimDeal, Defendant, John Doe No. 113 a/k/ HeartRateRapid are writers, registered users, or editors of Jezebel.com.

17. On information and belief, Defendant, Lawyergossip.com is a website that disseminates news worldwide on the Internet. On information and belief, John Doe No. 201 owns Lawyergossip.com and wrote an article on Lawyergossip.com.

18. On information and belief, Defendants, New Nation News a/k/a Newnation.org, a/k/a Newnation.tv promote racism and the discrimination and hatred of racial minorities

worldwide on the Internet.

19. On information and belief, Defendant, John Doe No. 401 a/k/a White Sail, John Doe No. 402 a/k/a Vorlos, and John Doe No. 403 a/k/a Tricknologist, are registered users of Newnation.tv.

## FACTS

### I. ABOVETHELAW.COM

20. On May 6, 2010, Plaintiff, Meanith Huon, was acquitted of sexual assault charges in Madison County, Illinois, after the jury deliberated for 2 hours.

21. On May 6, 2010, after Mr. Huon was acquitted, Defendant Elie Mystal, posted the following on Abovethelaw.com and made these statements available worldwide on the Abovethelaw.com website:

Rape Potpourri

We've got a couple of rape stories . . .

Here at ATL, we're your one-stop shop for breaking rape coverage. We cover the rape allegations of the rich and famous, as well as any alleged attorney rapists near you . . .

Our next story from the files of the wanton and depraved is a little more in our wheelhouse. A St. Louis-area lawyer came up with an excellent little game to meet women. Meanith Huon allegedly listed Craigslist ads where he claimed to be a talent scout for models.

So far, so good. I once pretended to an Ostrich rancher from sub-Saharan Africa because I was trying to impress bubble gum princesses at a BU party. But Huon's potentially harmless lies allegedly turn dastardly, pretty quickly:

The victim said she responded to a Craigslist ad posted by Huon in late June, seeking promotional models, sending her resume, her phone number, and two pictures of herself . . .

The two agreed to meet at the downtown St Louis bar Paddy O's, the victim testified.

But the next day, the victim was running late and called Huon. He told her to meet him

at another bar, but when she got there, he **told her the other promotional models left,** and so he was going to **interview** her, **the victim** said.

And this people, is why God invented Google. **Had the victim Google Huon, she would have found stories like this from the Madison County Record:**

A Chicago attorney who was **posing as a supervisor for a company that sets up promotions for alcohol sales at area bars** was charged in Madison County July 2, with two counts of criminal sexual assault, two counts of criminal sexual abuse and one count of unlawful restraint.

Meanith Huon, 38, of 3038 S Canal St. in Chicago, was arrested by the Chicago Police Department on July 1, and was transferred to Madison County the next day.

**Or she might have come across this link from, at Lawyer Gossip:**

Lawyer, Meanith Huon, 39, who was originally charged with criminal sexual assault, sexual abuse and unlawful restraint is now facing charges of harassment and cyber stalking!

Of course, women shouldn't have to assume that every guy they meet is a **potential rapist**. But apparently there are a lot of **depraved dude walking around that are potential rapist**.

In any event:

Huon and the woman went to a couple of bars near Busch Stadium, then to a Laclede's Landing bar **before Huon asked the victim if she wanted to go to Pop's in Sauget to meet the other models.**

The woman agreed, **but told Huon she didn't have enough gas in her car,** so she went with him, she said.

**This is gonna end badly.**

As Huon's Honda Civic crossed the poplar Bridge, the victim said Huon drove past the Sauget exit and continued north on Interstate 55. As the car was moving, **Huon fondled the woman, then forced her to perform oral sex on him,** the **victim**, said.

Oh, come on. If somebody was driving and tried to **"force" me to perform oral sex** on them, I'd just get out of the stupid car. Which is to say, **I'd do exactly what the victim did in this case.**

Huon exited Interstate 55 near New Douglas, looking, **the victim** said, for a secluded place to make out with her. The **victim leaped from the moving car,** she said, **to escape**

Huon, leaving her cell phone, purse, shoes and identification in his car.

**“If he wasn’t going to take me back to the freeway, I had made a decision to do anything I could to get out of that car,”** the victim testified.

Assistant State’s Attorney Chris Hoell showed pictures to the jury of the woman’s bruised knees, skinned feet and cut toes.

**Damn. If you can’t get a woman to consensually stay in a moving vehicle, can you really get her to consensually agree to sex (insofar as lying to her about your job and your intentions to get her into the car counts as consensual in the first place)?**

**Obviously, Huon sees things differently.**

Mike Mettes, Huon’s defense lawyer, said during opening statement that Huon and the victim met, but at some point in the evening, it became social and the two of them had consensual sex. But the victim asked for \$500 and threatened if Huon didn’t pay her, she would “cry rape,” the attorney argued.

**So we’re not denying that she hurled herself out of a moving vehicle, we’re contending she jumped out of the car to make it look like she was raped? Right, sure. That sounds like the definition of incredible.**

**It seems to me that there is entirely too much (alleged) raping going on in this country.** If this keeps up, men and women are going to have to start carrying around sexual consent forms on their persons.

I, the undersigned, being of sound mind and hot body, do hereby consent to affixing my \_\_\_\_\_ to the other party’s \_\_\_\_\_. Such amorous undulations include, but are not limited to, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and all proposals will be considered so long as no animals (barnyard or otherwise) are involved.

I claim no rights to future \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, or \_\_\_\_\_, in exchange for this brief interruption in my chronic loneliness. (Emphasis supplied.) A copy of the article is attached as Exhibit “A”.

22. Defendants, Breaking Media and Breakingmedia.com, Abovethelaw.com, David Lat, John Lerner, David Minkin, Elie Mystal, published and disseminated the defamatory articles and comments worldwide via the Internet. Defendants continued to republish and disseminate the above-mentioned defamatory statements worldwide after May 6, 2010.

23. Defendants knew or should have known that certain statements in the article were false at the time they were made and published.

24. Defendants intentionally omitted the following facts:

- a. The complainant that is the subject of all the news articles is the same woman.
- b. The jury was not allowed to consider the consent defense and, thus, the jury found that no sexual contact took place. The trial judge had barred the consent defense.
- c. The complainant sustained minor injuries from walking or running in a cornfield.
- d. There was no evidence of a Craigslist ad for a job for promotional modeling. There was no evidence that Mr. Huon represented himself as a talent scout.
- e. The video evidence at trial showed Mr. Huon, dressed in shorts, on a Sunday afternoon with the complainant, in a bar.
- f. There was no DNA evidence of semen and the complainant never went to the hospital.
- g. The police never interviewed witnesses at the scene who testified at trial that the complainant gave different versions of the alleged incident.
- h. The police asked the complainant to call Mr. Huon to arrange a private meeting and to ask for money.
- i. The complainant had gone drinking with Mr. Huon at several bars for hours.
- j. There was no evidence presented that the complainant jumped out of a moving car.
- k. There was no evidence of force presented at trial. The police report stated that complainant alleged that Mr. Huon raised his voice but that Mr. Huon never threatened the complainant.
- l. The photograph of the complainant showed no injuries (besides from her walking in a cornfield barefoot) and showed her clothes to be completely intact with no tears.

25. Defendants intentionally invented the following fiction or made the following false statements available worldwide on Internet via the Abovethelaw.com website by:

- a. Falsely identifying Mr. Huon as an **attorney rapist** near you on the day of his acquittal.
- b. Falsely labeling Mr. Huon as **wanton and depraved**.
- c. Falsely identifying Mr. Huon as a **St. Louis-area lawyer**. Mr. Huon's address in the news article is in Chicago and he was a financial advisor at the time of the alleged incident.
- d. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon came up with an excellent little **game to meet women**.
- e. Falsely reporting that Meanith Huon allegedly **listed Craigslist ads** where he claimed to be a **talent scout for models**.
- f. Falsely suggesting that Mr. Huon was targeting “ **bubble gum princesses** at a **BU party**.” The alleged complainant was 26 years old at the time of the alleged incident.

- g. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon told **lies**.
- h. Falsely calling Mr. Huon's actions as **dastardly**.
- i. Falsely reporting the complainant as a "**victim**" of Mr. Huon.
- j. Falsely reporting that the complainant **responded to a Craigslist ad posted by Huon** in late June, seeking **promotional models**.
- k. Falsely reporting that the two agreed to meet at the **downtown St Louis bar Paddy O's**.
- l. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon told complainant to meet him at certain bars.
- m. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon told complainant that "**other promotional models left**" and that Mr. Huon " was going to **interview** her."
- n. Falsely reporting that if the complainant had Googled Mr. Huon, she would have found other stories in the Madison County Record and Lawyer Gossip.
- o. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon was **posing as a supervisor for a company that sets up promotions for alcohol sales at area bars**.
- p. Falsely calling Mr. Huon a **potential rapist** and a **depraved dude walking around that are potential rapist**.
- q. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon **asked the complainant if she wanted to go to Pop's in Sauget to meet the other models**.
- r. Falsely reporting that the complainant said she **didn't have enough gas in her car**, so she went with him.
- s. Falsely reporting that "**This is gonna end badly**."
- t. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon "**fondled the woman, then forced her to perform oral sex on him**."
- u. Falsely stating that Mr. Huon "**force**" **the complainant to perform oral sex** and that the complainant jumped out of the car for that reason. Defendants write: "Oh, come on. If somebody was driving and tried to "**force**" **me to perform oral sex** on them, I'd just get out of the stupid car. Which is to say, **I'd do exactly what the victim did in this case**."
- v. Falsely reporting that the photograph of the woman showed **bruised knees, skinned feet and cut toes**.
- w. Falsely reporting that the issue of consent was an issue before the jury: "**Damn. If you can't get a woman to consensually stay in a moving vehicle, can you really get her to consensually agree to sex (insofar as lying to her about your job and your intentions to get her into the car counts as consensual in the first place)? Obviously, Huon sees things differently**."
- x. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon lied about his intentions or that he tried to get complainant into the car.
- y. Falsely reporting that complainant hurled herself out of a moving car.
- z. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon "raped" the complainant: "**It seems to me that there is entirely too much (alleged) raping going on in this country**."
- aa. Falsely inventing a fiction that the issue of consent was submitted to the jury. The issue of consent was never submitted to the jury and, thus, the jury had to have found no sexual contact. (Emphasis supplied.)



26. Defendants defamed Mr. Huon and placed him in a false light by inaccurately reporting his defense attorney's opening argument. Defendants omitted that Mr. Huon's defense counsel was relying on information contained in the police report that was replete with false statements.

27. Defendants created the following consent form which further defamed Mr. Huon and placed him in a false light :

I, the undersigned, being of sound mind and **hot body**, do hereby **consent** to **affixing my \_\_\_\_\_ to the other party's \_\_\_\_\_**. Such **amorous undulations** include, but are not limited to, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and all proposals will be considered so long as **no animals (barnyard or otherwise)** are involved.

I claim no rights to future \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, or \_\_\_\_\_, in exchange for this **brief interruption** in my **chronic loneliness**. (Emphasis supplied.)

28. The consent form defames Mr. Huon and places him in a false light in that he suggests that he has "chronic loneliness", was seeking a "brief interruption" for a "hot body" from anyone other than a "barnyard" animal.

29. The consent form defames Mr. Huon and places him in a false light in that he is intimidated as a rapist who needs to use a consent form.

31. Defendants knew or should have known that the aforesaid statements were false at the time they were made and published

32. Defendants conducted no investigation into the reliability or accuracy of the sources of the news articles or allegations on the internet. Had Defendants called Mr. Huon or investigated lawyergossip.com, Defendants would have learned that when Mr. Huon asked lawyergossip.com to remove the false and defamatory statements, lawyergossip.com contacted the Madison County State's Attorney's Office, who threatened to bring more charges against Mr. Huon.

33. Defendants conducted no investigation into the credibility or reliability of source of the news articles or allegations on the internet. Had Defendants called Mr. Huon or investigated the newspaper sources Defendants would have learned that when Mr. Huon asked the newspapers to remove the false and defamatory statements, a reporter contacted Mr. Huon's defense attorneys during trial and threatened to give Mr. Huon bad press coverage.

34. Defendants omitted that Mr. Huon had been acquitted on May 6, 2010.

35. Defendants provided no coverage of Mr. Huon's false arrest and malicious prosecution and never contacted Mr. Huon for his comments before publishing the article.

36. Defendant, Abovethelaw.com has history of cyberstalking or cyberbullying Mr. Huon. On July 3, 2008, Defendants called Mr. Huon "Lawyer of the Day" and linked the post with an article from the Madison County Record that contained false statements and defamed Mr. Huon. On information and belief, Defendants' post and links continued to be republished on the Abovethelaw.com website and were made available worldwide on May 6, 2011. The post continued to be made available online to the world, including Illinois readers, after May 6, 2011.

37. Defendants intentionally misrepresented the articles reported in the newspapers. The writer and editor, both Harvard-educated attorneys, have the competency to read a news article that are written at the 6<sup>th</sup> grade level. The news articles identify the complainant that is the subject of all the news articles as being the same woman.

38. Defendants knew that the news articles involved the same woman cause Defendants called Mr. Huon in the July 3, 2008 posting "**Non-Sequiturs: 07.03.08** . . . Lawyer of the Day" and attached a link to an article regarding the same woman. A copy of the posting is attached as Exhibit "B".

39. Defendant knew that the allegations about Mr. Huon contained in the news articles are inconsistent and contradictory. Defendants falsely reported both that Mr. Huon posed as a talent scout and that Mr. Huon posed as a supervisor. Both allegations are inconsistent. Defendants never explained the inconsistencies contained in the news articles.

40. Defendants falsely stated or intimated that there were other women that Mr. Huon allegedly had raped but did not explain that the same woman is the subject of all news stories or blog posts.

41. Defendants' falsely reported or intimated that Mr. Huon was a serial rapist.

42. Defendants' falsely reported or intimated that Mr. Huon got away with rape.

43. On information and belief, Defendant, John Doe No. 1 a/k/a LatherRinseRepeat, posted "Huon has a history . . . Looks like he's in for another a\_ss kicking" on the Abovethelaw.com website on or after May 6, 2011. John Doe No. 1 posted his false statement, knowing that it was false with actual malice. This statement is false. A copy of this posting is attached as Exhibit "C".

44. The aforesaid statement continued to be posted on the Abovethelaw.com website and made available worldwide after May 6, 2011.

45. Defendants knew or should have known that the aforesaid statements were false at the time they were made and published.

46. On information and belief, Defendants, John Doe Nos. 2 to 100, are registered users, writers, or editors of Abovethelaw.com who posted defamatory comments regarding Mr. Huon. On information and belief, Defendants have intentionally removed the comments in an effort to spoliage evidence. Mr. Huon seeks an order compelling Defendants to produce copies of the comments and postings by John Does 1 to 100 regarding Mr. Huon.

## **II. JEZEBEL.COM**

47. On May 11, 2011, **after Mr. Huon filed this lawsuit against Abovethelaw.com and more than one year after**, Plaintiff, Meanith Huon, was acquitted of sexual assault charges in Madison County, Illinois, Defendant, Irin Carmon, wrote an article regarding Mr. Huon with the captioned, **“Acquitted Rapist Sues Blog for Calling Him Rapist”** and disseminated it worldwide on the Internet via the Jezebel.com website. A screenshot of the article is attached as Exhibit “D”.

48. Defendants, Jezebel.com, Gawker Media a/k/a Gawker.com, Nick Denton, Gabby Darbyshire, Irin Carmon, disseminated and published the defamatory statements and comments worldwide via the Internet.

49. There were more than 4,374 views of the article.

50. Defendants published Mr. Huon’s arrest and booking photograph in the article.

51. Defendants intentionally superimposed the arrest photograph of Mr. Huon on the Abovethelaw.com article so that the words **“Rape Potpourri”** would be next to Mr. Huon’s photograph identifying him as a rapist.

52. The aforesaid article continues to be published and republished and disseminated worldwide on the Internet via Jezebel.com.

53. Defendants provided a link to the Abovethelaw.com article containing defamatory statements regarding Mr. Huon As of July 10, 2011, the link continues to remain even though Abovethelaw.com has removed its defamatory article from the Abovethelaw.com website. See attached Exhibit “E”.

54. Defendants control, block, edit and promote the comments that users can leave regarding the article. Defendants promote some comments and do not publish other comments. Defendants can promote certain comments by users, placing the comments at the top of the page or in a prominent location for all readers to view. Defendants have “Featured” and “Promoted Discussion” Comments. See attached Group Exhibit “F”.

55. Defendants state on its website that it is the policy of the Defendants to only post comments that Defendants “love”:

How do I get approved to comment?

We only approve the comments we love—so make sure you're adding something of quality to the post. Stay on-topic and seek to further the conversation. Leave us a juicy story on the #tips page or throw your hat into the ring of our open forums . . .

Do you have any tips for auditioning?

Leaving multiple high-quality comments on different threads with your newly created account increases your chances of getting approved. See attached Group Exhibit “F”.

56. On information and belief, John Doe No. 101 a/k/a Andpreciouslittleofthat, posted and edited a post to read: “Ed: Two seconds of proper Googling will get you to Mr. Huon’s firm webpage, complete with his phone number, should you want to call and offer any critiques. Exhibit “G”.

57. Defendants intentionally published and disseminated Mr. Huon’s arrest photograph next to the words “Rapist” and encouraged readers to Google Mr. Huon for his address and telephone number for the malicious purpose of harassing and cyberstalking Mr. Huon.

58. Various versions of the same Jezebel.com article continues to be published and republished and disseminated on the Internet worldwide. (Defendants altered the article to spoliage evidence, after Mr. Huon complained):

A Chicago man who was acquitted on a sexual assault charge is suing the legal blog Above The Law for implying that he's a serial rapist. If Meanith Huon gets his way, blogger sloppiness may cost ATL \$50 million.

Huon, a lawyer, was initially charged with two counts of sexual assault, two counts of sexual abuse, and one count of unlawful restraint. A woman had jumped out of his car, ran through a cornfield barefoot, and knocked on a random person's door saying he had forced her into sexual activity. She later said she believed she was spending time with him for a job opportunity related to alcohol promotions, until he allegedly yelled at her to perform oral sex. Huon's version was that it was a consensual encounter, and partly on the strength of a bartender's testimony that the woman had been drinking and asked where to go to have fun, the jury believed him.

Huon is also suing local law enforcement authorities in Madison County, Illinois for prosecutorial misconduct. His beef with Above The Law stems from a roundup post entitled "Rape Potpurri," in which blogger Elie Mystal mistakenly believes that news accounts of the same incident are different incidents that should have tipped the woman off that Huon was a serial offender. "The content of the article were [sic] defamatory in that it incorrectly and recklessly portrayed Mr. Huon as a serial rapist by treating the

same complaining witness as three different women," says the complaint, according to Forbes.

"And this, people, is why God invented Google," wrote Mystal in the original post, linking to articles that in fact described the same case. **The lesson learned: Google only takes you so far.** (Emphasis supplied.) A copy of one version of the article is attached as Exhibit "H".

59. Defendants continued to republish and disseminate the above-mentioned defamatory statements in various versions of the article worldwide after May 11, 2011.

60. Defendants knew or should have known that certain statements in the article were false at the time they were made and published.

61. Defendants republished or disseminated the same defamatory article from Abovethelaw.com without explaining that the article contained false statements. Defendants falsely stated that Abovethelaw.com was "sloppy". Defendant, Abovethelaw.com, intentionally disseminated false statements regarding Mr. Huon.

62. Defendants knew that Mr. Huon sued Abovethelaw.com for publishing a defamatory article replete with false statements and that Mr. Huon was acquitted more than a year ago. Defendants knew that Mr. Huon filed a false arrest and malicious prosecution lawsuit against Madison County, Illinois and several defendants. But Defendants continued to make false statements insisting that Mr. Huon was a serial rapist and that **"The lesson learned: Google only takes you so far."**

63. Defendants continued to publish and disseminate the false statements after Abovethelaw.com removed its defamatory statements regarding Mr. Huon.

64. Defendants engaged in retaliatory and vigilante justice by cyberstalking and cyberbullying Mr. Huon, posting his booking photo on its website and encouraging readers to Google Mr. Huon's telephone number and address and to contact him.

65. Defendants continued to call Mr. Huon a "rapist" who had been acquitted and suggested that had the complainant investigated Mr. Huon by other methods besides Google, the complainant would have learned that Mr. Huon was a serial rapist. Defendants knew that Mr. Huon had no prior convictions and had no other arrests for rape.

66. Defendants defamed Mr. Huon and placed him in a false light as a serial rapist who got away with rape when Defendants placed an arrest photograph of Mr. Huon next to the bold title **"Acquitted Rapist Sues Blog for Calling Him Rapist"**. Defendants' described the false statements made by Abovethelaw.com and allegations made by Mr. Huon. Defendants then closed with the words: **"The lesson learned: Google only takes you so far"**. Defendants falsely intimidated and made the false statement that Mr. Huon is a serial rapist and that

Abovethelaw.com was sloppy in reporting on a serial rapist.

67. Defendants knew that Mr. Huon had sued Madison County, Illinois and several defendants for defamation, false arrest, malicious prosecution but never reported this to its readers. Defendants conducted no investigation into the allegations. Defendants knew of the allegations in the lawsuit Mr. Huon filed against Madison County, Illinois and several defendants but never discussed the false arrest or malicious prosecution of Mr. Huon. Defendants never contacted Mr. Huon before publishing and disseminating the false statements.

68. Defendants knew that Abovethelaw.com had published false statements regarding Mr. Huon. Nevertheless, Defendants rushed to judge and convict Mr. Huon as a rapist within days of this lawsuit being filed against Abovethelaw.com.

69. In fact, Defendants engaged in the same reckless or intentional misconduct as Abovethelaw.com. Defendants intentionally misrepresented the news stories about the same woman in different incidents. Defendants writes that “. . . blogger Elie Mystal mistakenly believes that news accounts of the **same incident** are different incidents that should have tipped the woman off that Huon was a serial offender.” (Emphasis supplied.) However, the news stories were of **different allegations—not the same incident--** made by the same woman in 2008 and 2009. Defendants either never read the news stories or intentionally misrepresented the news stories.

70. Defendants can control, block, edit and promote the comments that users can leave.

71. Defendants intentionally promoted and selected comments that called Mr. Huon a rapist and that defamed Mr. Huon:

a. Defendant, John Doe No. 102 a/k/a SarahMc, wrote:

Just because a man is acquitted of rape does not mean he did not commit rape. That a jury would decide "not guilty" does not magically erase what he did--if he did, in fact, rape someone. The vast majority of rapists are never convicted of rape. Does that make them not rapists?

b. Defendant, John Doe No. 103 a/k/a Dinosaurs and Nachos, girlfriend!, wrote:

Innocent until proven guilty is a widely misunderstood concept. It basically means that the mere fact that someone is charged with a crime is not itself evidence that the person committed a crime.

Then you go to court. In court, there will be evidence presented. This evidence is where an actual, legal determination is made. Nobody is declared "innocent" in a court of law, they are found guilty or not guilty.

"Not guilty" is absolutely not the same thing as "innocent" from a legal standpoint. Those words do not mean the same thing in the world of law. "Innocent until proven guilty" is merely a concept for laymen to try to keep their non-lawyer brains from jumping to (non-legal) conclusions.

c. Defendant, John Doe No. 104 a/k/a SorciaMacnasty, wrote: Nevermind "serial rapist," he sounds like a foreal crazy person.

d. Defendant, John Doe No. 105 a/k/a deafblindmute, wrote: According to the link under "strength" he traveled to another city, used a false name, and then pretended to be a representative of a liquor company and advertised a job for a model. Now, that doesn't mean that he did/didn't rape her, but it is a goddamn shady way to start off an evening. He must have had some damn good lawyers to push that out of the jury's mind.

My big question is, if she tried to run from him that night and he acknowledges that they were together and there was some sexual interaction going on, what was his defense? I don't care how drunk you are, in the middle of a wanted sexual encounter you don't jump out of a moving car and run through a cornfield barefoot (fun fact: the bristly hair on corn leaves feel like thousands of needles when you run through it). I mean, it's sort of his word against hers for what was happening in the car, but we know that a third person saw her after she ran from him.

Any more legally knowledgeable people know how a jury is supposed to treat this type of evidence? Does the fact that its word vs. word in the car disqualify her claims to being assaulted even though she ran away from him and said she was assaulted that night? How can any sexual assault case be tried if that counts as reasonable doubt?

Arg this is more perplexing the more I think about it. Everything points to rape (his shady actions and lies earlier in the night; her running from him to a stranger), but there is no conclusive evidence I have heard speak of that proves he did/didn't do it.

God, it's almost as if our legal system is imperfect or something :/

e. Defendant, John Doe No. 106 a/k/a CassandraSays, writes:

Thanks, bartender and lawyer, for reminding me that since I have a vagina I'm not allowed to go out in public and attempt to engage in any sort of enjoyable activity unless I'm willing to have sex. With anyone who asks - my presence in a bar gives blanket permission to any guy who happens to find me attractive. I mean, if I didn't want to be raped I'd just stay at home, right?

f. Defendant, John Doe No. 107 a/k/a lanboy, writes: So he is actually upset about the "Serial" rapist part, actually he is just a one time accused rapist.

g. Defendant, John Doe No. 108 a/k/a JadeSays, writes:

Weird. I didn't know "where do I go to have fun" meant the same thing as "where do I go to get raped." It's great that that jury made that clear to me, otherwise I could get myself in some sticky situations like apparently accidentally begging to be raped. AWE. SOME.

h. Defendant, John Doe No. 109 a/k/a rachel723, writes:

you know it's women like you who don't understand the rules that make the rest of us ladies look bad.

I'm glad you learned before you actually got raped not to complain now if you do, you were asking for it!!

/sarcasm

i. Defendant, John Doe No. 110 a/k/a vikkitikkitavi, writes:

She jumped out of a moving car, leaving her shoes and purse behind and ran barefoot through a cornfield and pounded on a stranger's door to help her?

Fuck this "he's been acquitted" noise. He's a rapist alright, so we may as well call him one.

j. Defendant, John Doe No. 111 a/k/a tomsomething, writes:

I know you're going to get a million comments like hits, but the phrase "acquitted rapist" probably won't fly for a person who has already demonstrated his letigiousitousnicity.

k. Defendant, John Doe No. 112 a/k/a cool\_as\_KimDeal, writes:

Well shit! I didn't know kicking back at a bar and asking where I should go to have fun meant that I hereby consent to any and all sexual activity, with anybody, with this bartender here as my witness. Can I sign away my right to consent here on my bar tab? Okay, great.

l. Defendant, John Doe No. 113 a/k/ HeartRateRapid, writes:

Yea, all those crazy bitches going to the cops and lying about being raped. Except that false reports for stolen cars are more common. False rape reports make up less than 3% of all reported rapes, and as I'm sure you know, it horrendously underreported.



72. Defendants blocked and prevented Mr. Huon from posting a reply under his legal name.

73. Defendants knew or should have known that certain statements in the article were false at the time they were made and published.

74. Defendants intentionally omitted the following facts:

- a. Mr. Huon sued Abovethelaw.com for publishing false statements, including allegations that he invented a game to meet women.
- b. Abovethelaw.com intentionally published false statements. It was not “blogger sloppiness”.
- c. The complainant that is the subject of all the news articles is the same woman.
- d. The jury was not allowed to consider the consent defense and, thus, the jury found that no sexual contact took place. The trial judge had barred the consent defense.
- e. The complainant sustained minor injuries from walking or running in a cornfield.
- f. There was no evidence of a Craigslist ad for a job for promotional modeling. There was no evidence that Mr. Huon represented himself as a talent scout.
- g. The video evidence at trial showed Mr. Huon, dressed in shorts, on a Sunday afternoon with the complainant, in a bar.
- h. There was no DNA evidence of semen and the complainant never went to the hospital.
- i. The police never interviewed witnesses at the scene who testified at trial that the complainant gave different versions of the alleged incident.
- j. The police asked the complainant to call Mr. Huon to arrange a private meeting and to ask for money.
- k. The complainant had gone drinking with Mr. Huon at several bars for hours.
- l. There was no evidence presented that the complainant jumped out of a moving car.
- m. There was no evidence of force presented at trial. The police report stated that complainant alleged that Mr. Huon raised his voice but that Mr. Huon never threatened the complainant.
- n. The photograph of the complainant showed no injuries (besides from her walking in a cornfield barefoot) and showed her clothes to be completely intact with no tears.

75. Defendants intentionally invented the following fiction or made the following false statements worldwide on the Internet via the Jezebel.com website by:

- a. Falsely stating that “**Huon's version** was that it was a consensual encounter”. (Defendants omitted the fact that the jury was not allowed to consider the consent defense and, thus, the jury found that no sexual contact took place. The trial judge had barred the consent defense. Defendants omitted that Mr. Huon’s defense counsel was relying on information contained in the police report that was replete with false statements. )

b. Falsely stating that Huon won his case “partly on the strength of a bartender's testimony that the woman had been drinking and asked where to go to have fun, the jury believed him.” (Defendants omitted evidence presented during the entire week long trial. Defendants were not present during the trial.)

c. Falsely stating that “blogger Elie Mystal mistakenly believes that news accounts of the same incident are different incidents that should have tipped the woman off that Huon was a serial offender.” There were news accounts of the same woman involving **different allegations** in 2008 and 2009. Defendant, Mystal, is a Harvard-educated attorney.

d. Falsely stating that “the lesson learned: Google only takes you so far.” Defendants knew that Mr. Huon had never been convicted of rape or any crime, that Mr. Huon had never been disciplined, that Mr. Huon had never been arrested for any other alleged rape.

e. Falsely stating that “**Acquitted Rapist Sues Blog for Calling Him Rapist.**” Mr. Huon was not a rapist. Furthermore, he sued Abovethelaw.com for disseminating false statements about him, including allegations of posing as a talent scout.

f. Falsely depicting the Abovethelaw.com lawsuit as Mr. Huon suing Abovethelaw.com for calling him a serial rapist. Mr. Huon sued Abovethelaw.com for disseminating false statements, including calling him a serial rapist. However, there were other false statements that were disseminated that Jezebel.com never reported.

g. Falsely depicting or intimating that Mr. Huon was a Chicago man preying on women in the St Louis area. Mr. Huon was working as financial advisor for Edward Jones and was in St Louis for training.

76. Defendants disregarded the complaints from several readers that the article defamed Mr. Huon:

a. BringerofthePain: No, but it does mean that you can't call them rapists without being sued. It's merely the difference between what they are and what they can be identified as in public. You can think he's a rapist to your hearts content, but you can't print it.

b. taylvie3: No, but someone found not guilty is innocent in the eyes of the law. Calling them differently on a blog opens you up to a libel suit. Truth would be a defense in a libel suit, but that would mean retrying a criminal case in a civil libel lawsuit to prevent paying \$50M.

c. the.schwartz.is.not.with.me: Excuse me, but can we not call this guy an "acquitted rapist"? He was acquitted, so he's not guilty. He is not a rapist, end of story. He is a man acquitted of rape, but he is most definitely not a rapist, modifying adjective or not.

d. lavenderstain: you know, I really dislike this man as much as the next (maybe even more given that he tarnishes the repute of my profession) BUT he WAS acquitted, meaning you could have at least used "Alleged" before the rapist acquitted. if anyone deserves to be sued for defamation...

e. SubvertAParadigm: "Acquitted Rapist Sues Blog For Calling Him Serial Rapist" WTF? Last time I checked, when a person is acquitted, he is legally not guilty. It doesn't matter if you like it or not - he went through the same processes that we're all subject to.

f. enjolie: If I were writing a blog post about a blog getting sued for multiple millions of dollars over incorrectly labeling a person a rapist, I would be pretty damn careful not to incorrectly label him a rapist myself. Apparently Jezebel feels differently.

g. Andrew\_in\_Seattle: Yeah, incredibly inept headline writing.

h. SubvertAParadigm: You can object to the minutiae of the statement all you want. The truth is, justice is a public value and therefore all justice systems are unfair and will never be truly fair to x, y, or z. It doesn't change the fact that legally if you are going to write a blog about someone who wrote a blog and is being sued for libel, you shouldn't actually write false statements in the title. That is a lie, and that is just another perpetuation of prejudices based on a system of "guilty until proven innocent," which is just as unfair. The guy was acquitted and whether or not we believe that is true is irrelevant to the material fact that he is currently, legally exonerated.

i. thePrototype: I know someone that is prepping his libel case. His criminal case has not yet started, but he has a tort lawyer on speed dial, and from the sounds of it his case might get dropped before it gets to a judge.

j. mohamedzv2001: So now to Jezebel, even if someone was acquitted, they're still a rapist, because ya know, an accusation is 100% true 100% of the time

k. zegota: Regardless of the statistics, calling someone an "acquitted [thing they were acquitted for]" is kind of stupid. Unless it's OJ, cause fuck him

l. zegota: "Acquitted Rapist" . Um, is my understanding off, or is this man not (legally) a rapist? It seems calling him an "acquitted rapist" paints a target on Jezebel's back. Might wanna change that heading.

m. Pär Larssona: Nah. This is Jez, man. Men are presumed guilty of original sin, until proven otherwise due to gayness or having been previously a woman - alongside some actually noteworthy news and commentary.

"Alleged rapist..." or "Acquitted man..." would have been, you know, responsible almost-journalism. Can't have that around here. People will get their unmentionables all in a twist.

77. On information and belief, more readers complained about the defaming headlines and story that placed Mr. Huon in a false light than supported the false headlines and story. However, Defendants did not report this but buried the discussions.

78. On information and belief, Defendants intentionally defamed Mr. Huon and placed him in a false light to generate website traffic and buzz and advertising dollars.

79. Defendants knew or should have known that certain statements in the aforesaid article were false at the time they were made and published.

80. Mr. Huon seeks the names, addresses, and other information on the Jane Does 1 to 100 to amend his First Amended Complaint and name the Jane Does as defendants with their legal name and for purposes of service of process.

81. On information and belief, after Mr. Huon complained to Jezebel.com, Defendants altered the article to spoliage evidence.

82. Mr. Huon seeks copies of all versions of the articles that were written or disseminated.

### **III. LAWYERGOSSIP.COM**

83. After Mr. Huon was arrested in July, 2009, Defendant, John Doe No. 201, created a website called Lawyergossip.com. Curiously, Defendant, Lawyergossip.com, stopped posting blog entries or articles before Mr. Huon's trial and acquittal in May of 2010.

84. Defendants, Lawyergossip.com, and John Doe No. 201, posted a false and defamatory article calling or intimating Mr. Huon as a serial rapist, shortly after his arrest in 2009.

85. When Mr. Huon contacted Defendants to remove the defamatory posting, Defendants emailed Mr. Huon that Defendants would contact the Madison County State's Attorney's Office to make sure that Mr. Huon would get sent back to jail. The next day, Mr. Huon's defense attorney was contacted by Madison County Assistant State's Attorney, Chris Hoell, who advised Mr. Huon's attorney that Mr. Hoell would bring additional charges if Mr. Huon contacted any websites asking the website owners to remove defamatory or false statements.

86. On information and belief, Defendant, John Doe No. 201, created Defendant, Lawyergossip.com, for the purpose of harassing and defaming Mr. Huon and to place him in a false light before the jury.

87. On information and belief, Defendants knew that a potential juror could Google Mr. Huon and find an article falsely accusing of him of being a serial rapist before or during the

trial. Defendants conspired to prevent Mr. Huon from getting a fair trial by an impartial jury and to be confronted with the witnesses against him, under the 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

88. On August 24, 2009, and continuing to the present date, Defendants, Lawyergossip.com and John Doe No. 201 wrote and disseminated the following article below regarding Mr. Huon containing defamatory statements.

89. Defendant, Lawyergossip.com and John Doe No. 201, published and continues to republish and disseminate the following defamatory statements worldwide on the Internet:

Lawyer accused of cyber stalking!

Lawyer, Meanith Huon, 39, who was originally charged with criminal sexual assault, sexual abuse and unlawful restraint is now facing charges of harassment and cyber stalking!

Meanith Huon is accused of maintaining an Internet web page where he was posting messages directly to the woman claiming he loves her and that "God" wants them to be together! He even went so far as to post all the reasons he would make a good husband. Check it out:

"He also posted '10 reasons why I'd make a good husband for you.' The No. 1 reason was listed as "God brought us together.' The suspect also allegedly posted the words: 'We'd have great kids. My brains. Your looks.' "

If God did want them to be together, then apparently it wasn't for very long because Huon is also accused of raping another woman!

"Huon was arrested in early July 2008 after he allegedly forced a woman to have oral sex with him, fondled her vaginal area and her breasts and refused to let her out of the car while driving on I-55 into Madison County."

This other victim claims she was lured to him over the Internet with what she thought was going to be a job selling alcohol to the local taverns. She meets Huon only instead of driving to the supposed tavern, he allegedly rapes her!

Some people just cannot take no for an answer! Stalking is not an act of love, it's an act of control. It stems from a feeling of powerlessness and a need to control. Rape is not an act of love, it's an act of violence!

Source: Article. A copy of the article is attached as Exhibit "K".

90. Defendants knew or should have known that certain statements in the above article were false at the time they were made and published.

91. Defendants intentionally invented the following fiction or made the following false statements worldwide via the Internet on the Lawyergossip.com website by:

- a. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon maintained “an Internet web page where he was posting messages directly to the woman claiming he loves her and that “God” wants them to be together!
- b. Falsely reporting that “ Huon is also accused of raping another woman!”
- c. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon “forced a woman [or any other woman] to have oral sex with him, fondled her vaginal area and her breasts and refused to let her out of the car while driving on I-55 into Madison County.”
- d. Falsely reporting that “ This other victim claims she was lured to him over the Internet with what she thought was going to be a job selling alcohol to the local taverns. She meets Huon only instead of driving to the supposed tavern, he allegedly rapes her!”
- e. Falsely reporting that Mr. Huon “ cannot take no for an answer!”
- f. Falsely intimating that Mr. Huon is a stalker: “Stalking is not an act of love, it’s an act of control. It stems from a feeling of powerlessness and a need to control. Rape is not an act of love, it’s an act of violence!”
- g. Falsely reporting that “violence” was involved. There was no allegation of force.

#### **IV. NEWNATION.TV**

92. On information and belief, Defendants, New Nation News a/k/a Newnation.org, a/k/a Newnation.tv promote racism and the discrimination and hatred of racial minorities. Newnation.tv is the discussion forum for Newnation.org and both sites are linked together.

93. On information and belief, Defendant, John Doe Nos. 401, 402 and 403 are registered users of Newnation.tv.

94. On or about May 4, 2010 and May 5, 2010, and continuing to a date after July 30, 2010, Defendant, John Doe No. 401 a/k/a White Sail, posted and republished the defamatory article regarding Mr. Huon that was reported in the Belleville News-Democrat. A copy of the posts are attached as Exhibit “M”.

95. Defendant, John Doe No. 401 posted the article under the subject “ Mystery meat "lawyer" charged with kidnapping and rape.” Defendants knew that this statement was false and

Mr. Huon had not been charged with kidnaping. Defendants knew that the aforesaid statements were false, defamatory, and portrayed Mr. Huon in a false light.

96. Next to the articles, Defendant, John Doe No 401, posted the words **“Nigger depravity—presented in their own words and actions—helps to understand the concept of infinity.”** See attached Exhibit “M”.

97. Next to the articles, Defendant, John Doe No. 401, posted the following:

**The white sails on sailships do the most work moving the ship ahead. The black anchor does next to nothing, pulls the ship down and keeps it from moving forward.**

**Ironic? Yes. Coincidence? Probably not.**

**Nigger depravity - presented in their own words and actions - helps to understand the concept of infinity.**

**"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." - Edmund Burke.** See attached Exhibit “M”.

98. Defendants knew that the aforesaid statements were false, defamatory, and portrayed Mr. Huon in a false light.

99. Defendant, John Doe No. 402 a/k/a Vorlos, posted “Re: Mystery meat "lawyer" charged with kidnaping and rape . . . Maybe Cambodian. Definitely an invasive species.”

100. Defendants knew that the aforesaid statements were false, defamatory, and portrayed Mr. Huon in a false light.

101. Defendant, John Doe No. 403 a/k/a Tricknologist, posted:

Re: Mystery meat "lawyer" charged with kidnaping and rape

Quote:

Scott Rosenblum, the lawyer for defendant

Who could have seen that coming?

Nigger celebrity is when they make the pages of New Nation.

The niggers in America today in their act and character, are that way because of the Jew media empowerment.

From "Yes Massa?" to "TLL SHOOT YO ASS CRACKA!", all in less than a century.

-P.E. at VNN

Reality makes racists.  
-Alex Linder

102. Defendants knew that the aforesaid statements were false, defamatory, and portrayed Mr. Huon in a false light.

103. On information and belief, Defendants posted a photograph of Mr. Huon's arrest and booking photograph.

104. Defendants knew or should have known that the statements were false at the time they were made and published. On information and belief, Defendants continued to republish or disseminate these false statements to the world on the Internet to a date after July 30, 2010.

### **COUNT I - FALSE LIGHT**

1-104. Plaintiff hereby repleads and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 104 of this Second Amended Complaint as and for paragraphs 1 to 104 of Count I.

105. In intentionally or recklessly stating and intimating the above-mentioned false statements, Defendants invaded Mr. Huon's privacy by portraying him in a false light.

106. The false light in which Defendants portrayed Mr. Huon would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.

107. Defendants had knowledge of or acted in reckless disregard as to the falsity of the publicized matter and the false light in which Mr. Huon would be placed.

108. The publicity created by Defendants, and each of them, jointly or separately, placed Plaintiff in a false light in the public eye in that the reports were fabricated by Defendants, and each of them, and publicly conveyed, and was intended to convey, a calculatedly false and inaccurate impression of Mr. Huon as criminal and immoral person.

109. The publicity created by the statements were highly objectionable to Mr. Huon, and would be to any person of ordinary sensibilities. The statements made Mr. Huon the object of scorn and ridicule by many residents of the Illinois and the United States and the world. The reports were intended to and did directly injure the Mr. Huon with respect to Mr. Huon's right to be left alone, as well as the Mr. Huon's reputation, character, and business.



110. The formulation, publication, and public dissemination of the statements by the Defendants was done with actual malice in that it was done with all or some of Defendants' knowledge of the reports' falsity, or in reckless disregard of the truth. At all relevant times, all or some of the Defendants were aware, or should have been aware, of facts contrary to the Defendants' malicious allegations.

111. The publicity created by Defendants, and each of them, was done with malice in that it was made either with knowledge of the falsity of the statements or in reckless disregard of the truth. The statements describing Mr. Huon's actions, character and intention were calculated falsehoods.

112. Defendants, and each of them, were also negligent in publishing the statements. With ordinary and reasonable care, Defendants would have realized, or could have discovered, that the reports were obviously false and grossly libelous, offensive, and damaging to Mr. Huon.

113. As a legal result of the statements, Mr. Huon has suffered a loss of social status, esteem, and acceptance, causing him to experience shame, severe emotional distress, and impairment of normal social functioning, all to his general damages in a sum not determined at this time, but in excess of \$100 million dollars.

114. As a further legal result of the above-mentioned disclosure, Mr. Huon has suffered injury in his business, all to the Mr. Huon's special damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

115. In making the disclosure described above, Defendants, and each of them, are guilty of unjust and deceitful conduct amounting to oppression, fraud, or malice in that defendants made the disclosure with a willful disregard of Mr. Huon's rights. Defendants' acts in formulating, publishing, and disseminating the statements on their website, and in their allowing other websites and entities to freely reprint their materials, were done with the knowledge by defendants that these acts would cause Mr. Huon to suffer great humiliation, mental anguish, and injury. Defendants' acts were therefore willful, wanton, intentional, and actually malicious and oppressive, justifying the award of exemplary and punitive damages according to proof at trial.

116. As the result of so portraying Mr. Huon, Mr. Huon sustained severe personal injuries including, but not limited to, emotional distress, irreparable damage to his reputation, loss of standing in the community, and injury to his professional reputation.

117. Defendants, and each of them, jointly and individually, wrote, printed, published, circulated, and continue to make available on their websites the defamatory statements for the purpose of, among other things, injuring Mr. Huon's reputation, injuring and interfering with his businesses, and publicly embarrassing and humiliating Mr. Huon. Defendants did so in furtherance of their agenda of preserving their influence worldwide and locally in social media, to generate website traffic, to generate advertising dollars, to sell more newspapers, and/or to advance their own material and economic advantage.

118. Defendants' widespread and continued dissemination of statements that Mr. Huon is a guilty of criminal and immoral conduct has exposed Mr. Huon to contempt, ridicule and embarrassment, injury to their reputations and economic loss.

119. The impact of Defendants' defamatory statements is particularly severe as a result of the fact that many readers of the websites are lawyers, attorneys, judicial clerks, law clerks, decision makers, businessmen or individuals employed in business and legal community.

120. The aforesaid conduct by Defendants, and each of them, was undertaken with the specific intent to cause injury to Mr. Huon, and that such conduct was despicable and carried out with willful and conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights and feelings and with ill-will, all of which constitutes "malice."

121. The foregoing conduct by Defendants, and each of them, was also intended to and did subject Mr. Huon to unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Mr. Huon's rights and, as such, constituted "oppression." As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions, Mr. Huon's reputations, which is vital for the continuing success of his profession and business, have been severely damaged by Defendants' conduct. By reason of such ill-will, malice and oppression, Mr. Huon is entitled to punitive or exemplary damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount sufficient to punish them and deter them from further similar conduct.

122. Defendants' acts of defaming Mr. Huon were reckless, outrageous, willful, and malicious, warranting the imposition of punitive damages.

### **COUNT II - INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

1-104. Plaintiff hereby repleads and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 104 of this Second Amended Complaint as and for paragraphs 1 to 104 of Count II.

105. Defendants' acts of perpetuating false and inflammatory information concerning Mr. Huon, specifically constituted extreme and outrageous conduct.

106. As a legal result of the intentional and malicious conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and separately, Mr. Huon has suffered damages.

### **COUNT III - DEFAMATION**

1-104. Plaintiff hereby repleads and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 104 of this Second Amended Complaint as and for paragraphs 1 to 104 of Count III.

105. The contents of the articles and comments were defamatory in that the above-mentioned statements were false.

106. Each of the above statements contained in the reports are of and concerning

Mr. Huon is false, untrue, and defamatory, and the reports is libelous on its face because

107. Each of the above statements contained in the reports are of and concerning Mr. Huon is also, untrue, and defamatory, and the reports is libelous on its face.

108. The Defendants, and each of them, jointly or separately, knew the statements as they apply to Mr. Huon to be false, and that the reports were intended by the Defendants to convey false or defamatory statements about Mr. Huon.

109. The Defendants, and each of them, jointly or individually, wrote, printed, published and circulated, or caused to be written, printed, published and circulated, the libelous statements concerning Mr. Huon either with knowledge of the falsity of the statements or with reckless disregard for their truth.

110. The statements were so understood by those who read them to have the defamatory meaning ascribed to them in this complaint and the Defendants, and each of them, jointly or separately, intended the statements to be so understood and read by users and visitors of the website. The Defendants, and each of them, jointly or separately, intended the statements to be so understood and read by who read the statements via third-party distribution, where permission for such further distribution was known and encouraged by the Defendants.

111. At the time the statements were publicly distributed throughout the world, the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and separately, were in possession of evidence that would raise serious doubt about the truth of the statements made. Nevertheless, the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and separately, without due regard for the truth, falsity, or malicious nature of the statements, formulated, published, and disseminated the statements.

112. The defamatory statements were written and published with reckless disregard for the truth of the matter, and Defendants knew at the time the statements were formulated that they were false and injurious to Plaintiffs. The statements were intended by Defendants, and each of them, to directly injure Mr. Huon with respect to Mr. Huon' reputation, character, and business.

113. Defendants, each of them, were also negligent in publishing the statements. With ordinary and reasonable care, Defendants would have realized, or could have discovered, that the statements pertaining to Mr. Huon were obviously false and grossly libelous, offensive and damaging to Mr. Huon.

114. The defamatory statements were not privileged in any manner. The statements were intended by Defendants, and each of them, to directly injure Mr. Huon with respect to his reputation, character, and business.

115. As a legal result of the intentional and malicious conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and separately, Mr. Huon has suffered damage to business, trade, profession and occupation, all to Mr. Huon's special damages in a sum to be determined at time of trial.

116. By engaging in the misconduct alleged above, the Defendants each engaged in unjust and deceitful conduct with the willful and conscious disregard for the rights of Mr. Huon. Defendants were aware of the probable dangerous consequences of their misconduct and willfully and deliberately failed to avoid those consequences, including subjecting Mr. Huon to cruel and unjust hardship, in conscious disregard of Mr. Huon's rights. Thus, an award of exemplary and punitive damages is justified.

117. The publication of the articles constitute publication by Defendants.

118. The erroneous and inflammatory comments concerning Mr. Huon were applied to Mr. Huon on the entire web page . Any and all viewers of the article understood the defamatory (i.e. criminal, loathsome, immoral) meaning of the erroneous inflammatory information concerning Mr. Huon.

119. Mr. Huon sustained special harm as a result of the publication of the erroneous and inflammatory communications by Defendants, including, but not limited to, the loss of his professional reputation.

120. Moreover, as the result of the defamatory publication referred to herein, Mr. Huon has sustained irreparable harm to his reputation, emotional distress and loss of standing in the community.

121. Defendants acts described herein were reckless, outrageous, willful, and malicious, warranting the imposition of punitive damages.

#### **COUNT IV - DEFAMATION PER SE**

1-104. Plaintiff hereby repleads and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 104 of this Second Amended Complaint as and for paragraphs 1 to 104 of Count IV.

105. The contents of the articles and comments were defamatory and false.

106. The publication of the articles and comments constitute publications by Defendants.

107. The erroneous and inflammatory comments concerning Mr. Huon were applied to Mr. Huon on the entire web page . Any and all viewers of the article understood the defamatory (i.e. criminal, loathsome, immoral) meaning of the erroneous inflammatory information concerning Mr. Huon.

108. Mr. Huon sustained special harm as a result of the publication of the erroneous and inflammatory communications by Defendants, including, but not limited to, the loss of his professional reputation.

109. Mr. Huon sustained special harm as a result of the publication of the erroneous and inflammatory communications by Defendants, including, but not limited to, the loss of his professional reputation.

### COUNT V - CYBERBSTALKING

1-104. Plaintiff hereby repleads and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 104 of this Second Amended Complaint as and for paragraphs 1 to 104 of Count V.

105. Illinois has enacted a law to protect people from Cyberbullying or Cyberstalking.

106. Sec. 12-7.5. Cyberstalking provides as follows:

(a) A person commits cyberstalking when he or she **engages in a course of conduct using electronic communication directed at a specific person**, and he or she knows or should know that would cause a reasonable person to:

(1) fear for his or her safety or the safety of a third person; **or**

**(2) suffer other emotional distress.**

(a-3) A person commits cyberstalking when he or she, knowingly and without lawful justification, **on at least 2 separate occasions, harasses another person through the use of electronic communication** and:

(1) at any time transmits a threat of immediate or future bodily harm, sexual assault, confinement, or restraint and the threat is directed towards that person or a family member of that person; or

**(2) places that person or a family member of that person in reasonable apprehension** of immediate or future bodily harm, sexual assault, confinement, or restraint; or

**(3) at any time knowingly solicits the commission of an act by any person which would be a violation of this Code directed towards that person** or a family member of that person.

(a-5) A person commits cyberstalking when he or she, knowingly and without lawful justification, **creates and maintains an Internet website or webpage which is accessible to one or more third parties for a period of at least 24 hours, and which contains statements harassing another person** and:

(1) which communicates a threat of immediate or future bodily harm, sexual assault, confinement, or restraint, where the threat is directed towards that person or a family member of that person, or

(2) **which places that person or a family member of that person in reasonable apprehension** of immediate or future bodily harm, sexual assault, confinement, or restraint, or

(3) **which knowingly solicits the commission of an act by any person** which would be a violation of this Code directed towards that person or a family member of that person.

(b) Sentence. Cyberstalking is a Class 4 felony; a second or subsequent conviction is a Class 3 felony.

(c) For purposes of this Section:

(1) "Course of conduct" means 2 or more acts, including but not limited to acts in which a defendant directly, **indirectly, or through third parties, by any action, method, device, or means follows, monitors, observes, surveils, threatens, or communicates to** or about, a person, engages in other non-consensual contact, or interferes with or damages a person's property or pet. The incarceration in a penal institution of a person who commits the course of conduct is not a bar to prosecution under this Section.

(2) "Electronic communication" means any transfer of signs, signals, writings, sounds, data, or intelligence of any nature transmitted in whole or in part by a wire, radio, electromagnetic, photoelectric, or photo-optical system. **"Electronic communication" includes transmissions by a computer through the Internet to another computer.**

(3) "Emotional distress" means significant mental suffering, anxiety or alarm.

(4) "Harass" means to engage in a knowing and willful course of conduct directed at a specific person that alarms, torments, or terrorizes that person.

(5) "Non-consensual contact" means any contact with the victim that is initiated or continued without the victim's consent, including but not limited to being in the physical presence of the victim; appearing within the sight of the victim; approaching or confronting the victim in a public place or on private property; appearing at the workplace or residence of the victim; entering onto or remaining on property owned, leased, or occupied by the victim; or placing an object on, or delivering an object to, property owned, leased, or occupied by the victim.

(6) "Reasonable person" means a person in the victim's circumstances, with the victim's knowledge of the defendant and the defendant's prior acts.

(7) "Third party" means any person other than the person violating these provisions and the person or persons towards whom the violator's actions are directed.

(d) Telecommunications carriers, commercial mobile service providers, and providers of information services, including, but not limited to, Internet service providers and hosting service providers, are not liable under this Section, except for willful and wanton misconduct, by virtue of the transmission, storage, or caching of electronic communications or messages of others or by virtue of the provision of other related telecommunications, commercial mobile services, or information services used by others in violation of this Section. (Source: P.A. 95-849, eff. 1-1-09; 96-328, eff. 8-11-09; 96-686, eff. 1-1-10; 96-1000, eff. 7-2-10; 96-1551, eff. 7-1-11.) (Emphasis supplied.)

107. Defendants engaged in a course of conduct using electronic communication directed at a Mr. Huon when Defendants published false statements of Mr. Huon calling or intimidating him as a serial rapist or a rapist, publishing his booking photograph, publishing his address. Defendants know or should know that would cause a reasonable person to suffer emotional distress.

108. Pleading in the alternative, Defendants created and maintained an Internet website or webpage which is accessible to one or more third parties for a period of at least 24 hours, and which contains statements harassing Mr. Huon which placed Mr. Huon in reasonable apprehension of immediate or future bodily harm, sexual assault, confinement, or restraint. Defendants called or intimated that Mr. Huon was a rapist or a serial rapist, published his booking photo, published his address.

109. Defendants, Gawker Media, Gawker.com, Jezebel.com, created and maintained an Internet website or webpage which is accessible to one or more third parties for a period of at least 24 hours, and which contains statements harassing Mr. Huon and which knowingly solicits the commission of an act by any person which would be a violation of this Code directed towards Mr. Huon. Defendants encouraged its users to look up Mr. Huon's telephone number and contact information and harass and cyberstalk him.

110. As a legal result of the intentional and malicious conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and separately, Mr. Huon has suffered damages.

## **COUNT VI - CIVIL CONSPIRACY**

1-104. Plaintiff hereby repleads and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 to 104 of Count V of this Second Amended Complaint as and for paragraphs 1 to 104 of Count VI.

105. The necessary elements of civil conspiracy include: (1) an agreement between two or more persons; (2) to participate in an unlawful act, or a lawful act in an unlawful manner;

(3) an injury caused by an unlawful overt act performed by one of the parties; and (4) the overt act was done pursuant to and in furtherance of the common scheme.

106. Each of the Defendants agreed with another Defendant to participate in an unlawful act of cyberstalking, cyberbullying, defaming Mr. Huon.

107. One or more of the Defendants performed an overt act in defaming, cyberstalking, cyberbullying Mr. Huon in furtherance of the common scheme.

108. Defendants knew that a potential juror could Google Mr. Huon and find an article falsely accusing of him of being a serial rapist before or during the trial. Defendants conspired to prevent Mr. Huon from getting a fair trial by an impartial jury and to be confronted with the witnesses against him, under the 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

109. Pleading in the alternative, Defendants knew that as an attorney, Mr. Huon's reputation was important to his profession. Defendants conspired to defame Mr. Huon and place him in a false light by depicting him as a rapist.

110. As a legal result of the intentional and malicious conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and separately, Mr. Huon has suffered damages.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Meanith Huon, requests the following relief:

1. An award of economic and compensatory damages to Plaintiff and against Defendants, jointly and severally, in an amount to be determined at trial;
2. An award of punitive damages to Plaintiff and against Defendants, jointly and severally, in the amount of 100,000,000 (One Hundred Million Dollars) or in an amount to be determined at trial.
3. An order for injunctive relief against Defendants and their employees from retaliating against Plaintiff;
4. The transfer of the domain names Abovethelaw.com, Jezebel.com, Gawker.com, Lawyergossip.com, newnation.org, newnation.tv to Plaintiff.
5. An order for injunctive relief against any individual or entity from posting an article or comment that relies as a source on the defamatory statements of the Defendants.
6. An award of costs;
7. As well as any other relief this Court deems just and appropriate.



**DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, plaintiff, Meanith Huon, demands a jury trial on all issues triable.

July 13, 2011

\_ /s/ Meanith Huon \_\_\_\_\_  
Meanith Huon

Meanith Huon  
The Huon Law Firm  
PO Box 441  
Chicago, Illinois 60690  
1-312-405-2789  
FAX No.: 312-268-7276  
ARDC NO:6230996

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 13th day of July, 2011, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint by causing copies of same to be served electronically on all counsel of record who have appeared in this case.

/s/Meanith Huon \_\_\_\_\_  
Meanith Huon  
PO Box 441  
Chicago, Illinois 60690  
Phone: (312) 405-2789  
E-mail: huon.meanith@gmail.com