


← + ! 🗑️ Move to Inbox 🏷️ More ▾

 **David Feige** <David@davidfeige.com> Jan 11 ☆ ↩️ ▾

to Amy, me, Daniel, docketing, gslaw, Oren, Steven, docket, Mae, Steven, fschuba ▾

Mr. Huon,

As to the redaction issue, I understand completely. Please know that as far as I knew (until yesterday morning) the filing was indeed properly redacted, and that within hours of my figuring out what the problem was (yesterday afternoon) the operations division agreed to temporarily seal the pleading pending a final order from the judge. Indeed, that pleading is already under seal. Additionally (though the technology department of the court is still investigating what they described as a very strange glitch) so far as they can tell, the issue would only arise if accessed via an iPad or mac running a particular browser. Hence, in most instances the document will appear properly redacted both on the screen and in a printed version.

On the local rule question, I am slightly confused by your question, but will certainly attempt to clear up any issues. In the 7.1 disclosures, we've indicated in 2(b) that Gawker Sales LLC, Gawker Entertainment LLC and Gawker Technology LLC each only have one member or affiliate. That member is Gawker Media LLC. Neither Mr. Denton nor Ms. Darbyshire are members of any of these entities. In turn Gawker Media LLC has only one member or affiliate--and that is the corporate entity Gawker Media Group inc. While Mr. Denton and Ms. Darbyshire may be officers of the LLC's or shareholders in the incorporated company, they are not members of any of the LLC's. Perhaps the confusion involves the fact that officers and members/affiliates are not a coextensive group.

Given the above I hope you'll see that indeed our 7.1 (and 3.2) disclosures were both accurate and adequate.

Hopefully this clarifies the situation. Let me know if it does not.

Best,

David