

EXHIBIT C

Clouds And Sun 58°
Weather Forecast



Discount Cigarettes

Search

Sunday
Dec 5, 2010

HOME NEWS SPORTS BUSINESS LIFESTYLES ENTERTAINMENT TRAVEL OPINION OBITUARIES JOBS AUTOS HOMES CLASSIFIEDS DEALS

The Complete Las Vegas



SAVE THIS EMAIL THIS PRINT THIS MOST POPULAR RSS FEEDS



Sherman Frederick is a columnist for Stephens Media. His column appears Sunday in the Opinion section of the Review-Journal. In between Sundays, you can find out what's on his mind here.

[Read the columns](#)

[Technorati Profile](#)

Recent blog entries

- Happy Hanukkah
- United R's and 4 D's block Obama's tax hike
- Muddy Waters

[View all blog entries](#)

December 2010

Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun
		01	02	03	04	05
06	07	08	09	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

[« Nov](#)

[Monthly archives +](#)

Blogroll

- Drudgereport
- The Huffington Post
- Fox News
- CNN
- Las Vegas Review-Journal
- Las Vegas CityLife
- Pahrump Valley Times
- Reno Gazette-Journal
- Nevada Appeal
- Slash Politics

Protecting newspaper content -- You either do it, or you don't

Posted by **Sherman Frederick**
Wednesday, Sep. 01, 2010 at 06:20 PM

As with most things, the Las Vegas Review-Journal and the Las Vegas Sun find themselves at opposite ends of how to protect a newspaper's content.

As revealed in this [odd and self-serving navel-gazing piece](#), the Las Vegas Sun's strategy for content protection is for all practical purposes no strategy at all. A Sun editor or secretary writes a nice "please stop" letter when it stumbles upon a content stealer, but it's done purely on a hit-and-miss basis, and rarely -- if ever -- does the Sun follow through with suit.

In the long run, that business "strategy" will get the Sun and any other newspaper foolish enough to think similarly, exactly what they deserve -- a ticket to irrelevancy in the sea of Internet information and eventually an "Out of Business" sign.

I could add a few comments about the Sun's perfect track record for bad business decisions, but saving journalism is too important to let my point get lost in the usual Sun competitive BS.

That point is this: If newspapers want to control their own destiny they must protect their content from theft. It can't be hit and miss. It must be effective and hard-nosed, using the Constitutional power of copyright law.

In this Internet environment, "please stop" letters don't work. Nor, as this Sun reporter naively argues, does it benefit the news enterprise through a patchwork of friendly links that allegedly enhance traffic and then mysteriously increases revenue to a website. Any newspaper that seriously adopts that as a business strategy hasn't done the math.

Since we've gotten tough with content stealers by using a company called Righthaven, which has developed software to effectively identify and sue copyright infringers, we've seen no erosion in revenue or traffic to our website. And, even if we did, the loss of the Review-Journal's unique content, which drives our franchise in both print and the web, would far outweigh the benefit of rewarding a content thief with a link.

So, some newspapers (and I hope it isn't many) will go the way of the Dodo if they continue to deal with this problem by crossing their fingers and hoping that unrestrained stealing of their content will have no bad effect on their long-term viability. As for me and my newspaper company, we choose sustainability by aggressively protecting our content.

That's a real strategy likely to sustain a news organization. Why? Because no matter what technology may bring to the news business, it's compelling and unique content -- let me repeat that: "compelling and unique content" -- that's the magic ingredient. Always has been, always will be.

My newspaper does this every day, 24-7. We do it in print, audio and video. We do it with breaking news, sports news, prep sports, community news, business, features, etc. If it moves in Las Vegas and Nevada, we're there. That's why we remain the No. 1 news outlet in Las Vegas, the state and the region -- both before the Internet and after. Even in this difficult recession -- in which television stations and newspapers like the Sun have gutted their newsrooms -- we've maintained our news resources, knowing that our lifeblood is the content we deliver to our customers.

Not for the customers and readers of content thieves. For the customers and readers of the Las Vegas Review-Journal.

So, I'm asking you nicely once again -- don't steal our content. Or, I promise you, you will meet my little friend called Righthaven.

Share & Save



What is this?

1 Tip for a tiny belly :
Cut down a bit of your belly everyday by following this 1 weird old tip.



▶ Tip

Recent Comments

- Report: Nevada GOP wary of Ensign comeback
12/05/2010 08:40 AM
2 Comments
- United R's and 4 D's block Obama's tax hike
12/04/2010 01:30 PM
9 Comments
- Muddy Waters
12/04/2010 10:46 AM
6 Comments
- Rock jock Culotta dies
12/03/2010 05:31 PM
5 Comments
- Drops in the puddle
12/03/2010 03:17 PM
10 Comments

R-J Sports Blog

Ed Graney

[More Blogs](#)

Advertising Feature

Featured Homes

Las Vegas, NV

This entry was posted on Wednesday, Sep. 01, 2010 at 06:20 PM and is filed under [The Complete Las Vegas](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0 feed](#). You can [leave a response](#).

Comments (53)

Share your thoughts on this story. **You are not currently logged in.** You must be registered to comment. [Register](#) | [Sign in](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#)

Some comments may not display immediately due to an automatic filter. These comments will be reviewed within 24 hours. **Please do not submit a comment more than once.**

Note: Comments made by reporters and editors of the Las Vegas Review-Journal are presented with a yellow background.



\$850 [Details](#)

Las Vegas, NV



\$495 [Details](#)

Las Vegas, NV



\$925 [Details](#)

[See all Featured Properties](#)

53 Responses to "Protecting newspaper content -- You either do it, or you don't"

I think this is all simply welfare for the poor poverty stricken lawyers.

Nothing makes me sadder than an attorney having to miss a payment on her Lamborghini.

Written by: Jack.Sprat on Wednesday, Sep. 01, 2010 at 6:43 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

It's amazing that you complain about people "stealing" your content but you still have material copied and pasted from another website one LVRJ website.

If this is such abhorrent behavior, why do your employees engage in it themselves?

Written by: Jaeger on Wednesday, Sep. 01, 2010 at 8:15 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

So Sherm, now you LOVE lawyers? Dang man, you trading parties AGAIN? Or are you just as hypocritical about this subject as you are about all other subjects you "write" (or should I say copy) about? Thanks in advance to your anticipated response to this very troubling question!

Written by: steven.alexander on Wednesday, Sep. 01, 2010 at 8:29 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Sherm forgot the first law o' bidness....

Never go into a partnership with a lawyer.

Written by: Jack.Sprat on Wednesday, Sep. 01, 2010 at 9:53 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

I love how you revel in your own miserliness. I hope you dream of the shekels you'll draw from the cat lady (and dutifully place on the Money Train to the home office in Little Rock) before you go to bed at night.

Written by: Libertarians made me an exile on Wednesday, Sep. 01, 2010 at 11:41 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

What is this? A bunch of mental patients rebelling against their doctor? The left has come unhinged. Knew it had to happen, but watching it leaves no good feeling.

Written by: Athos on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 2:18 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

The difference between the Sun and the RJ? The RJ actually has something WORTH stealing. Keep on keeping on Mr. Fredericks. I continue to be a fan of yours and the RJ.

Written by: SweetSue on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 3:30 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Did Sharron Angle really say that she wants to abolish the Millennium Scholarship program?

Written by: nypete on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 4:48 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

I can understand the complexities of the news industry, what with the Internet and cell phone capabilities. Is it stealing to supply a link to your site; or must the thief cut and paste your content to theirs? If the rules are firmly established as to what is stealing and what isn't, drag the thieves into court. More power to you.

Written by: Jerry.Sturdivant on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 5:35 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

This "newspaper" can not make it based on the caliber of its content, it must resort to frivolous lawsuits to make any revenue.

There is not another newspaper available in Las Vegas to cover the local news. So the LVRJ is our only choice (and a monopoly).

This is an act of desperation of a failing, dying newspaper.

Written by: Diogenes of Sinope on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 5:45 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Try to make your thoughts hang together. If the content is so invaluable why to people steal it? You make no sense.

Written by: Sherm on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 6:09 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Is the copyright law in the Constitution? "In this Internet environment, "please stop" letters don't work." Is there data to support this statement? I think there was a quote from the editor a Seattle newspaper saying that it did.

Certainly, there's no question that violation of the copyright laws widespread, to understate the problem, but I think the take down letters being sent first would have been a better course of action. I think you stated you "grubstaked" Righthaven to the tune of \$300,000. How much would it have cost to send letters our first and avoid this mess.

Written by: murrayburns on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 6:41 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Even Shaq hits a free throw every once in a while, Sherm... you have 10 bylined stories a day and eventually one of them is going to resonate with the cat lady or Joe the Gumbo Man or something.

Still, I'm pretty sure if your lawyer -- and by the way, super classy of him to leave the Bluetooth in his ear for his glamour shot -- made a call (Bluetooth deployed!) to Cat Lady and said "Sweetheart, look, I'm going to sue you for everything you're worth and leave you with a buttload of sleepless nights if you don't pull that blog down," she'd yank it.

Irony is rich, BTW, that you're, yet again, relying on the government to solve your problems for you. Why not just send Vin out with a pica pole and have him teach these thieves a lesson?

Written by: Libertarians made me an exile on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 7:17 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

We rely on the Constitution. You gotta problem with that?

Written by: Sherm on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 7:39 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

"We rely on the Constitution. You gotta problem with that?" I'm not trying to argue with you, just understand what that means. Being neither a lawyer or an expert in the Constitution, I have read the latter and not seen anything about copyright in it.

I think it's important that all media protect its content, but at the same, it just seems to me that there's a more reasonable way to do it than jumping right into litigation.

Written by: murrayburns on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 7:48 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

"We rely on the Constitution"? That's rich Sherm (pardon the pun). Exactly which part of the Constitution are you relying ON? Thanks in advance once again for your anticipated response as always! And since your claiming that you rely on the Constitution, I expect that you have a ready cite for which part of it you are "relying" on; or no?

Written by: steven.alexander on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 8:12 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

The constitution protects intellectual property - Article I authorizes Congress to "promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."

That doesn't mean that the current "no warning shot needed" version of the copyright act is a good idea, or that Mr. Sherman's obvious resort use of heavy-handed litigation as a profit center is not blame-worthy.

but I really have not problem if people limit their use of other people's copyrighted work to fair use standards. It would be even better if the fair use standards broadened slightly.

Written by: nypete on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 8:14 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

The Constitution contains a Copyright Clause, which allows the granting of copyright and patents. The first federal copyright act came in 1790. It's a well established law for which the advent of the Internet does not mitigate.

Written by: Sherm on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 8:14 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Thank you. Though I've read it and it's been a long time, I didn't know that. Again, I'm not a lawyer, but I think this will be a fascinating case to watch from an intellectual or academic standpoint in terms of the First Amendment. To repeat, my view is not from one side or the other, but one of interest.

Written by: murrayburns on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 8:35 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Mr. Frederick: How come Sharon Angle doesn't appear to fall under your threat of lawsuits? She has multiple RJ columns on her web site. We know your attack dogs were sicked on the NV Democratic party.

Nobody is fooled. the (pultzer winning) Sun nailed it yesterday. This is a business plan to generate revenue, despite sherman's preaching as if he is a freedom fighter. He's financially raping the middle class of their money for personal gain. Period. These actions do nothing but take money out of the pockets of middle class citizens, non profit organizations, and small business'. This is why the Boston Globe calls the Righthaven lawyers "sharks". The smoking gun is that there is no prior notice to people running RJ articles. This is the proof of a scam-for-cash. There is no other reason for the sneak attack style lawsuit shakedowns. Stephen Bates at UNLV's Hank Greenspun School of Journalism was right when he called the Righthaven suits "lawful but preposterous" and a "waste of judicial resources."

This is the RJ's contribution to our community and country. Shoddy, 3rd rate "journalism" on the part of it's publisher, who clearly slept through journalism 101, a shakedown of working families and non-profit groups.

Written by: Scout on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 9:15 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

You can certainly see how well the business plan of the insert paper is working. Think god the family is also in the casino business or they probably wouldn't even be an insert. Keep up the great effort Sherman.

Written by: Nomad84 on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 9:44 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Scout -- You're ignorance is showing again.

Written by: Sherm on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 9:45 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Sherman - Your staggering, willful ignorance shows every. single. day. I notice you have nothing, as usual, but a little childish jab at me, as opposed to anything to back up your statements. Zero zilch. Nada. A usual, zero sum content from a zero sum pretend "journalist".

Why don't you answer the question about Angle's website running RJ columns? I wonder.

Written by: Scout on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 10:18 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Not to mention...if my opinion on this is in the company of Stephen Bates at UNLV, along with many other respected professors of journalism, the Boston Globe, and the one newspaper in town that won a Pulitzer (obviously, not this rag), I think I'll stick with that team that can shoot straight. People that, you know, actually have the first clue about journalism.

In the last week or so alone, you've feigned disgust about a reporter not checking his sources before opening his mouth, while being guilty of the very same during the NAACP mess. You write on the topic of green energy and global warming without disclosing your ties to big oil. Your standards for so-called "journalism" are completely laughable. Yes, I think a comment on my ignorance from you of all people, on a subject like this, is a compliment. I'll stand with the people who have at least a clue about the basics of journalistic integrity. You are not one of them.

Written by: Scout on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 10:28 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Sherm: You indicated it was less expensive to work with Righthaven on this issue and you put \$300,000 into Righthaven. I'd like to know about the financial analysis that took you in this direction: Did you ever consider the cost of warnings first versus immediate lawsuits or the possible impact in terms of how the public will view the LVRJ relative to the suits or the possibility that your reporters might find themselves losing sources because of these suits. You've already sued at least a couple of sources, according to the Sun. I wonder if the time ever came that an RJ reporter was sued to give up confidential sources whether or not the RJ could be trusted to stand behind the reporter, to say nothing of protecting the confidential source.

Written by: murrayburns on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 10:28 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

The financial analysis, or "scam" as I prefer it called, is that in most cases it's cheaper for the defendants to pay the RJ's shakedown money than it is to mount a defense in court. It's the other smoking gun, the first being the lack of warning of these lawsuits being filed, that expose this racket.

It's why John Paton, CEO of the Journal Register Co. newspaper chain and Editor & Publisher magazine's publisher of the year called this practice "Such a bad idea for newspapers." It's why Wired magazine called this practice a "business plan".

Written by: Scout on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 11:08 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Sherm,

Sherm, you still haven't answered my question so I'll ask it again. Why do your employees copy and paste from other websites into yours if the practice is illegal and suit-worthy?

Or is the truth of the matter that you don't take issue when your employees steal from others?

Written by: Jaeger on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 11:10 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

When a newspaper, or any company for that matter, starts to sue its customers, and without warning, that is a sure sign that that company, and this newspaper, is quickly going down and is headed for bankruptcy. Suing your customers, and all the negative publicity and scorn it is bringing, will only accelerate the process. How much longer will the R-J be able to hold out before it has to fold?

Also, take a good look at the R-J's Web site and the LV Sun's Web site. It is like night and day, the Sun's site is professional looking, well organized, and easy to read, while the R-J's site looks like it was put together by a 5th grader late on a Friday night.

It must really gall you, Sherm, that your rival newspaper, the LV Sun, has a Pulitzer Prize and your wannabe paper does not. And I too must ask why has not Sharron Angle been sued for use of R-J articles on her Web site?

Written by: ionfield on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 11:15 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Here is the truth:

The lawsuits are a shakedown of the people and an attempt to marginalize honest debate in our nation. They are bogus to the extent that they never ask through an administrative process with the website owner for the alleged contented to be removed. It appears the only sucker in this matter is going to be the Las Vegas Review-Journal who will spend an ungodly amount of money just like the RIAA (Recording industry) with very little results other than tossing any bit of lasting leverage out the door and the court of public opinion will judge them accordingly. Once the alleged website owners request for proof of claim and the fact that none can be given, these lawsuits will be thrown out.

People must visit the following website and read the intelligence being

gathered about the law firm. It appears they have direct ties to the White House as the lead attorney worked with Mrs. Obama.

<http://dailypaul.com/node/143700#comments>

Written by: God.IsTruth on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 11:33 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

This is what happens when people have never run a business and are of the "collective" mindset. They can't even understand the noble reasoning of allowing the Sun to "piggyback" on a self-sustaining product.

Some people can't even fathom the idea of someone asking permission and/or buying a right to copy and publish articles with the proper acknowledgment of the copyrighted material.

What the heck are they teaching in schools for this degree of ignorance?

Written by: spike on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 12:19 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Mr. Frederick, you are horribly, horribly confused and are performing business seppuku, apparently without the vaguest notion of what you're doing.

The practice of suing first and asking questions later will ultimately not only tarnish your paper's brand, it will ensure that you help drive your newspaper out of business.

"In this Internet environment, "please stop" letters don't work."

How would you know? Righthaven does not ask infringing websites to take down infringing content (the normal DMCA request process), they immediately file lawsuits, many of them against tiny operations or individuals, as part of a scorched earth effort to drum up immediate cash and bully individuals and websites that cannot afford protracted court battles.

"Since we've gotten tough with content stealers by using a company called Righthaven, which has developed software to effectively identify and sue copyright infringers, we've seen no erosion in revenue or traffic to our website."

This has only just begun. Few currently know who Righthaven is or what they're up to. That's clearly changing. Wait, watch, and learn.

As your paper's name is (deservedly) dragged through the mud for thinking that myopic bullying helps your brand, you're ensuring that an entire ocean of bloggers and reporters stop linking to you -- either out of fear or justifiable disgust.

That's not a particularly intelligent move as the world of journalism shifts toward a more participatory culture, and inbound traffic becomes increasingly important.

Written by: Baird.Costello on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 12:37 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Don Reynolds, the man who studied under the "Father of Journalism" Walter Williams and founded the company that would eventually become Stephens Media Group is without a doubt turning in his grave at what a sham his life's work has become.

Sherm, I realize the communications dept at NAU may not have taught you "The Journalist's Creed." That's why I've urged you to read it on multiple occasions. You have to understand, they don't print it on conservative blogs and weekly tabloids where you get your news...a little research into journalistic integrity will lead you the source, but that obviously isn't on your to-do list. Therefore, I will post it here every time you violate the ethics of journalism. Maybe you will peruse it in between posting snarky responses to thoughtful comments.

Written by: Mizzougypsy on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 12:40 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

The Journalist's Creed

I believe in the profession of Journalism.

I believe that the public journal is a public trust; that all connected with it are, to the full measure of responsibility, trustees for the public; that acceptance of lesser service than the public service is a betrayal of this trust.

I believe that clear thinking, clear statement, accuracy and fairness are fundamental to good journalism.

I believe that a journalist should write only what he holds in his heart to be true. I believe that suppression of the news, for any consideration other than the welfare of society, is indefensible.

I believe that no one should write as a journalist what he would not say as a gentleman; that bribery by one's own pocket book is as much to be avoided as bribery by the pocketbook of another; that individual responsibility may not be escaped by pleading another's instructions or

another's dividends.

I believe that advertising, news and editorial columns should alike serve the best interests of readers; that a single standard of helpful truth and cleanness should prevail for all; that supreme test of good journalism is the measure of its public service.

I believe that the journalism which succeeds the best-and best deserves success-fears God and honors man; is stoutly independent; unmoved by pride of opinion or greed of power; constructive, tolerant but never careless, self-controlled, patient, always respectful of its readers but always unafraid, is quickly indignant at injustice; is unswayed by the appeal of the privilege or the clamor of the mob; seeks to give every man a chance, and as far as law, an honest wage and recognition of human brotherhood can make it so, an equal chance; is profoundly patriotic while sincerely promoting international good will and cementing world-comradeship, is a journalism of humanity, of and for today's world.

- Walter Williams, 1906

Written by: Mizzougypsy on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 12:43 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Mizzougypsy: That's some quote. Along that line, I think it was Ken Auletta who said "Perhaps the biggest problem in journalism is the cult divide between journalists and corporate owners." And A.J. Liebling must have been thinking of the RJ when he wrote, "People everywhere confuse what they read in newspapers with news."

Written by: murrayburns on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 1:18 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

The LVRJ stole a story that was up on Drudge today and it did not give proper credit. Can you say hypocrite? I am sorry, but the LVRJ looks horrible in doing this. First, suing mostly out of state, out of town people, so it makes it almost impossible for them to defend. Then you sell the copywrite after the article was posted and before Righthaven bought it. That cannot be legal. Then using the courts to do your business for you? Pathetic. And here I thought you were a conservative.

Written by: Dan on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 1:59 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Anybody that believe going to court is considered a business plan; hasn't read the prospectus. The suggestion that you should always get a second chance; or turn the other cheek; simply hasn't been in law enforcement. Those that steal others' works had better know what they're doing. You don't just tell the police officer that, "I've never speed before and didn't know I couldn't." Ignorance of the law is no excuse. You are responsible for your own actions. (Just as we covered in medical insurance, when discussion Healthcare Reform).

Written by: Jerry.Sturdivant on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 2:47 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

I worked in journalism for years. It's standard practice to notify anyone lifting intellectual property in writing before legal action is taken. Does it feel good to know you are financially squeezing people who may not be able to afford legal representation? Give them an honest chance to correct their mistake before you bully them all the way to the courtroom.

Written by: billythekid on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 4:22 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

The copyright clause Sherm? Seriously Sherm, the copyright clause? Correct me if I'm wrong here, but exactly HOW are you relying on the copyright clause when ALL the clause does is GRANT the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THE RIGHT TO PERMIT COPYRIGHTS. Are you out there fighting FOR the right of big brother AGAIN Sherm? Geez man, be serious for once in your life.

Written by: steven.alexander on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 4:39 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

No one debates that the copyright laws were violated and no one debates your "right" to sue. What's being questioned is your incredible lack of judgement in suing not only without warning, but also suing your newspapers sources.

This is just an observation, but you may be the angriest person I've seen in ages and anger obscures judgement. It's inconceivable that those you are suing can pony up the "statutory" damages or that the Federal Court system will even allow them.

What is conceivable is a rash of countersuits that could be thought of as "nuisance" suits and lose before they even get to court, but still cost money.

Maybe you ought to think about focusing on making your newspaper a better newspaper that advertisers want to advertise in and people want to read, rather than offending what seems to be a sizeable segment of the local population.

You can knock the Sun all you want, but the fact remains that it DID win a

Pulitzer and that it seems to regularly scoop the RJ. You can fall back on the fact that the RJ encloses it, but that's not going to help you much as your business relies increasingly on the Internet.

And, if your principles were really what you say they are, why would hire Gibson, who's been disqualified in front of the Federal court at least once, went to a third tier law school (at the time he attended) and has rarely tried a case.

You picked an issue that's going to become national and I wonder what you're going to do when you're up against major league national attorneys. Right or not, it's what you recover in court and so far your law firm, settling for fractions of the statutory damages, just doesn't seem that confident of a Federal Judge being at all sympathetic in terms of "rewarding" these suits.

Written by: murrayburns on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 6:39 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Mr. Frederick. I admire you for being able to keep a print newspaper going in this town but all your statements are not fact.

C & D emails work more then 90% of the time. I have been using them for over ten years and have had very little problems. Only had to go to court once in that time.

Also your statement about loss of income. That is not true.

Four of my clients have stopped all advertising with any of your publications.

You may have not seen a gross drop due to new advertisers but you have lost some that have been with you for years.

Written by: vegaslee on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 8:21 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Vegaslee: First, I think I'm on your side. Second, are you saying that cease and desist letters work 90% of the time for you or your firm, or is that a general newspaper figure? If it's a newspaper percentage, I'd really like to have a reference to it. My assumption is that the letters probably do work that percentage of the time only because of the lack of general awareness of the the law.

Written by: murrayburns on Thursday, Sep. 02, 2010 at 9:36 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Hey RJ -

I'm in my 20s, married, lean-right, Vegas native, and business owner. I SHOULD want to read your paper (I can't stand the loco-lib Sun). But, these lawsuits are the wrong thing to do (debating appropriateness, not legal rights). So I'm boycotting your web site, paper, sister papers (just cxi'd my LVBP subscript), and advertising until you & Righthaven stop. Sure, you have the right to sue any content "infringers." Just like I have the right to boycott such a shortsighted organization.

You're acting like 2nd-grade bullies. Start acting like adults; there are better ways to get what you want. Until that happens, I will be getting my news from & advertising in (wince) the Sun & IBLV.

Written by: JennyD on Friday, Sep. 03, 2010 at 7:51 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Please give us the name of your business so that we can come steal from you once or twice without consequence.

Written by: Sherm on Friday, Sep. 03, 2010 at 9:06 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

I'm so glad that was your retort, Sherm. If this really were about "journalistic integrity," then LVRJ & Righthaven wouldn't be willing to settle one suit. You'd rest on your mighty laurels that a judge would award your request of \$75K + infringing domain. But you don't. You settle like little weasels against mom-and-pops, independents, vegas-grown firms, and the like, struggling in this economy (much like the print news outlets, ahem). Your true journalistic integrity shows crystal clear in that you refuse to make one measly (not to mention cheap, easy, and polite since most offenders don't know they're doing anything wrong) attempt to correct the illegal behavior before filing suit. Next excuse?

BTW, I don't steal from the RJ, or any other news or media outlet. If I did, "your little friend" would be suing me, I'm certain.

Written by: JennyD on Friday, Sep. 03, 2010 at 10:03 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

You didn't give us your business. Why not?

Written by: Sherm on Friday, Sep. 03, 2010 at 6:26 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

I only know about this paper because of the negative publicity nationwide you are getting for your overbearing enforcement policy for your copyrights.

I totally agree that people should not be quoting entire articles from a paper without permission. As a columnist myself, I have worked to get permission for other sites to copy my articles, and my paper has always granted those rights, because in the end providing information is the true mission of news organizations, not making money.

If you think the primary job of a newspaper is to keep others from repeating the information you have provided, thus educating more people, because making money is more important than informing the people, you will become irrelevant -- and given the hatred I am seeing for your paper in postings around the country, I'm guessing sooner rather than later.

Eventually, someone with money will stand up to your lawyers, and the DMCA notification process will be upheld, making many of your lawsuits moot. I only hope that when that happens, some judge will award enough counter-damages to bankrupt your lawsuit firm and discourage any other so-called news organizations from trying this gambit.

Again, I think it is very important for papers to protect their information, and for others to respect copyright -- but this is a wrong-headed way to go about it, especially regarding large-scale websites which allow users to post.

I think it would be supremely funny if some random commenter to your site slipped in a copy of something written elsewhere, and some law firm came after you without warning for having stolen work.

BTW, I like the idea of highlighting the reporter/editor information. I'd suggest that to my paper, except I'm afraid you'd find out and sue them for stealing your idea.

Written by: CharlesWayne on Friday, Sep. 03, 2010 at 9:26 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Oh Sherm...

I'm still waiting for your answer.

Written by: Jaeger on Saturday, Sep. 04, 2010 at 4:14 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

You lie.

Written by: Sherm on Saturday, Sep. 04, 2010 at 5:20 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

Really Sherm? You can't even think up a 2nd lame excuse for me to shut down?

I guess my dad was right when he told me that I should never overestimate the intelligence of others.

Written by: JennyD on Saturday, Sep. 04, 2010 at 6:36 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

I have to agree with Sherman. It is stealing. I am a conservative and I am appalled that some of my fellow conservatives who rail against wealth redistribution seem to have no problem with content redistribution. Quite the double standard. I constantly remind my kids about "free" music downloads because that is stealing too.

It seems clear that Sherman is asking for very little. Make sure you post a link to the LVRJ and make sure you don't post the whole article, only a paragraph or so, at most. Simple rules, right Sherman?

Written by: sam.spade on Sunday, Sep. 05, 2010 at 8:55 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

JennyD -- You said you were a business owner. You say you have no problem with people stealing from my business. So, I asked you to name your business so people could steal from you without consequence.

You didn't name your business. Twice. How about, JennyD -- put your own business where your mouth is.

Written by: Sherm on Sunday, Sep. 05, 2010 at 4:45 PM -- [Report abuse](#)


I love it. Today's editorial cartoon shows "freedom from greed". Your pathetic little paper hires trial lawyers, almost as execrably devoid of morality as ADA hounds. You are just greedy, Sherman. Hope your karma catches up with you.


Written by: James.King on Monday, Sep. 06, 2010 at 9:47 AM -- [Report abuse](#)

Sad, Sherm, that you wouldn't approve my last comment on this issue. I'm not surprised, though...just more bully tactics.

Written by: JennyD on Monday, Sep. 13, 2010 at 9:39 PM -- [Report abuse](#)

- [Contact the R-J](#)
- [Report a news tip/press release](#)
- [Privacy Statement](#)

- [Subscribe](#)
- [Send a letter to the editor](#)
-  [RSS](#)

- [Report a delivery problem](#)
- [Print announcement forms](#)
-  [Twitter](#)

- [Put the paper on hold](#)
- [Jobs at the R-J](#)
-  [Facebook](#)

- [Advertise with us](#)
- [Stephens Media, LLC](#)
- [How to link to the RJ](#)

Copyright © Stephens Media LLC 1997 - 2010

[Feedback](#)