Document 410 Filed 03-19-2020 Page 1 of 46

FILED

	03-19-2020 CIRCUIT COURT
1	DANE COUNTY, WI STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT DANG 8CONSY
2	* * * * * * * * * * *
3	LEONARD POZNER,)
4	Plaintiff,) vs.) Case No. 18-CV-3122
5	JAMES FETZER, et al.,)
6	Defendants.)
7	* * * * * * * * * * *
8	TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL ARGUMENTS PROCEEDINGS
9	commencing on the 17th day of March, 2020, at approximately
10	1:33 p.m. before the
11	HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK D. REMINGTON
12	
13	
14	APPEARANCES: LEONARD POZNER appeared by Attorneys at
15	Law, JACOB ZIMMERMAN, Meshbesher & Spence, Minneapolis, Minnesota, EMILY
16	FEINSTEIN and EMILY STEDMAN, Quarles & Brady, Madison, Wisconsin, appearing telephonically
17	
18	JAMES FETZER appeared with Attorney at Law,
19	RICHARD BOLTON, Boardman & Clark, Madison, Wisconsin, appearing telephonically
20	
21	
22	
23	Reported by: Colleen C. Clark, RPR
24	Official Court Reporter, Branch 8 Dane County Circuit Court
25	215 S. Hamilton Street Room 4109 Madison, WI 53703-3290

INDEX
<u>WITNESS</u> JAMES FETZER
Examination by the Court 41
EXHIBITS
No. Description Marked Received (NONE)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Proceeding began at 1:33 p.m.)

THE COURT: Okay. Great. This is case 18-CV-3122, Leonard Pozner versus James Fetzer.

Mr. Pozner appears by Counsel Zimmerman, Feinstein, and Stedman. And, James Fetzer appears in person, by phone, along with counsel, Richard Bolton.

Thank you, gentlemen -- ladies and gentlemen, appearing by phone. Actually, it's probably easier for you, as the way it works out, Mr. Zimmerman. But in between the time I scheduled this matter and today, obviously, the events on the national or international stage unfolded and the new word being social distancing applies to the courts and this and other cases have been moved on -- continued but moved on by phone. So I appreciate your telephonic appearances.

We're on the court's calendar for oral arguments. I've read the briefs and the file and, in addition, somebody filed today Mr. Fetzer's e-mail to the Colorado Licensing Agency regarding suspended attorney, Alison Maynard.

I have some questions I'd like to ask and then I'd like to work through the issues, but before I do that, as I usually do, I reach out to the lawyers to invite if there are any additional preliminary comments, you're welcome to make them at this time.

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

I'll start with the plaintiff. Who would be speaking, Ms. Zimmerman, Feinstein -- Mr. Zimmerman, Ms. Feinstein, or Ms. Stedman?

MR ZIMMERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I'll take the lead on it. We don't have any additional comments at this time.

THE COURT: Mr. Bolton, same invitation.

MR. BOLTON: Um, one question I have. We filed a supplemental affidavit for Professor Fetzer this morning. I don't know if the Court has seen that or not?

THE COURT: I have not. Let me look for it. As you know, while my clerk looks for it, the way the e-filing system works, these things get put into a queue and then don't come to the judge's desk until they receive it. So in that circumstances, you're always welcome to call the court on the phone and alert us to the fact that there's a late filing and we can dig it out that way.

MR ZIMMERMAN: And, Your Honor, I don't think we've seen that either.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah. Well, I apologize. When we filed it electronically, I had assumed, because I got -- I got an e-mail from the Court saying that it had been received and associated with the case. I assumed that that at that point went to everyone who was appearing electronically as well as the Court. And I may -- I may

2.1

not correctly understand the process then, but we did receive an acknowledgement -- I thought we received an acknowledgement that it had been received and associated, whatever the language it is they use, and maybe -- maybe I'm -- maybe I'm wrong on that.

THE COURT: Well, I -- Mr. Zimmerman, let me just read to you what's been provided. In the end, because of my preliminary thoughts, I'm not sure it's going to make any difference, but my assumption is Mr. Fetzer is responding to the plaintiff's suggestion that the Court should order an independent examiner to examine the files -- electronic files of Dr. Fetzer to verify what he's saying.

To that end, this is what James Fetzer says in his affidavit:

I make this affidavit as a supplement to my affidavit of February 11, 2020.

I previously indicated that I have deleted all texts and video versions of the deposition of Leonard Pozner, which I believed to be true.

I subsequently have sought professional input from Jack Mullen, the webmaster from my blog, who is a cybersecurity engineer, to verify that all copies of the Pozner deposition had been deleted from my desktop and my laptop computers. These are my only computers.

I asked Mr. Mullen to assist me in searching both my desktop and laptop computers for any video and transcript versions of Mr. Pozner's deposition.

Using an application called AnyDesk.com, Mr. Mullen and I searched my desktop computer, an iMac, on March 13, 2020, which search was video recorded at that time.

We found one remaining PDF file of the deposition transcript on my desktop, but no copies of the video deposition, which I promptly deleted from my computer.

A true and correct copy of the recording of our search and deletion will be filed with the Court separately.

Realizing that we had not searched my e-mail or my laptop, Mr. Mullen and I did a subsequent search of my laptop and e-mail using AnyDesk.com of both on March 15th, 2020.

When we searched my laptop and e-mail for copies, we found two additional copies of the deposition transcript, which I then deleted.

A true and correct copy of the recordings of our search of my laptop and e-mail deletions will likewise be filed separately by the -- with the Court.

Based on these -- based on the searches conducted by Mr. Mullen and me, I believe that all video and/or text versions of Mr. Pozner's depositions have been deleted from any and all -- from all of my computers and e-mail.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOLTON: Only that we have been acting in all good faith to make sure that any version of the -- of the Pozner deposition has been deleted from the possession or control of Professor Fetzer.

Having said that, I will also note that -- that I feel -- I do still have a copy of the deposition transcript, which -- which I do not have any intention to -- to release it to anyone.

So in terms of trying to, you know, further verify or confirm -- let me -- let me add -- I need to back up. In terms of the video of what -- of that search and -- that they conducted, I'm going to apologize. I -a link to it was sent to me. I haven't been able to open the link yet, which probably doesn't surprise certainly any of my partners given my computer skills, but there's hard -- as you can imagine, there's hardly anybody here at the office. So I do have it, but I have not filed that -those videos with the Court, which I don't think can be electronically filed in any event.

But in terms of any further attempt to verify, you know, such deletion, we're not -- we're not opposed to that. But what I -- what I would say in that respect is simply -- is this. While we're not opposed to it, to the extent that that process is held up, for instance, by Professor Fetzer, you know, paying a forensic expert, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

ability to make such payment is -- is -- if I said uncertain, I probably would be overstating his ability to make such -- such a payment. So while we're not -- we're not opposed to that process, I just want the Court to know that to the extent that that's dependent on him being able to pay for such a forensic examination, I do not believe that's within his capability.

I would give -- and I may be wrong on some of this. I attempted to get information here in Madison from -- from different forensics computer experts as to what the cost would be for what we were looking for, and what I was told -- quoted, and I -- I don't have this in writing, but what I was quoted orally was that we were probably looking at something between \$4,000 and \$5,000, which is not something that Professor Fetzer can come up with at this time.

So but in terms of trying to satisfy the Court and opposing counsel about the sincerity and desire to fully comply with getting -- getting rid of this, you know, we're not opposed to that, and we'll -- we're trying to do everything we can to, in fact, accomplish that ourselves.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bolton, I've got a couple questions. So you recall that the plaintiff had previously filed a motion to hold Dr. Fetzer in contempt,

1 and we had a hearing on September 13th and at that hearing 2 I did hold him in contempt and then I set purge 3 conditions, among other relief, including that then as it related to the videotape deposition he -- I think you were 4 the one that said put the cat back in the bag or 5 6 unscramble the egg or I can't remember your -- but the 7 plan on September 13 was Dr. Fetzer was charged with recalling that which he inappropriately sent out, correct? 8 9 MR. BOLTON: I do recall that, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. BOLTON: The only -- and you corrected my 12 memory. I was recalling that the hearing was on September 13 12th, but I do recall now that it was on Friday, September 14 13th, I believe. THE COURT: Okay. And at the time of the first 15 16 motion, Mr. Pozner's concern was not only was Dr. Fetzer's action in direct violation of the court order, but it 17 18 compounded and exacerbated his concern for his safety and 19 well-being because now his picture is out on the internet 20 for everyone to see; isn't that correct? 2.1 MR. BOLTON: I recall. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. BOLTON: Yes, it is, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Okay. And did I not make it clear

to Mr. Fetzer that -- to Dr. Fetzer that in the Court's

1 opinion, disseminating the videotape deposition violated 2 the Court's order? 3 MR. BOLTON: I believe you made that clear, Your 4 Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. So my question is, if I understand it correctly, reading Dr. Fetzer's deposition, 6 7 that notwithstanding all that was done on September 13th, on October 27th he sent Ms. Maynard a copy of the 8 9 deposition; is that true? MR. BOLTON: It is true, but I -- but I need to 10 11 make the answer a little more full. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Well, in a moment. 13 MR. BOLTON: Um --14 THE COURT: In a moment -- in a moment, please. 15 MR. BOLTON: Oh, okay. 16 THE COURT: So isn't it also true that the deposition transcript was watermarked confidential? 17 MR. BOLTON: I don't recall if it's watermarked 18 19 confidential, but what I do recall, if I -- and I don't 20 have it in front of me right now, Your Honor, is that it 2.1 is -- it is marked confidential at the top of the 22 paginations. 23 THE COURT: Okay. So about one month after he 24 was held in contempt for disseminating the videotape 25 version of his deposition, in direct violation of it being

1 marked confidential, he sends out a copy of the written deposition, similarly marked confidential. Please 2 3 explain. MR. BOLTON: Um, he -- he -- that is true. 4 I -- and I do not make any apology for it. 5 6 Professor Fetzer, as the Court knows, has 7 consulted with Ms. Maynard over the course of time, and my understanding is that he sent her the transcript, which 8 9 does not include any additional image of Mr. Pozner, 10 related to basically ongoing any consultation or 11 information that she might provide as to -- as the case 12 continues, including potentially for appeal. THE COURT: Okay. Let's stop there and address 13 14 that tangential issue. 15 Ms. Maynard is currently suspended or disbarred 16 in the State of Colorado and is not legally authorized to 17 practice law, correct, Mr. Bolton? 18 MR. BOLTON: I believe that's true. 19 THE COURT: And this recently filed Exhibit A 20 e-mail from Dr. Fetzer to the regulatory authorities in 2.1 Colorado seems to recognize that Dr. Fetzer should not, 22 did not, and could not seek legal advice from Ms. Maynard. 23 And, in keeping with that, then should I not make a reasonable inference that sharing the confidential 24 25 transcript with Ms. Maynard on -- on or about October 27th

2.1

had no litigation or law-related purpose by virtue of the fact that she's suspended and/or disbarred?

MR. BOLTON: I don't know that -- I would disagree with that. But what I -- I would say is that in terms of whether or not, you know, what -- what that -- for instance, what the -- what constitutes the practice of law or whether or not he is prohibited from conferring with her, I don't believe that that's something that Professor Fetzer knows the answer to.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. --

MR. BOLTON: I believe -- I believe that he considered that -- that advice or consultation that she provided to him wouldn't necessarily constitute, you know, per se legal advice, but that he was not prohibited from at least conferring with her.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BOLTON: He understood at that point that he certainly could not -- that she certainly could not appear in court or draft legal documents or sign legal documents or anything like that.

THE COURT: Mr. Bolton, as a licensed lawyer in the State of Wisconsin in good standing for over 30 years and regularly practicing in the courts, I ask you this question. As a lawyer, if you were asked by an individual to review a deposition transcript for purposes of advising

and giving advice and information on a pending appeal, do 1 you believe you would be engaged in the practice of law? 2 3 MR. BOLTON: I -- I don't -- I haven't considered that before, but what I'll say is I've never 4 5 been, obviously, in that situation, and I can say that in 6 my personal -- my personal view is that I would -- I would 7 not do that. THE COURT: Well you might not do that and 8 9 thankfully, you don't have ethic issues in regard to your 10 license. 11 But I will say this, as I proceed to articulate 12 my thoughts and my rulings on the pending motion, there's 13 no doubt in my mind that sending a deposition transcript 14 to an individual for purposes of advice and information on 15 a pending appeal is tantamount to asking that person to 16 practice law. It's something that I cannot recognize for 17 purposes in Wisconsin as a valid reason for sharing the 18 deposition transcript with her. But be that as it may, as 19 I said, that was tangential. 20 Is not -- is Mr. -- is Dr. Fetzer sharing the 2.1 written deposition transcript with Ms. Maynard another 22 violation of the Court's order -- protective order? 23 MR. BOLTON: I believe it is, and I have not --24 and I don't believe I argued otherwise, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You did not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

And being that it is a violation, Mr. Zimmerman, are you asking as to that act Dr. Fetzer be held in contempt?

> Yes, Your Honor, we are. MR ZIMMERMAN:

THE COURT: And the Court will make that finding.

Dr. Fetzer, this is separate and distinct from the hearing and the contemptuous behavior that was discussed on September 13th. It's separate and distinct for -- from what you said in regard to that hearing and information you had. This is a new and additional example of a complete and utter disregard for the order of the Court, and therefore, I am going to hold you in contempt.

MR. BOLTON: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yeah?

MR. BOLTON: Okay. May I -- Professor Fetzer would like to speak to one or more of the questions posed by the Court. Do you have any objections to -- to him --

THE COURT: Here --

MR. BOLTON: -- being heard?

THE COURT: Let me tell you what my plan is and then I'll come back to that, depending on where we go.

Mr. Zimmerman, in your brief you asked for various forms of relief. Principally, I think to address the ongoing issues regarding the failure of Dr. Fetzer to

successfully purge his earlier contempt and retrieve all copies of the videotape deposition. Isn't that correct?

MR ZIMMERMAN: With one exception, Your Honor.

The relief we requested was directed both to the videotape deposition but also to copies of the transcript that has now been released.

THE COURT: Okay. And is it a correct statement of the facts, as I believe you've related to the Court, that as of today, Dr. Fetzer has not cured all of the problems caused by his release of the confidential videotape and written deposition transcript?

MR ZIMMERMAN: That is correct, Your Honor. He has not. Copies of portions of the deposition transcript are still publicly available. In particular, Alison

Maynard -- Alison Maynard and Defendant Fetzer both filed ethics complaints against me in Minnesota, and Ms. Maynard attached a portion of the deposition to her ethics complaint. In addition, Wolfgang Halbig attached excerpts from the deposition to a document that he filed in court in California.

So at this point we know the deposition transcript is out there. It has not been retrieved, it has not been deleted, and at least portions of it are being used by Defendant Fetzer and his (unintelligible).

THE COURT REPORTER: Can he repeat that last

1 word? 2 THE COURT: Last word -- my court reporter 3 asked --MR. BOLTON: Your Honor, may I --4 THE COURT: -- for clarifications, 5 6 Mr. Zimmerman, repeat that, the last sentence. 7 MR ZIMMERMAN: Copies of the deposition transcript are being used by Defendant Fetzer and his 8 9 colleagues. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Bolton, do you agree that as of 11 today the problems caused by the inappropriate release of 12 the videotape and written deposition have not been cured? 13 MR. BOLTON: I believe that Professor Fetzer has 14 done what he is capable of within his control to cure. THE COURT: That's not my question. That may 15 16 very well be true, but the question is more than just what Dr. Fetzer can do. My question is do you agree that the 17 18 facts are established that as of today, the problems 19 caused by Dr. Fetzer's inappropriate sharing of the 20 videotape and written deposition have not been fully 2.1 cured? 22 MR. BOLTON: I don't -- in terms of the problems 23 caused by it, I don't agree with that, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: You think the problem--25 MR. BOLTON: I understand --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You think -- Mr. Zimmerman says, Well, if the Court's purge order from the earlier hearing was for Dr. Fetzer to retrieve everything that he sent out, Mr. Zimmerman is saying that, of course, that's not true at all because copies of the deposition are now appearing in Minnesota and elsewhere. Is -- do you have information to contradict those statements by Attorney Zimmerman? MR. BOLTON: I -- I -- in terms of my 10 understanding, and -- and I may be incorrect, my

understanding is that in terms of any public posting or otherwise of the -- of either the transcript or the deposition video by Ms. Maynard have been withdrawn. Ιf I'm wrong on that, I don't know. I -- you know, he can tell me otherwise. I don't -- but my understanding is that any public posting has been removed.

THE COURT: But other --

MR. BOLTON: In terms of anything -- Go ahead.

THE COURT: I don't -- I just want to make for clarity sake, the Court's earlier purge condition was not to simply just be limited to removing the public postings of this confidential information. It was obviously to remove all public postings of the confidential information and then to have all copies in possession of those not authorized to possess it destroyed or returned.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

So my question to you back, Mr. Bolton, is if Mr. Zimmerman is telling the facts accurately, it appears that confidential pages from the deposition transcript are still in the possession of people who are not authorized to possess them. Do you disagree with that factual proposition?

MR. BOLTON: My understanding, and I don't know -- my understanding is that Ms. Maynard has at least -- I don't remember just what the date of her affidavit or declaration was -- but has at this point in time destroyed or deleted any electronic version, video or written transcript, or otherwise. That's my understanding. And my understanding is that Professor Fetzer has also done that. That's -- that's my understanding.

THE COURT: Your response, Mr. Zimmerman?

Respectfully, Your Honor. MR ZIMMERMAN: heard that before. We heard that last time. The last time we were told that Ms. Maynard deleted all the copies of the videotape deposition. We know that she did not, because she posted them to a Vox.com account in retaliation for our reporting her to the Colorado regulatory source.

So on some level, we hear these people say they've returned the documents, they're complying, they're

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

complying, but frankly, we don't believe them and nor do I think they're in a position to be believed.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FETZER: Your Honor, if I might address the Court?

THE COURT: Dr. Fetzer, in a moment. I want to continue my train of thought on the process.

Obviously, the purpose of a motion for contempt and the non-summary remedial contempt is to terminate the -- to take such steps as necessary, designed to terminate the continuing contempt.

Mr. Zimmerman, I believe, based on my experience and in review of the facts of this case and in consideration of the point that you just last made about we've been told this before, I believe that the truth of the matter is, is that because Dr. Fetzer released the videotape deposition and the written transcript in violation of the Court's order, Dr. Fetzer will not ever be able to retrieve every copy or have every page and copy destroyed. And that I accepted that representation in September, and experience tells us based on the evidence that you've presented, without regard to the sincerity of his intent or the motive behind what he did, he was not able to do it.

And at this point in time, frankly, I am not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Page 21 of 46

optimistic that these most recent representations from Ms. Maynard are sufficient to assure the Court that she can be trusted to have done what she claims she will do.

That doesn't even address the fact that other individuals have in their current possession copies of these documents in violation of the Court's order, although the Court has no jurisdiction to sanction these individuals outside the parties in this case, who don't even reside in Wisconsin.

And so, Mr. Zimmerman, what I will say is with due respect, I think relentlessly pursuing the retrieval or destruction of this information, in my opinion, may very well be a hopeless task. That doesn't mean that Mr. Pozner's without remedy.

The burden of proof in a non-summary contempt procedure is against the person against whom contempt is charged to show that the person's conduct is not contemptuous. Well, I've already concluded that the -- as indicated from the Court's earlier ruling, Dr. Fetzer's sharing of the videotape deposition was contemptuous, and I made the finding today that his sharing the written transcript is contemptuous.

The sanctions under 785.01(1)(a) is including but not limited to the following remedies:

Is a payment to compensate the loss or injury

suffered by a party as a result of the contempt. 1 Imprisonment, six months or as long as contempt 2 3 continues, whichever is shorter. 3. Forfeiture not to exceed \$2,000 per day for each 4 day contempt continues. 5 6 4. An order designed to ensure compliance with prior 7 order of the Court. 5. If the Court finds the preceding sanctions would be 8 ineffectual to terminate contempt, Court may fashion a 10 different sanction. That's under 785.04(1)(e). 11 Obviously, based on the facts, Mr. Zimmerman, 12 that you presented for the Court, the public dissemination 13 and current possession of his image associated with the 14 videotape deposition is, in Mr. Pozner's mind, caused him injury; is that correct? 15 16 MR ZIMMERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. That is 17 correct. THE COURT: And the dissemination -- likewise, 18 19 the dissemination now of the written transcript is 20 similarly injurious to Mr. Pozner, correct? 2.1 MR ZIMMERMAN: That is correct, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: So rather than set off about to hire 23 individuals to go through computers, rather than try to figure out whether Mr. Fetzer's cyber security engineer 2.4 25 has the qualification and talents to do what he says he's

2.1

done, even if we assume that Mr. Pozner -- excuse me,
Dr. Fetzer has done the things he said and he doesn't have
it any longer, as long as others do, that's a continuing
contempt of the Court.

What I propose is that, Mr. Zimmerman, I schedule an evidentiary hearing and that we hear from Mr. Pozner as to the nature and extent of his loss or injury, much as the jury heard about the damages as a result of the defamatory statements. 785.04(1)(a) allows the Court to conduct a bench trial for the purposes of considering what loss or injury -- the magnitude of the loss or injury and the requested compensation for the loss or injury as a result.

Now, that loss or injury due to Mr. Pozner may not simply be confined to the facts now relating retrospectively to the release of his image on the videotape but prospectively as to the continuing and the like — the injury of the continuing dissemination, publication, and access to his image on the internet and what loss or injury he suffered as a result of others now having possession of that which they are not entitled to.

Then I would consider the evidence and I would consider whether Dr. Fetzer should make any payment or if he should make a payment, in what amount as compensation of the loss or injury suffered by Mr. Pozner,

2.1

understanding that no amount of time imprisonment will enable him to do what he's set loose and unable to undo.

But, keeping that in mind, that's the way I'd like to proceed, although, Mr. Bolton says Dr. Fetzer is not financially able to, that's an entire -- to bear the additional costs associated with the remedies sought by the plaintiff, may not be financially able to pay the judgment as a result of the loss or injury he exacted upon Mr. Pozner, but that's secondary to the question of we know he did which what was -- he should not have done, and he's been unable to fix the problem, and the question is, is what consequences should he bear by them.

Your response, Mr. Zimmerman, as to proceeding with a trial -- an evidentiary hearing to fix the loss or injury to Mr. Pozner and for such other and further relief as you would deem appropriate under the circumstances?

MR ZIMMERMAN: Your Honor, I guess my initial reaction is I think in some sense it's an illusory judgment or -- or gain. We have conducted post-verdict discovery into Dr. Fetzer's finances. It's clear that he has nothing approaching the amount of money that will be required to satisfy the jury's judgment already. So we can add an additional amount onto it based on the harm that Mr. Pozner has received or, you know, incurred as a result of the contempt, but I don't think that really does

2 i 3 a

anything because Dr. Fetzer can't pay it. And so it -it -- you know, it requires us to incur additional costs
and expenses without any hope of actually recovering any
money for it, nor do I think it would dissuade Dr. Fetzer
from any future dissemination of this information, which I
think is really the purpose of the remedial contempt.

I think that what he said at the last contempt hearing when we had him on the stand holds more truth today than it did then. The Court may remember, we showed a series of texts between Dr. Fetzer and the individual from Wrongs Without Wremedies, and in that series of texts he said, among other things, "What are they going to do? They're already suing me for a million dollars." And I think the outcome here is exactly that. What are we going to do? Tag more money onto a judgment that he already can't pay? So I -- I don't think that meets the requirements or the needs of the remedial contempt nor do I think it would help Mr. Pozner in any way.

THE COURT: Well, it is a remedy available to Mr. Pozner under the statutes, and be -- and it is of course something that he, and with the advice of counsel, could consider. I mean, it's not for me to say what relief you want. I note only that it's in the statutory framework the first item of sanctions associated with contemptuous behavior.

25

And, as I think demonstrated in this case already, there is some deterrent -- general deterrent function associated with fixing the consequences of the loss or damages based on not just defamation but violation of the Court's order. But, you're right. I don't suggest that -- you would know more than anyone else as to whether that is actually money that's going to be paid, but I might offer it only in the sense that there are other benefits associated with fixing the loss or damages. But that's why I raise it and that's why I cut Mr. --Dr. Fetzer off, because if that's what we were going to do, I think in fairness we would not be able to do that today. It would require a hearing, because under the common law, hearing evidence and findings of fact are required, and that would -- I think from my perspective, need some kind of evidentiary hearing.

The problem I have, under 785.04(1)(b), that's true, I can put Dr. Fetzer in jail for six months or as long as the contempt continues, whichever is shorter.

The -- Mr. Bolton, as a practical matter, accepting for the moment that Dr. Fetzer has done all that was in his power, if there are still copies out on the internet, isn't it your position that he would not be able to retrieve or require those be destroyed? He's done everything he can. He can do no more. Isn't that what

2.1

you're presenting to me?

MR. BOLTON: I believe so, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Zimmerman, my hesitation is, is to say that I should use imprisonment as a sanction, there is no purge condition that appears to be within Dr. Fetzer's ability. Now, Dr. Fetzer doesn't deserve any sympathy for that, because he alone is responsible for his intentional disregard for the Court's order on the dissemination of both the videotape deposition and the written deposition. But I think we ought to be realistic in terms of having -- I believe he appears to have, at least as of today, exhausted his abilities and he simply is unable to undue what he's done.

A forfeiture similarly is not, I think,

Mr. Zimmerman -- Mr. Zimmerman, a forfeiture is -- just

adds \$2,000 per day for each day. That would be starting

today and run up the cash register, so to speak, and I

don't know what -- what date in the future that would end.

I didn't -- you know, you had suggested the Court appointing some individuals to oversee this. That's not a remedy that's set forth explicitly in 785.04(1)(a) through (d). I don't know whether that's within the scope of my authority under subsection (e). But I don't know that Dr. Fetzer would have to come up with funds in advance to pay for that, and Mr. Bolton is telling me that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

he doesn't have any money anyway.

So I think, Mr. Zimmerman, I mean, I can do the following simple things.

Mr. Bolton, Mr. Zimmerman asked that Dr. Fetzer be required to turn over to the plaintiff -- I'm looking for my note here. Here it is. Turn over to the plaintiff any correspondence between Dr. Fetzer and anyone having access to Pozner's deposition, including but not limited to Halbig and Maynard. Now, Mr. Bolton, you say that Dr. Fetzer has destroyed the -- or deleted the actual videotape and written deposition. Does he have any correspondence between any individuals, including Mr. Halbig and Ms. Maynard, relating to those two documents?

MR. BOLTON: Judge, I'm not sure the answer to that.

THE COURT: Well why don't you --

MR. BOLTON: I --

THE COURT: Okay. Assuming --

MR. BOLTON: What I --

THE COURT: -- that he does, your response to the Court's order under 785.04(1)(e) that he be ordered to produce all documents and records relating to the videotape deposition and the written transcript of the deposition. Your response to the request that I order him Case 2018CV003122

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

to disseminate -- produce all those documents.

MR. BOLTON: I don't have -- no. I don't object to that.

THE COURT: All right. The Court's going to order within the next 30 days, Dr. Fetzer, for you to go through your entire files and produce every document of any kind discussing or relating to Mr. Pozner's deposition, including but not limited to discussions. only exception would be is those that are protected by attorney-client privilege. But any letter, e-mail, blog post, or any kind of written document that discusses those document -- that discusses Mr. Pozner's deposition in any way. And that is not limited to Halbig or Maynard, it applies to any person. You will search your files and you'll produce those within 30 days.

The Court's also, having now found a second contemptuous act by Dr. Fetzer is, as appropriate, going to award costs and fees associated with this second motion. Like I said, it deals less with the accuracy of what was said and when it was said, but certainly is a motion that is proper and has been granted as it relates to the inappropriate dissemination of the written transcript. What fees and costs are you asking for associated with bringing this motion, Mr. Zimmerman?

MR ZIMMERMAN: Your Honor, the total attorney

time spent on this second contempt is in excess of 35 1 2 I -- if it would be acceptable to the Court, need 3 to follow up with Quarles and Brady lawyers to determine the hourly rate that applies to the hours that they spent 4 on this issue. 5 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR ZIMMERMAN: My standard hourly rate is \$450 8 an hour. THE COURT: All right. I believe Mr. Bolton did 10 not object to the hourly rate that was asked for and 11 awarded last time, but have that -- when do you -- when 12 can you have filed your bill of costs and fees? MR ZIMMERMAN: We should be able to do that 13 14 tomorrow, Your Honor. THE COURT: How many days do you need, 15 16 Mr. Bolton, to respond to that? 17 MR. BOLTON: Ten days, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Ten days. Then I'll -- if there's 19 no objection, then, Mr. Zimmerman, with your filing, 20 submit a proposed order as well. 2.1 Additionally, if you would please submit an 22 order articulating in words that you would like, the order that Dr. Fetzer produce any document between him and any 23 24 other person relating to the deposition of Mr. Pozner. 25 That then brings us to what other and further

Page 31 of 46

25

such relief is appropriate. I guess, just to make sure we have a clear record, although you, I think, had some reticence, if I would entertain Mr. Leonard Pozner's request for a sum of money to compensate him for the loss or injury associated with this -- Dr. Fetzer's contempt, if you'd like, what would you like to do on that element of damages or sanctions under 785.04(1)(a), Mr. Zimmerman?

MR ZIMMERMAN: Again, if I could ask the Court's indulgence, I'd like to talk to Mr. Pozner and see whether he is interested in going forward with that or not.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that's fair. I'm not wedded to the procedure. It could be -- I don't believe there -- I think what I would say, Mr. Zimmerman, if you'd like to proceed for an evidentiary hearing, which would produce findings, tell me how you would -- how you or Mr. Pozner would like to proceed. It doesn't necessarily have to be in live testimony. It could be by some other The only disadvantage is -- well, the only advantage of a hearing in court is there would be an opportunity for cross-examination. So consult with your client, ask him what he wants and how he wants it, and then why don't you have that response to me by when?

MR ZIMMERMAN: Again, I should offer the Court a response to that by tomorrow.

THE COURT: Well, I want you to give some

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

2.1 22

23

24

25

thought to the procedure, because I haven't researched the cases on the procedure -- I'm looking at the Judicial Benchbook chapter on contempt, but it talks about -- all it talks about is a hearing, evidence, and findings required. I'm satisfied that it's a hearing before the Court.

Why don't we do it by -- have your position on such further proceedings for damages, how about by the end of next week. So it's March 17th, by March 27th.

MR ZIMMERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. That's acceptable.

THE COURT: Mr. Bolton, we'll give you two weeks, by April 10th to respond.

THE CLERK: What was the first date?

THE COURT: March 27th, April 10th, and then for a response -- and then a reply April 17th from you, Mr. Zimmerman, and that -- really, I'm interested in understanding the parties' positions as to how.

We know that Mr. Pozner says he has been injured. I believe that the injury is ongoing. I don't know how much his injury -- the magnitude of the injury or what it is he's asking for in compensation. I do know that he's entitled to payment to compensate the loss or injury suffered by him as a result of Dr. Fetzer's contempt. So in that respect, then that moves on that

2.1

I said earlier on, if we're going to have a hearing, I have some hesitation to utilize the remedy of imprisonment at this time. My information -- my belief on -- or my understanding of a purge condition on an imprisonment might be better once I understand really the details and intricacies of how far and wide Mr. Pozner's deposition has been disseminated and whether there is truly any possible remedies or actions he can take to mitigate the loss or injury to Dr. -- excuse me, to Mr. Pozner.

That's what I was prepared to do today.

Mr. Zimmerman?

MR ZIMMERMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's not everything you wanted. I'm not -- today I'm not going to appoint a court-appointed forensic computer person. I'd like just to -- I'd like to address that after the evidentiary hearing on the magnitude of the loss or injury to Mr. Pozner.

It appears, and I know I read it to you, that maybe Mr. -- Dr. Fetzer has done everything he can do. I don't even know who this person is. I mean, I don't even know -- do you know -- does this -- Mr. Bolton, does this individual have any professional qualifications other than helping Mr. -- Dr. Fetzer run his blog?

MR. BOLTON: I don't have that at my fingertips. 1 I do -- I do believe that he -- he's -- he designs 2 3 websites. He's --MR. FETZER: He has multiple degrees and high 4 qualifications, Your Honor, which he'd be glad to submit 5 for the benefit of the Court. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. Then I'm going to order within ten days, Mr. Bolton, if you're going to ask me to 8 9 rely on this so-called expert, I'm going to ask you within 10 the next ten -- I'll require, before I consider anything 11 that he says, that you provide an expert report. 12 I'd like that report, as with any other expert 13 report, to detail who he is, what his training, knowledge, 14 qualification, what educational degrees he has, and what 15 opinions he's offering to the Court as to the success in 16 consultation with Dr. Fetzer as to the mining and 17 stripping of his personal computers. 18 Then that gives some better information to 19 Mr. Zimmerman than simply Dr. Fetzer saying, This is my 20 buddy, Jack Mullen, who's a so-called cyber security 2.1 engineer. 22 If you don't provide that report, then I'm going 23 to completely disregard the hearsay statements associated with Mr. Mullen. 24 25 MR. FETZER: May it please the Court?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I'm sorry? Who said something?

MR. FETZER: The whole --

MR. BOLTON: Wait. Wait. Wait, Dr. Fetzer. Ιf the judge -- the judge needs to agree to let you speak before you may proceed.

And, Your Honor, obviously, Professor Fetzer has wanted to speak at least briefly.

THE COURT: Okay. Dr. Fetzer, what --

MR. BOLTON: If --

THE COURT: Dr. Fetzer, what would you like to tell me.

MR. FETZER: The whole confidentiality business, Your Honor, was done without my informed consent. It was negotiated between Mr. Zimmerman and the fellow who is representing, Dave Gahary, Wrongs Without Wremedies. I was, as it were, coaxed into it, but I did not understand its ramifications and I most certainly would not have agreed to it had I properly understood.

Second, the -- the fact is the content of this deposition is what is crucial. On two different occasions, first in relation to Dave Gahary's attorney and second in relation to me, Mr. Pozner, the plaintiff, agreed that the copy of the death certificate we published in the book was the same as the copy of the death certificate he had made available to my researcher

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

associate, Kelley Watt.

This means that Mr. Zimmerman is not acting here altruistically or on behalf of his client but seeking to protect himself from a fraud upon the court that he falsely testified during the summary judgment that that was not the death certificate that his client had provided but another, which was in fact a fifth fake death certificate, which I contested at the time was a shell game, but it was in fact a bait and switch. I have no doubt. I've examined that death certificate with a magnifying glass. It is a fake, Your Honor.

MR. BOLTON: Stop. Let me interrupt you. Professor Fetzer, I -- I don't believe that we're speaking to the immediate issue before the Court. And so, I'm not going --

MR. FETZER: Your --

I'm not going to tell you not to MR. BOLTON: proceed, but I don't know that there's -- that it's productive.

MR. FETZER: Your Honor, I've -- I'd like to add a couple of additional points. The --

THE COURT: I think that -- Dr. Fetzer --

MR. FETZER: The --

MR. BOLTON: You --

THE COURT: Doctor -- Dr. Fetzer. I think you

2.1

should listen to your lawyer. Everything you just told me is completely immaterial and, in fact, mildly offensive to the Court. So if you want to go ahead and keep speaking extemporaneously on issues that are off topic and show me that if anything is clear, you haven't learned anything from being sued and the lessons that the Court had attempted to -- or the court system had attempted to engender.

But, as your lawyer says, is if you're intent on doing that, I'll give you a little bit more time, but my recommendation is, is you have -- you wanted a lawyer, you worked hard to get a lawyer, you have a lawyer who's respected in the community and he's giving you advice.

What would you like to do, Dr. Fetzer?

MR. FETZER: Because these occurred when I was pro se, Your Honor, I have been very exacerbated by the form of events here where I have sought to conform to the Court's directives here. I initially believed that it was the video deposition and the images that were at stake.

And it was not until late December, when I was in Las Vegas en route to the Rose Bowl that I learned that Ms. Maynard had published the -- the written transcript that then -- and I immediately consulted -- Dave Gahary so informed me. I immediately consulted with Mr. Bolton who confirmed to me that was correct. I was shocked. I

2.1

had -- that had not been my understanding.

I immediately reached out to Ms. Maynard and asked her to take down the transcript, that even that was covered by the Court's order. I have acted in every way possible in conformity with the Courts's directive.

Mr. Zimmerman has made another false representation in suggesting I'm using the transcript now in relation to complaints against him. Alison Maynard did a whole separate affidavit to explain why she had her own reasons for the -- challenging the conduct of Mr. Zimmerman as unethical.

I did not use any aspect of the transcript, but
I most certainly have cited the fact that in two different
instances in that video deposition Mr. Pozner confirmed
that the death certificate we published in the book was
indeed the same death certificate he had given to Kelley
Watt, and since that happens to be the central issue in
this case, I have been frankly dumbfounded that there has
been no way I've been able to bring this to the attention
of the Court and get an appropriate response.

I understand that defendants have rights as well as plaintiffs, but I'm hearing a great deal about the plaintiff's rights and none about my own.

Wolfgang Halbig made it clear from the beginning he wasn't going to surrender the video deposition, but

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Mr. Zimmerman's been going after me as if I could control Wolfgang Halbig.

I've done everything I can with Sunny Maynard. She's not an attorney. She never represented herself to be an attorney to me except that in my own mind because she was a lawyer, when I drafted certain things I -- I said it was because, you know, with the assistance, because she and I have discussed these matters, but since she's not technically a lawyer, she cannot be practicing law, she can only be exercising her First Amendment right to share her -- her research and the results which included the determination that according to statutes in Connecticut, not even parents can be the possessors of uncertified death certificates, which was the major blunder that Mr. Zimmerman sought to compensate by introducing two new fabricated death certificates during the summary judgment.

That is the facts of the matter, Your Honor. I'm dedicated to the truth, and I would be most appreciative if the Court would take judicial notice of what I had just reported.

THE COURT: I'll ask you one question, Dr. Fetzer. You've tried to convince me that although you signed the document indicating your agreement with it, that you -- had you not as you understood the contours and

requirements of the Court's protective order, being 1 2 unrepresented at the time, you say you would not have 3 agreed to it. You're telling me that, correct? MR. FETZER: Yeah. That I understand the 4 ramifications of that, I would not have agreed to it --5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 7 MR. FETZER: -- at the time, Your Honor. Yes. THE COURT: All right. But on October -- on 8 October -- in October, when you shared the confidential 10 written transcript, you were represented, and the written 11 transcript --12 MR. FETZER: Your Honor --13 THE COURT: -- and the -- and the written 14 transcript says on its face that it's confidential, does it not? 15 16 MR. FETZER: Well, it does, Your Honor, but I had not understood. I thought the whole issue was the 17 18 That the images -- honestly, I'm being as sincere 19 as I could possibly be, Your Honor. I did not understand 20 until 30 December that it covered the written transcript 2.1 as well as the video. 22 THE COURT: Since you're complaining about --23 since you're asking to be excused for the decisions you made while unrepresented, why should I excuse you for 24 25 misunderstanding for the decisions you made when

1 represented, with my assumption, is that you never 2 consulted your lawyer to ask whether you could share a confidential document with another individual? 3 MR. FETZER: That -- that was my misjudgment, 4 5 and I take responsibility. 6 Therefore, Your Honor, I -- I did not consult 7 with Mr. Bolton about whether Ms. Maynard was entitled to it. I believed she did because I was seeking her 8 9 assistance in preparation for the appeal. She knows the 10 court -- the case very thoroughly. She had also assisted 11 Wolfgang Halbig and knows his case very thoroughly. And I 12 thought it was fully appropriate in order to elicit her 13 First Amendment right expression of concern which I had 14 conveyed to Mr. Bolton repeatedly that I wanted, as we prepared our appeal, that he would consult with her among 15 16 several of the parts. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. -- Dr. Fetzer, would you 17 18 raise your right hand. 19 MR. FETZER: Yes. 20 JAMES FETZER, 2.1 called as a witness, being first duly sworn in 22 the above cause, testified under oath as follows: 23 EXAMINATION BY THE COURT: 24 25 Now, Dr. Fetzer, you just told me a number of things. 0

Α

2.1

hadn't anticipated that you were going to be communicating facts to me, but now that you're under oath, has all that you told me in every respect been truthful and accurate?

It has, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Based on the testimony you provided to me, I'm going to make a finding of fact that you shared the deposition transcript of Leonard Pozner for the purposes of seeking legal advice and that legal advice from a person not authorized to practice law in Wisconsin.

Now, that's not a crime for you in Wisconsin,

Dr. Fetzer, but having made that finding, based on your

sworn testimony, that is a problem for Ms. Maynard, who in

this Court's opinion continues to present herself as an

attorney in the practicing of law.

Two other things. Mr. --

MR. FETZER: Just a --

THE COURT: -- Mr. Zimmerman, in your -- in your -- when you get back to the Court, I am considering one other possible remedy under 785.04(1)(e). As I indicated in the court -- in a written decision, I denied the plaintiff's request for attorney's fees because I did not believe you were able to obtain your attorney's fees under the American Rule for an action at law.

My question to you is because now here, so far

2.1

after the trial in this matter, Mr. Pozner is -- has not sought -- has not obtained the full relief that he intended by stopping the utterance of the defamatory statements and the harassment that he testified to, my question to you I'd like you to address is whether the Court should award your attorney's fees for the entire case within the Court's authority under 785.04(1)(e).

MR ZIMMERMAN: Your Honor, we do think that that's an appropriate remedy in this instance, using the Court's power -- sanctions power rather than the initial grounds that we briefed in our post-trial motions.

THE COURT: And then, Mr. Bolton, you'll have an opportunity to respond.

I bring it up because it occurred to me, though I am satisfied with the ruling that I made on the unavailability of the actual attorney's fees for the underlying defamation case, I do believe -- I mean, it's very clear that 785.04 does allow the payment of attorney's fees, and the payment of only -- the only nexus, of course, that I -- Mr. Zimmerman, you should address is that the nexus between the fees incurred in the underlying case as it relates now to the actual contemptuous behavior. Because it -- the language in 785.04(1)(e) is if the Court finds the preceding sanctions would be ineffectual to terminate contempt, the Court may

2.1

fashion a different sanction. And I guess that sanction would be is then, essentially, Dr. Fetzer reimbursing Mr. Pozner for all the fees and costs associated with bringing this action as against him in light of his post-trial, post-verdict contemptuous behavior -- repeated contemptuous behavior.

All right. Then after I receive those documents, I'll send out a new notice for a -- depending upon what I hear from you as to how you'd like to proceed.

Just bear in mind, nobody knows what the court systems -- how they're going to be operating. I am handling -- holding hearings in open court by telephone. If the -- there's further restrictions on court proceedings, I'll let you know. It's not anticipated that -- it's unclear as to how quickly the courts will reopen for evidentiary purposes, but we'll proceed to address this matter as quickly as possible.

Mr. Zimmerman, is there anything more that you'd wanted me to address or accomplish here today? I have listened -- I'm granting your motion and holding Dr. Fetzer in contempt for a second time. I have indicated, I've awarded your costs and fees associated with bringing the motion, and I've ordered Dr. Fetzer to turn over any correspondence or documents relating to his communications in any way with anyone regarding the

1	deposition transcripts.
2	Is there anything else that you'd like the Court
3	to do here this afternoon?
4	MR ZIMMERMAN: No, Your Honor. We appreciate
5	your attention.
6	THE COURT: Mr. Bolton, have I addressed all the
7	issues you wanted to bring before the Court?
8	MR. BOLTON: Yes, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Is there anything else you'd like to
10	say?
11	MR. BOLTON: No, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Well then we'll adjourn.
13	I'll for further proceedings upon receipt of the
14	written documents ordered by the Court.
15	Thank you very much. Have a good rest of the
16	day.
17	(Proceeding concluded at 2:45 p.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF WISCONSIN) ss.)
2	COUNTY OF DANE)
3	I, COLLEEN C. CLARK, Registered Professional
4	Reporter, Official Court Reporter, Branch 8, Dane County
5	Circuit Court, hereby certify that I reported in Stenographic
6	shorthand the proceedings had before the Court on this 17th day
7	of March, 2020, and that the foregoing transcript is a true and
8	correct copy of the said Stenographic notes thereof.
9	On this day the original and one copy of the
10	transcript were prepared by pursuant to Statute.
11	Dated this 19th day of March, 2020.
12	
13	Electronically signed by:
14	Colleen C. Clark
15	COLLEEN C. CLARK, RPR
16	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
17	
18	
19	
20	The foregoing certification of this transcript
21	does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or
22	direction of the certifying reporter.
23	
24	
25	