FIRST AMENDMENT APPLICABILITY:

Is the plaintiff a public official or public figure, or does the statement involve a matter of public concern?

 $NO \rightarrow$ the First Amendment <u>does not</u> come into play, just analyze under the common law

COMA

 $VES \rightarrow$ the First Amendment <u>does</u> come into play



Is the plaintiff a public official or public figure, or is the plaintiff a private person?

PUBLIC OFFICIAL OR PUBLIC FIGURE

the plaintiff must prove, as part of the prima facie case, that the statement is **false**, <u>AND</u> the plaintiff must prove the defendant's **actual malice**, that is, that the defendant acted with knowledge that the statement was false or with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity of the statement

PRIVATE PERSON RE MATTER OF PUBLIC CONCERN → the plaintiff must prove, as part of the prima facie case, that the statement is **false**, <u>AND</u> the plaintiff must, either:

prove the defendant's **actual malice**, that is, that the defendant acted with knowledge that the statement was false or with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity of the statement

OR

prove negligence plus actual injury

GO ON TO COMMON LAW ANALYSIS

(modifying elements and defenses as advised)

THE COMMON LAW ELEMENTS: YES (1) Is there a **defamatory** statement? (tends to injure the reputation in the view of any substantial and morally respectable group) ② Is the statement a matter of fact? No liability (the statement could theoretically be proven true or false; as opposed to opinion) 3 Is the statement of and concerning the plaintiff? (identification of person can be implicit, can be by group identification if group is small) Was the statement published? (intentionally or negligently actually communicated to at least one third person) Is it **libel** or **slander**? SLANDER PER SE / LIBEL PER QUOD ANALYSIS Does the statement's defamatory information come from ...? If slander ... adverse to one's profession or business use **slander per se** analysis loathsome disease guilt of crime involving moral turpitude If libel ... lack of chastity Is it libel per se? If $YES \rightarrow$ then no special damages need be proven. (no external information is needed to understand defamatory import) If $NO \rightarrow$ then special damages must be proven. ... or is it **libel per quod**? NOT PROVED PROVEN SPECIAL DAMAGES (innuendo, etc.; some external information is needed for defamatory meaning) NO Is the statement substantially true? (true and not misleading, or, if inaccuracies exist, they were insignificant and the literal truth would have had the same impact on the reader) NO (2) Is the statement protected by **absolute privilege?** (court proceedings, legislative business, high-level government executive communications, spouse-to-spouse) (a) is the statement protected by qualified privilege? LIABILITY (fair comment, fair and accurate reporting, neutral reportage, wire service defense, employment reference, other) NOT EXCEEDED Is the qualified privilege exceeded? (lack of subjective belief in truth. lack of objectively reasonable belief

in truth, excessive publication)