1	Page 1
	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH
2	JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
3	DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
4	CIVIL DIVISION
5	CASE NO: 09-68539 CA 25
6	JOHN GIORDANO, individually, and G&G
7	ADDICTION TREATMENT, INC., a Florida Corp.
8	Plaintiffs,
9	vs. ORIGINAI
10	DONNA L. ROMEO, and XCENTRIC VENTURES,
11	LLC, an Arizona Limited Liability Corp.
12	Defendants.
13)
14	September 14, 2010
15	9:30 a.m 12:15 p.m.
16	73 W. Flagler Street
	75 W. Flagici Stiect
17	Miami, Florida
17 18	
18	
18 19	
18 19 20	Miami, Florida
18 19 20 21	Miami, Florida Transcript of the proceedings had and taken before
18 19 20 21 22	Miami, Florida Transcript of the proceedings had and taken before the Honorable PETER ADRIEN, Judge of the above-entitled

1	APPEARANCES:	·	Page 2
2			
3		MENDY HALBERSTAM, ESQUIRE	
4		Rosen, Switkes & Entin	
5		407 Lincoln Road - PH SE	
6		Miami Beach, Florida	
7			
8		LAURENCE A. WANSHEL, ESQUIRE	
9		12940 S.W. 133 Court	
10		Miami, Florida 33186	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Page 3 1 (Thereupon, the following proceedings were had) 2 3 MR. HALBERSTAM: Good morning, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: What is your case number? 5 MR. HALBERSTAM: Case number 09-68539. 6 THE COURT: What~is it on for? 7 MR. HALBERSTAM: Good morning, Your Honor. 8 Mendy Halberstam for the plaintiffs. We are here on our 9 motion for temporary injunctive relief against the 10 defendant, Donna Romeo. Just by way of background we 11 were before Your Honor twice. 12 THE COURT: This is Xcentric? I~will do 13 it at the end of the calendar. 14 MR. HALBERSTAM: I have a mediation at 15 11:00 o'clock on the Beach. 16 MR. WANSHEL: Your Honor, I~am new in the 17 I substituted on August 31st. My client is here. case. 18 This is an evidentiary hearing. She's never had an 19 opportunity to present herself in this case. She was 20 never notified of any other hearing from prior counsel 21 and we are here to present testimony. It will be ten 22 minutes at the most but I think before the court issues 23 or makes a decision, she at least should have the

perspective.

24

25

opportunity for you to hear the case from my client's

1	Page THE COURT: I would have to hear from her
2	to make the determination?
3	MR. HALBERSTAM: Just so I can put it out
4	there, Your Honor, we had a two-hour special set
5	hearing.
6	THE COURT: I remember.
7	MR. HALBERSTAM: In February and you heard
8	testimony at that time.
9	THE COURT: From her?
10	MR. HALBERSTAM: Well, her attorneys were
11	there. If it was an evidentiary hearing they have had
12	every opportunity to bring her.
13	THE COURT: But the whole idea of
14	resetting it was to hear from her and I said I would do
15	it at the end of motion calendar but if you come in and
16	you have something else set, it's hard to fit it in but
17	I need to hear from her in order to make findings and
18	things like that; and the last time you were here the
19	motion was not directed to her.
20	It was directed to someone else. So I
21	think the court would need to take testimony and make a
22	determination based on what it hears. If you want to
23	get a special set right now you can go to my J.A. and
24	get one. Tell her I want it within 30 days.
25	MR. HALBERSTAM: The only problem is my

	D
1	Page 5 client lives in Tampa and came in specially for this
2	hearing. I told him it should be set for an evidentiary
3	and he said we could set it before the motion calendar
4	based on the Court's last decision.
5	THE COURT: I told him he could?
6	MR. WANSHEL: Based on that, I~had my
7	client come here.
8	THE COURT: I told him he could? I can't
9	help it if he has a mediation at this point. I~will set
10	it within 30 days. She will come back down in 30 days
11	so if you want to get a special set to put in the order
12	-
13	MR. HALBERSTAM: Let me see if I can get
14	somebody to cover that. It's an accounting I can see
15	if somebody can cover that and I will wait.
16	THE COURT: If someone will come, if we
17	will wait, I~will pass it.
18	(Recess until the end of the calendar)
19	MR. WANSHEL: I think this file is under
20	seal and everybody has to be removed from the courtroom,
21	anything that is not connected with the case.
22	THE COURT: That is not a problem.
23	MR. WANSHEL: I have another witness, Your
24	Honor. Also you want him to wait outside the courtroom?
25	THE COURT: The rule is invoked. Do you

Page 6 1 want to invoke the rule? 2 MR. HALBERSTAM: It doesn't make a 3 difference to me. 4 THE COURT: He can wait here. What~is the 5 case number again? 6 MR. HALBERSTAM: 09-68539. 7 THE COURT: You are asking for an 8 injunction to be entered against Donna Romero, correct? 9 MR. HALBERSTAM: Exactly. If you would like 10 I guess we will just put it on the record so I~will 11 briefly recite the facts but essentially the facts are 12 uncomplicated, and Your Honor heard an awful lot of 13 testimony at the first motion for injunction so I am not 14 going to re-invent the wheel, but Mr. Giordano was here 15 on the February 12th hearing. 16 We also filed his affidavit in support of 17 the motion for injunctive relief. Essentially Ms. Romeo 18 was, once had a business relationship with G&G. She was 19 unhappy with the services there. Subsequently wrote a 20 whole posting with defamatory statements on rip off 21 report.com. 22 As part of the post on rip off report.com 23 the defendant noted that the employees of the 24 plaintiff's facility illegally dispensed medication. It

25

was also, the defendant also stated that one of the

owners was a convicted felon and you can read all about it and she cites to a Court of Appeals court case from New York state.

We provided a copy of that case, Your Honor, with the February 12th hearing. We also filed a notice of filing of Mr. Giordano's FBI clearance that he has because he is a chaplain with the police department in North Miami Beach and we also filed an affidavit from Mr. Giordano saying that all the statements on the website are false.

In fact, the defendant has not denied that she's made the statement and doesn't even deny that she now knows that they are false because yesterday or last week, I'm sorry, on Friday we were served with responses to our request for, request for admissions and I don't think counsel is going to deny the defendant essentially said yes, I made the statement, I now know that they were false and I made a mistake but that is the reality.

MR. WANSHEL: Can I proffer?

THE COURT: When he finishes.

MR. HALBERSTAM: Essentially, as Your Honor had found, at least I believe Your Honor found at the February 12th hearing, those statements imputing illegal activity and the fact that one of the principals of G & G, now one of the plaintiffs here, Mr. Giordano,

is a convicted felon. That falls as defamation per se.

As a result our clients had a substantial likelihood of success on the merits. Our client testified on the February 12th hearing and in the affidavit affirms he suffered a loss of business, loss of his good will.

People are calling up and saying they are not interested in attending the facilities because of the things they are reading on rip off report.com.

Under well settled law, if you are not able to determine with any exactitude what damages you are suffering, then your damages are irreparable.

There is no adequate remedy at law. So as a consequence we have established that there is a substantial likelihood of success on the merits because of defamation per se. There is, our plaintiffs have and are continuing to suffer irreparable harm because no matter what they try to do, they can't get that information off~the website and they are suffering losses; their business, good will.

Public policy favors the issuance of an injunction because the public favors protecting Florida businesses from baseless attacks and individuals who are trying to make a contribution to the community from having their reputation destroyed for no reason and it's

2.3

١	something	they	cannot	do.
---	-----------	------	--------	-----

inere is nothing in their power to protect
themselves from it. The balance of hardship favors the
plaintiff because we are asking for an order to direct
the defendant to remove or approach Xcentric and say,
take the stuff down, I want to mitigate my damages, and
Your Honor has already indicated at the June 10th
hearing that Your Honor believes that the court is able
to issue an injunction against Xcentric only after we
actually applied to the court for relief, for injunctive
relief against Ms. Romeo and at that point if Xcentric
refuses to comply with an order, with an injunction
having Ms. Romeo remove it and essentially is lying and
continuing to damage her and our client, then we can
bring Xcentric back in because Your Honor dismissed them
orally on June 10th.

THE COURT: You have to first establish in the court that you are entitled to an injunction against Ms. Romeo.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ HALBERSTAM: That is-what I am trying to establish right now.

THE COURT: Does she object?

MR. WANSHEL: In a sense, yes, if she's subject to contempt for not complying with an injunction that she can't possibly enforce or do anything about,

1 yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1-6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let me restate my question. Without admitting guilt or not, would she object to requesting --

MR. WANSHEL: She already requested from them to remove the article.

THE COURT: Would she object to requesting from Xcentric officially that any and all posting that she made regarding this gentleman be removed?

MR. WANSHEL: If it's limited to the one statement -- what the problem is, Your Honor, is that this posting that she made is a long posting. Everything that is in that she claims is accurate, and she's here to testify, that she believes that -- I mean, there is truth to everything said.

The only comment in there was that he was a convicted felon and she had reason to believe that was correct based on other postings that were already on rip off.com concerning him and that clinic and identified that clinic.

So based on comments that he made to her at the facility she believed it to be true. So she had a reasonable belief. So I have no problem -- she doesn't want that on the Internet and did what she can but she's powerless to do anything about it.

1	THE COURT: Are you satisfied with that or
2	you want the complete posting listed because as to the
3	other stuff, if it's her opinion
4	MR. HALBERSTAM: Obviously, Your Honor,
5	the motion, and we are actually seeking to have the
6	whole thing removed. I don't think that Ms. Romeo has a
7	problem. I think the issue is whether or not she is
8	going to be subject to contempt and we are not asking
9	for that.
10	THE COURT: He says she doesn't want to
11	remove everything. She only wants to remove
12	MR. WANSHEL: I have to ask her about it
13	but if we could reach an accord, but the court
14	THE COURT: Tell me about the contempt
15	issue because if she requests it and it's beyond her
16	control, how can the court find her in contempt?
17	MR. WANSHEL: That is why, to issue an
18	injunction against her to begin with if she's powerless
19.	to do anything about the article
20	THE COURT: Because she's a step in the
21	chain.
22	MR. WANSHEL: If the court wants to issue
23	an order saying that she's requested, I mean, to file an
24	official request for them to remove that information, I
25	don't think she will have a problem with that. In fact,

	Y 4
1	Page 1 she's already done that and they refused.
2	THE COURT: In terms of the injunction the
3	injunction would basically require that she specifically
4	request it be removed and use the best efforts to do so.
5	That is as far as the court can go and then whatever she
6	does she provides
7	MR. WANSHEL: That is open to
8	interpretation what her best efforts could be because, I
9	mean, she's written, I mean, she's already
10	THE COURT: You keep telling me that.
11	MR. WANSHEL: That is the truth. What can
12	we do?
13	MR. HALBERSTAM: I drafted a proposal. I
14	will just tell you what it says.
15	THE COURT: Show it to counsel and see if
16	he can agree to it.
17	MR. WANSHEL: Can I ask her about it's
18	never been, the court has never been aware of her
19	position that she's basically
20	THE COURT: I agree.
21	MR. WANSHEL: She's basically saying that
22	everything in there is accurate and correct. She made a
23	mistake about the criminal conviction, wasn't offensive

24

25

to him because he made comments to her, and this is our

testimony, that he had a troubled past, that he had been

1	involved	in	criminal	activities.
---	----------	----	----------	-------------

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: You do have a choice. I am not forcing you to agree to that. I just want to know if we can short cut it and do that. If not, then I-will hear her testimony and I-will make a determination. If you want to talk to counsel after you speak to her to see if you can reach an agreement as to that --

MR. WANSHEL: Okay. Can I take two minutes to read it?

THE COURT: Sure. You can go outside with her if you want to. When you finish, if there is some changes you would like, some language that would make -- I can't say hold harmless because that is not what they are seeking ultimately but something regarding the completeness of her ability to remove everything.

Maybe you guys can discuss it and see if you can agree to some language because it sounds to me like he is concerned if she requested and she does whatever she can and they still won't do it, he is concerned you are going to want to go after her. So maybe you can cover that in the order.

MR. HALBERSTAM: I have covered it already in the order.

THE COURT: If he has any objections or any additional language that would help his clients out

	Page 14
1	he~will tell you and you guys see if you can reach an
2	agreement.
3	MR. WANSHEL: We also thought it was
4	important for the court to hear her position.
5	THE COURT: I~will hear her position if
6	you can't make an agreement and I will make a
7	determination whether it's warranted or not and I have
8	the time.
9	(Short recess)
10	MR. WANSHEL: I think we are reaching an
11	agreement. Another three minutes, that is all. I think
12	we have reached an agreement.
13	THE COURT: I am going to go ahead and
14	start my calendar call.
15	MR. HALBERSTAM: We have agreed. What we
16	have agreed to is that we will enter an agreed order
17	entering the injunction but the defendant would like to
18	proffer her testimony of what she believes happened here
19	and why she made the statement that she did. That is
20 -	what she would like to do.
21	MR. WANSHEL: I want her to proffer because
22	I don't think the court has ever heard it and they have
23	heard testimony from other people about what her
24	THE COURT: Last time we~had a hearing
25	counsel was here and counsel did put her position

1	Page 15 forward in terms of what he believed it is but I am not
2	necessarily making any findings for the injunction, but
3	if you want to proffer, go ahead.
4	MR. WANSHEL: So far as the injunction
5	there is going to be no admissions.
6	THE COURT: Without admitting.
7	MR. WANSHEL: No finding of libel per se
8	and no finding of irreparable damage which~is just an
9	agreed injunction, that she will do what she can to
10	and then I would like that specified that she should
11	write to them and tell them to remove
12	THE COURT: Officially requested and
13	documented that it's been requested.
14	MR. HALBERSTAM: I am providing them a copy
15	of the order of the court.
16	THE COURT: Requiring that it be removed.
17	MR. WANSHEL: That is fine and all that
18	language in the proposed order gets eliminated about
19	temporary I mean, libel per se and findings of any
20	kind of factor in wrongdoing on the part of my client.
21	THE COURT: The court is not making any
22	specific findings as to wrongdoing but by way of
23	agreement the parties are agreeing without admitting or
24	denying, that the injunction can be entered and as a
25	result she will send them a letter officially requesting

- 1 | that the posting be removed from the website.
- 2 MR. WANSHEL: Which she's already done but 3 we will do it officially.
- MR. HALBERSTAM: With a copy of the court order and telling them that she's under a court order to do it.
- THE COURT: Okay, and that she's

 specifically to do it pursuant to the court order

 because then you will have a second section of the court

 order which says based on the parties agreement the

 court is hereby directing Ms. Romero to specifically

 remove that posting and to request that it be removed,

 okay?
 - MR. WANSHEL: Yes, and if you give me another minute I would like to go back on the record and proffer what she would have testified.
- 17 THE COURT: You can go now.
- MR. WANSHEL: My client is going to

 testify, Your Honor, that she was not an alcohol addict;

 she had an alcohol problem. She was despondent trying

 to find a place for relaxation and guidance while she

 was -- for a certain period of time.
- THE COURT: I didn't even remember that was an issue.
- MR. WANSHEL: Well, she wanted to explain

14

15

why the article is true.

2.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. WANSHEL: And she was contacted by marketeers and they were explaining this experience was ideal for her, that they had a chef on the premises; that it was going to be luxurious accommodations; that it was going to be a spa type of rehabilitation; that they were only going to treat her for alcohol problems and she was on medications and she believed them to be true.

It was suppose to be near the Beach. It was suppose to have organic food with a chef, luxury. What she found out is that she went to boot camp with 18 to 20-year olds that were court mandated to be there and she was in a totally different environment than she was expecting; that she was suppose to have certain type of medication that she was taking for health, like blood pressure medication and she had anti-anxiety pills and they detoxified her so far as everything and removed her from drugs that she needed to use and she got sick as a result of that and she is saying that she witnessed adolescents at the facility bringing in drugs, having sex in an open courtyard and things that are totally inappropriate for a woman in her position and she decided to leave.

She went to Mr. Giordano prior to leaving and is saying the reasons why she wanted to leave the facility and Mr. Giordano told her that she was crazy, that he wouldn't refund any money. She was only there 11 days out of a 35-day period and told her, I dare you to do anything against me because you are not going to be successful.

She's also going to testify there were certain things that were very inappropriate so far as what was happening in the facilities. She made a request that they stop sending in piped in music that was over, that it was piped throughout the whole facility and Mr. Giordano refused to remove it because he said it had subliminal messages that were necessary for people's treatment.

She was eating on styrofoam and paper plates when she was expecting a luxurious kind of stay there and it was totally -- she was the only person -- everybody that was there was between 18 and 22 years old.

She observed, they called them blue shirts, giving inadequate medication to people. Not knowing how to put on a blood pressure machine. She was given the wrong medication. Instead of getting a diuretic, she was given a pill so she had to go to the

19_

bathroom and it was all kinds of mix ups and mistreatment while she was there.

But the thing is, it didn't fit her needs and she was marketed this. It was sold to her and she spend over \$27,000 to be at that facility and was only there 11 days and basically that was the case.

So far as the unfortunate mistake she made when she went to, she decided to complain about the facility based upon her experience there and she wanted to let the public know it's a boot camp type environment, not what they were doing.

In addition they were treating every kind of addiction possible. They didn't have any kind of limitation. It wasn't just for alcohol or drugs. It wasn't for sex. It was for any kind of addiction and it was totally inappropriate for her and she made that report on rip off.com and she swears by and stands by that rip off report.

The only fact is when she went to Google and did a search on rip off.com there was an article, there was a previous posting where they said Mr. Giordano was a convicted felon and they referred the reader to go to rip off dot -- I mean to the website, Cornell University website where they printed out the case law on a conviction.

2.3

THE COURT: But he actually, it's just not the same person. She posted something. There were two complaints. Number one, because you bring in a whole bunch of stuff that I don't understand was the crux of the motion. The crux of the motion I understand were two things mainly.

Number one, that they said he was a convicted folon which it turns out he is not a convicted felon. That was very slanderous and which she admits she did. She says she was given wrong information but she did.

The second thing was she specifically said he was administering medication, prescription medication at the facility. Now I understand you are saying some blue shirts were doing that but you are not saying he specifically was doing that?

MR. WANSHEL: She didn't say in the article that he was specifically administering medication. She said that medications were not properly administered and some of the personnel was illegally administering medications, that they didn't have the qualification and training to do.

She didn't accuse Mr. Giordano -- in fact, Mr. Giordano is not even mentioned in there except to say that one of the owners is a convicted felon and it

1	Page 21 was referred to by other articles that were already
2	_
	printed.
3	THE COURT: Did it mention his name?
4	MR. WANSHEL: No. It said one of the owners
5	is a convicted felon. If you go and she got that from
6	other postings. So she reasonably believed that to be
7	true because it was identifying that John Giordano as
8	the one.
9	THE COURT: Anything else you want to
10	proffer?
11	MR. WANSHEL: Yes. So far as the damages
12	is concerned they haven't proved any kind of damages,
13	irreparable damage whatsoever. In fact, in the type of
14	rehabilitative facility that he runs it's not
15	necessarily offensive to say that the owner is a
16	convicted felon who had a drug problem because a lot of
17	them are run by convicted felons that have drug
18	problems.
19	THE COURT: Did they say if you are a
20	convicted felon, would it affect your law license?
21	MR. WANSHEL: I am an attorney. He is
22	running a facility for addicts that also rely on people
23	that sometimes have the problem, experienced it and they
24	directly direct these things.
25	THE COURT: Other people who own these

facilities	and	run	them	are	ex-addicts?
**************************************	α		CIICIII	ате	CA-QUULCLO:

MR. WANSHEL: No, that is not the case but another reason why she reasonably believed it to be true is because Mr. Giordano at one of the meetings said that there were, that he came from the area, the Brooklyn area and he did say he was, he had a troubled past.

He was in trouble with the law. He admitted this to everybody but it was not the same John Giordano and I am not going to say that I ran an investigation and found out it was not.

THE COURT: On the record the court is not making any kind of findings in this case proceeding.

The court will have to have an independent hearing to hear the evidence or any facts regarding the specific posting that she placed on the record as to whether it was true or not; as to where she got it from.

The court will make a determination at that time as to whether that is relevant. More importantly as to whether she posted it or not. At this time though what the court understands is the court is entering an injunction based on an agreement by the parties without it making any specific findings, in which she's agreeing to remove the posting.

MR. WANSHEL: Correct, without any findings and no admissions.

	Page 23
1	MR. HALBERSTAM: Yes. I am just asking
2	Your Honor before we leave if I can add into the order
3	that if Romeo attempts to comply with the order from
4	this court but is stopped by if rip off reports.com
5	has a policy of maintaining statements on their website
6	even against this order and against an expressed request
7	the court believes that the conditions precedent for the
8	issuance of a against rip off report.com will
9	have~been met and will consider an appropriate motion at
10	that time.
11	THE COURT: I don't think I can make that
12	finding right now. You go a little too far with it. You
13	can make a determination that she needs to do the
14	request and if she does and they don't, then you can
15	file whatever motions you want to.
16	I can't make that finding until I have
17	them in front of me and things like that. So we have to
18	take it step by step. You are trying to jump it. I
19	have to go through step by step.
20	MR. HALBERSTAM: Yes,~sir.
21	THE COURT: If she makes the request and
22	they refuse to, then after you are notified of the
23	official refusal, then you~will go ahead and file
24	whatever pleadings you believe is appropriate.

25

MR. HALBERSTAM:

And I am assuming that

Page 24 the defendant will provide us with any copy of the 1 2 refusal? 3 THE COURT: Yes. 4 MR. WANSHEL: I already have a refusal? 5 MR. HALBERSTAM: After she does this. 6 THE COURT: There is a difference with the 7 one you have and this one. This one is going to be done 8 with~your points pursuant to a court order that is going to notify them and that respectfully asks that they 9 10 remove it. 11 MR. WANSHEL: You can put it in the order, 12 give us ten days? 13 MR. HALBERSTAM: I did seven. 14 MR. WANSHEL: Seven is fine. 15 THE COURT: You~will provide proof of that 16 and proof of any response to counsel. When you draft 17 that order send it to him so he can review it before you 18 submit it. 19 MR. WANSHEL: Can an attorney write a letter or does it have to be from Donna Romeo? 20 21 THE COURT: You can write the letter on 22 her behalf and attach the order and specifically request 23 it but they may say they want her. So if you can~have 24 her notarize it and sign it. 25 MR. WANSHEL: My problem is she's in Tampa.

Page 25 1 THE COURT: I will give you 15 days. 2 MR. HALBERSTAM: Thank you very much. 3 THE COURT: That way I think they are 4 going to want to see her signature. 5 MR. WANSHEL: They are going to want to 6 hear from her although they have a policy that they 7 don't care what you write. 8 THE COURT: I don't know. We will cross 9 that bridge when we reach it. 10 (Thereupon, the hearing was concluded) 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	Page 26 CERTIFICATE					
2						
3						
4	STATE OF FLORIDA)					
5	SS.					
6	COUNTY OF DADE)					
7						
8	I, MYRIAM BOSCH, Registered Professional Reporter, do					
9	hereby certify that I was authorized and did transcribe					
10	in Shorthand, the proceedings had and taken before the					
11	Honorable Peter Adrien, Judge of the above-styled Court,					
12	at the time and place stated in the caption thereof.					
13						
14						
15	I further certify that I am not of counsel, I am not					
16	employed by nor related to an attorney to this suit,					
17	and I am not financially interested in the outcome					
18	thereof.					
19						
20	MYRIAM BOSCH					
21	MY COMMISSION # DD 755793 EXPIRES: March 27, 2012 Respect from Notary Public Underwriters					
22 _	Comments and the Comment of the Comm					
23						
24						
25						