

1 into our settlement demands.

2 THE COURT: I'm not going to get too far down this
3 trail. But it's very different when the person who, as you see
4 it is communicating pressure has a picture of your child, puts
5 it on a web site for the whole world to see than to simply get a
6 letter from a creditor saying you owe us money and we're going
7 to take house if you don't pay. And we know you have a family
8 that lives there.

9 That child in the second case, if were known, couldn't
10 be detected when she steps on a school bus. At least there's no
11 way to know the person who sent the pressuring letter would be
12 able to do that.

13 When Elizabeth Greenwood sees her daughter posted on
14 the Internet, very different thoughts go into her mind. I'm
15 confident you're raising a legitimate point about where does it
16 end, what could it lead to. These are constant and recurring
17 First Amendment concerns. You're perfectly justified in raising
18 them. In this case it's not even close in my opinion. There
19 isn't any likelihood whatsoever that courts, prosecutors, grand
20 jurors or others would be unable to draw principled and pinnacle
21 distinctions.

22 I don't think that what you're talking about in terms
23 of bare knuckle litigation with which I am familiar is anything
24 comparable to what's in Count 4. I think I have heard enough
25 and I deny the motions on that basis.