ORDER APPEALED FROM [A4-A5]

SUPREME COURT — STATE OF NEW YORK XTRIXL/SPECIAL TERM, PART I SUFFOLK COUNTY

Present:		,	•	
HonJOSEPH JASPAN		MOTION DATE	8/11/82	19
Ju	stice	MOTION NO	14,802	•
GEORGE SASSOWER,	Plaintiff	PLTF'S/REFSKAT' George Sassow 283 Soundview White Plains,	er, Esq. Avenue	0606
-again: ERNEST L. SIGNORELLI, P VINCENT G. BERGER, JR., GRYMALSKI, CHARLES BROWNEW YORK NEWS, INC., an	ANTHONY MASTROIANNI, , ALAN CROCE, ANTHONY NN, HARRY E. SEIDELL,	DEFT'S/REST'S AT Patterson, Be For New York 30 Rockefelle New York, New read on this mot	lknap, Webb News, Inc. r Plaza York 10112	
Notice of Motion/Order to Sho and supporting papers Replying Affidavits and supporting hearing counsel in support of a	; Answering Affidavits and ng papers; and opposed to the motion) it	supporting papersOther		
	eks to recover damages	for the publicefamatory.	cation of two	
He now moves News, Inc. (News) for 1 23 items requested in v rogatories" dated March 20).	what is referred to as	lure to respond to the "Second L	d to eight o	f -
The defendant method of discovery are Co., 21 N.Y. 2d 403) or the prosecution of the	r even that they are r	v. Crowell-Colot "material a	lier Publish nd necessary	ing "in
The News reli Section 79-h of the Civ defendant dated June 25	ies instead upon a cla vil Rights Law and ass 5, 1982.	im of privilegerted in the a	e granted by nswers of th	at
No motion was challenged items as aud does not preclude cons	s made for a protective thorized by C.P.L.R. 3 ideration of defendant	103. However,	that section	n
	Law Section 79-h(b) p	rovides defend	ants with a	
Da reidx x.x.	-1-	X	K KOKK	,

Privilege against disclosure of both news and news sources but it may be invoked only after there has been established an express or implied agreement confidentiality (Hennigan v. Buffalo Courier Express Co., Inc., et al.,

A.D. 2d ____, 446 N.Y.S. 2d 767). No such claim is made by the News in this case.

Further, the third partial affirmative defense in mitigation of damages alleges that the matter published was received by defendant from reliable sources and published without malice toward plaintiff. Since defendant News thereby puts in issue the very privilege upon which they rely they cannot use Section 79-h(b) as a shield (Greenberg v. C.B.S., Inc., 69 A.D. 2d 693).

In any event, the questions posed do not reach the area of confidential sources.

Items 5 and 6 merely inquire as to whether the articles were questioned or checked before publication for accuracy and fairness by the News and if so what were the results.

Item 16 asks whether any articles concerning the plaintiff were submitted for review by the legal department of the News and if so defendant is asked to set forth copies of same as submitted and as thereafter corrected or adjusted.

Items 14, 15, 19 and 20 relate to the custom and practice of the News in handling and verifying articles submitted by independent contractors.

Item 7 requests the following information:

"c) 'all articles by Art Penny which were received by defendant, New York News, Inc. prior to August 17, 1977, which were not published by New York News, Inc. and the reason, if any, for such non-publication' (Interrogatory 7) "

Although the defendant has not made this point, the information required does not appear to be relevant to the issues herein and defendant will not be required to respond to it (C.P.L.R. 3103(a)).

Plaintiff's motion to strike the answer of the defendant "News" is granted unless that defendant responds to interrogatories 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 19 and 20 within twenty (20) days after service of a copy of this order with notice of entry.

This memorandum shall constitute the order of this court.

J. 5.0

Dated: September 29, 1982