

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

LAURA LOOMER, Individually

Plaintiff

v.

FACEBOOK, INC.,
1 Hacker Way
Menlo Park, CA, 94025

Defendant.

Case Number:

COMPLAINT FOR DEFAMATION

Plaintiff, LAURA LOOMER (“Plaintiff” or “Ms. Loomer”) hereby files this action against FACEBOOK, INC. (“Defendant Facebook”) for Defamation, Defamation *Per Se* and Defamation by Implication.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 under diversity of citizenship. The parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

2. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) as this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred.

THE PARTIES

3. Plaintiff Laura Loomer is an individual and a citizen and resident of the state of Florida and lives and does substantial business in this district.

4. Defendant Facebook is a corporation incorporated in the state of Delaware. Facebook does substantial business in all 50 states, including Florida and in this district.

STANDING

5. Plaintiff Loomer has standing to bring this action because she has been directly affected, victimized and severely damaged by the unlawful conduct complained herein. Her injuries are proximately related to the conduct of Defendant Facebook.

FACTS

1. Ms. Loomer is a well-known conservative investigative journalist.
2. Ms. Loomer is also a conservative Jewish female activist.
3. In the past, Ms. Loomer has worked for Canadian news publisher, The Rebel Media, as well as Project Veritas.
4. Ms. Loomer has long maintained a page on Defendant Facebook's platform, where she engaged with fans and promoted her work.
5. On Friday, May 2, 2019, Ms. Loomer was banned from Defendant Facebook's platform, along with other conservative figures.
6. In a statement released and published widely to the public in this district, nationally and internationally, Defendant Facebook explained their purported and false justification behind Ms. Loomer's ban:

We've always banned individuals or organizations that promote or engage in violence and hate, regardless of ideology. The process for evaluating potential violators is extensive and it is what led us to our decision to remove these accounts today.¹

¹ Oliver Darcy, *Louis Farrakhan, Alex Jones and other 'dangerous' voices banned by Facebook and Instagram*, CNN Business, May 3, 2019, available at: https://amp.cnn.com/cnn/2019/05/02/tech/facebook-ban-louis-farrakhan-infowars-alex-jones-milo-laura-loomer/index.html#referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com&_tf=From%20%251%24s.

7. In issuing the ban against Ms. Loomer, Defendant Facebook and its sister publication Instagram publicly designated her as “dangerous,” which publication was widely disseminated in this district, nationally and internationally.

8. A spokesperson for Defendant Facebook represented and published that:

... such factors [for designating an individual as “dangerous”] include whether the person or organization has ever called for violence against individuals based on race, ethnicity, or national origin; whether the person has been identified with a hateful ideology; whether they use hate speech or slurs in their about section on their social media profiles; and whether they have had pages or groups removed from Facebook for violating hate speech rules.²

9. According to Defendant Facebook’s own posted Community Standards, “Dangerous Individuals and Organizations” are defined as “organizations or individuals involved in the following: Terrorist activity, Organized hate, Mass or serial murder, Human trafficking, [or] Organized violence or criminal activity.”³

10. Ms. Loomer does not fall, or come close to falling, within any of the defined groups set forth by Defendant Facebook.

11. Ms. Loomer has never once advocated violence against any person or group of persons.

12. In fact, Ms. Loomer uses social media to call out anti-Semitism, Islamic terrorism, political violence, and violence against homosexuals, as just one example once having tweeted:

Ilhan is pro Sharia Ilhan is pro- FGM Under Sharia homosexuals are oppressed & killed. Women are abused & forced to wear the hijab. Ilhan is anti Jewish.

13. Facebook subsequently banned Ms. Loomer for 30 days.

14. Ms. Loomer’s tweet refers to Rep. Ilhan Omar (“Rep. Omar”), who was elected to Congress from Minnesota and took office in January of 2019.

² *Id.*

³ https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards/dangerous_individuals_organizations

15. Indeed, Ms. Loomer's tweet simply contained facts about Sharia law, which Rep. Omar admittedly is known to support. The tweet pointed out the fact out that Rep. Omar's supports Sharia law and thus this does not make her an ally for gay people, women, or Jews. Ms. Loomer was also simply pointing out that Rep. Omar is anti-Jewish, a fact that even Nancy Pelosi has agreed with and said publicly.

16. As a result of this tweet, Twitter has now permanently banned Ms. Loomer and Facebook and Instagram followed suit by removing Ms. Loomer's Facebook and related Instagram account.

17. Now, in addition to banning Ms. Loomer from Facebook and its sister social media site Instagram, which it owns, controls and directs, without any just cause, Defendant Facebook has maliciously defamed her by falsely accusing her of "promot[ing] or engag[ing] in violence and hate...."

18. Defendant Facebook has also maliciously defamed Ms. Loomer by falsely designating her as a "dangerous" individual, which defamation was widely published in this district, nationally and internationally.

19. Defendant Facebook and its various owned and pliant entities such as Instagram at all times knew that Ms. Loomer had never once promoted or engaged in violence and hate, and that Ms. Loomer was not a "dangerous" individual.

20. Ms. Loomer is simply a conservative, Jewish woman who has used social media to call out anti-Semitism and violence against homosexuals, while expressing her political views and opinions.

21. There is nothing dangerous, violent, or remotely illegal and improper about Ms. Loomer's conduct.

22. Indeed, in Facebook's own Civil Rights Audit,⁴ which stated:

Designated Hate Figures Enforcement: In recent months, Facebook has continued to apply its "Dangerous Individuals and Organizations" policy, which bans organizations or individuals from the platform when they meet Facebook's Civil Rights Audit certain hate or violence criteria. Under that policy, individuals or organizations that amplify or traffic in hate are banned from the platform, as was the case with Facebook's recent bans of **Alex Jones, Milo Yiannopolous, Laura Loomer, Minister Louis Farrakhan** and others. For individuals or organizations that go beyond amplifying hate to proclaiming a violent or hateful mission or engaging in acts of hate or violence, Facebook not only bans them from the platform but also prohibits other users from praising or supporting them.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
Defamation

23. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

24. Defendant Facebook published the malicious, false and defamatory statements that Plaintiff Loomer had promoted or engaged in violence and hate.

25. Defendant Facebook published the malicious, false and defamatory statements that Plaintiff Loomer was a dangerous individual.

26. This false and misleading statements were published with malice, as Defendant Facebook knew that they were false and misleading, or at a minimum acted and published with a reckless disregard for the truth.

27. Plaintiff Loomer has been severely harmed and damaged by these and other false and misleading statements by Defendant Facebook, because they subjected her to hatred, distrust, ridicule, contempt, and disgrace, and the threat of severe bodily injury or death by those who are now lead to believe that she is dangerous and a domestic terrorist against Muslims in

⁴ https://fbnewsroomus.files.wordpress.com/2019/06/civilrightaudit_final.pdf

particular. Muslims and other extremists thus are now prone to retaliate against her and her life is in mortal danger.

28. Plaintiff Loomer has been severely damaged by these false and misleading statements because they damaged Plaintiff Loomer's reputation and good will and severely harmed financially in her profession and business as a conservative investigative journalist, as well as personally.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
Defamation Per Se

29. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

30. Defendant Facebook, as alleged herein, published numerous false, misleading and defamatory statements to severely harm and damage Plaintiff Loomer, which were republished widely elsewhere. Specifically, Defendant Facebook published in this district, nationally and internationally the falsity that Plaintiff Loomer is a "dangerous" individual that has engaged in hate and/or violence and is a domestic terrorist, which has a criminal felonious meaning.

31. Under Florida Law, "it is established...that an oral communication is actionable per se - that is, without a showing of special damage - if it imputes to another (a) a criminal offense amounting to a felony, or (b) a presently existing venereal or other loathsome and communicable disease, or (c) conduct, characteristics or a condition incompatible with the proper exercise of *his lawful business*, trade, profession or office, or (d) the other being a woman, acts of unchastity." *Wolfson v. Kirk*, 273 So. 2d 774, 777 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1973)

32. These false, misleading and defamatory statements were published in this district, domestically and internationally on the internet and elsewhere for the entire world to see and hear. Specifically, Defendant Facebook published false and misleading facts, *inter alia*, that

Plaintiff's conduct, characteristics or a condition is incompatible with the proper exercise of her lawful business, trade, profession or office as a journalist, as well as personally.

33. These false and misleading statements were published with malice, as Defendant Facebook knew that they were false and misleading, and/or at a minimum acted and published with a reckless disregard for the truth.

34. These false, misleading, and defamatory statements are defamatory *per se* because these false and misleading statements severely harmed and damaged Plaintiff Loomer in her profession and business as an investigative journalist, as they concern conduct and characteristics incompatible with being an investigative journalist, and personally. Damage is presumed by law when defamation *per se* is shown as alleged herein.

35. An investigative journalist's reputation is paramount. Falsely labeling Plaintiff Loomer as "dangerous" and falsely accusing her of having engaged in hate and/or violence damages her good will and reputation, making it impossible for her to successfully continue her profession and also harms her personally as alleged herein.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
Defamation By Implication

36. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

37. Defendant Facebook published numerous false, misleading and defamatory statements about Plaintiff Loomer, as set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

38. These false, misleading and defamatory statements were published on the internet and published and republished elsewhere in this district, nationally and internationally for the entire world to see and hear.

39. These false and misleading statements were published with malice, as Defendant

Facebook knew that they were false and misleading, and/or at a minimum acted with a reckless disregard for the truth.

40. These statements created the false and misleading implication that Plaintiff Loomer has engaged in hate and/or violence as is a “dangerous” individual and in fact is a domestic Jewish female terrorist.

41. Plaintiff Loomer has been severely harmed and damaged by these false and misleading statements because they subject her to hatred, distrust, ridicule, contempt, and disgrace, as well as put her life in danger by those who would seek to retaliate against her.

42. Plaintiff Loomer has been damaged by these false and misleading statements because the statements severely harmed Plaintiff Loomer in her profession and business as an investigative journalist, as well as personally, as pled herein.

43. Plaintiff Loomer has requested pursuant to Florida law that these defamatory statements be retracted, an apology made and that she be reinstated on Facebook and Instagram. Defendant Facebook has arrogantly and unlawfully ignored this request and the defamation as pled herein is on-going and compounded each and every day.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Laura Loomer prays for judgment against Defendant Facebook as follows:

- a. Awarding Plaintiff Loomer compensatory including actual, consequential, and incidental damages for malicious defamatory conduct as alleged herein in an amount to be determined at trial and in excess of \$35, 000,000 U.S. Dollars.
- b. Awarding punitive damages for Defendant Facebook’s malicious defamatory conduct based on the routine and accepted calculation of 5 percent of Facebook’s current net worth of

about \$63 billion U.S. dollars. Thus, punitive damages are requested be awarded by the jury in an amount to exceed \$ 3 billion U.S. dollars, which amount of punitive damages are designed to sufficiently punish Defendant Facebook in order that its illegal conduct not reoccur.

c. Awarding Plaintiff Loomer attorney's fees and costs.

d. Granting any such further relief as the Court deems appropriate including preliminary and permanent injunctive relief.

PLAINTIFF LOOMER DEMANDS A JURY TRIAL ON ALL COUNTS SO TRIABLE.

Dated: July 9, 2019

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Larry Klayman
Larry Klayman, Esq.
FL Bar No. 246220
KLAYMAN LAW GROUP, P.A.
7050 W. Palmetto Park Road
Boca Raton, Florida 33433-3426
Telephone: (561) 558-5536
Email: leklayman@gmail.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received by me on *(date)* _____.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* _____
_____, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,
on *(date)* _____, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* _____, who is
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* _____
_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because _____; or

Other *(specify)*: _____.

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.) NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

DEFENDANTS

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Attorneys (If Known)

(d) Check County Where Action Arose: MIAMI-DADE MONROE BROWARD PALM BEACH MARTIN ST. LUCIE INDIAN RIVER OKEECHOBEE HIGHLANDS

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
2 U.S. Government Defendant
3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

- Citizen of This State
Citizen of Another State
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country
PTF DEF
1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State
2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State
3 3 Foreign Nation
4 4
5 5
6 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions

Grid of categories for Nature of Suit: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, CIVIL RIGHTS, PERSONAL INJURY, TORTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding
2 Removed from State Court
3 Re-filed (See VI below)
4 Reinstated or Reopened
5 Transferred from another district (specify)
6 Multidistrict Litigation Transfer
7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment
8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File
9 Remanded from Appellate Court

VI. RELATED/ RE-FILED CASE(S)

(See instructions): a) Re-filed Case YES NO b) Related Cases YES NO JUDGE: DOCKET NUMBER:

VII. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and Write a Brief Statement of Cause (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

ABOVE INFORMATION IS TRUE & CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE

DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Larry Klayman

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT IFP JUDGE MAG JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked. Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

IV. Nature of Suit. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Refiled (3) Attach copy of Order for Dismissal of Previous case. Also complete VI.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (8) Check this box if remanded from Appellate Court.

VI. Related/Refiled Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases or re-filed cases. Insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judges name for such cases.

VII. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553

Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

VIII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.