

# Exhibit D

Pxie @pxielovee May 20

I have not lied about anything. The emails you have posted further illustrate my point.

I suggest you re-read the objection your legal counsel filed.

Your legal team asked to file unredacted versions before the seal was granted, \*or\* strike them from the record.

If this was truly a civil rights problem, why even suggest withdrawing/striking from the record? Wouldn't the demand only be to know of the identities?

In connection with her motion for preliminary injunction, Plaintiff moved to file under seal three emergency declarations. Plaintiff's motion should be denied for three reasons: (1) Plaintiff failed to meet and confer prior to filing her motion; (2) Plaintiff refused to identify the names of the declarants to Defendant Bessell's counsel; and (3) the stated rule and statute upon which Plaintiff relies are not applicable here.

At 7:59 p.m. EDT on Friday, May 2, 2025, Plaintiff's counsel emailed the undersigned writing:

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.7 (a)(3) we are meeting and conferring on the following motions:  
1. Motion to File Under Seal Certain Documents and to Propound Order;  
2. Motion for Leave to Excise Page Labels on Reply Memorandum?

The documents to be filed under seal are certain statements by witnesses, which purpose is keep their names out of the public. You and your client will know their identities. I apologize for not tracking out before it's been an intense week.

Suppl. Bessell Decl. Ex. A (emphasis added): At 11:46 p.m. EDT on May 2, Plaintiff filed her motion for leave to file declarations under seal. [ECF No. 48.] At 12:35 a.m. EDT on Saturday, May 3 (after the deadline to file her reply papers), Plaintiff filed the declarations in redacted form. [ECF Nos. 49-2, 49-4, 49-5.] At 10:00 a.m. EDT on May 3, Defendant's counsel requested "unredacted copies of Plaintiff's filings." Suppl. Bessell Decl. Ex. B. Despite repeated requests, Plaintiff refused to return to Bessell the names of her declarants. At

The local rules require "[a]fter filing a redacted exhibit [or] contemporaneously serve a version of the exhibit upon all counsel . . . that is either unredacted or that contains only those redactions authorized in connection with producing a document to another party in discovery." L.R. 5.4(f)(1)(A). To date, Plaintiff has not complied. Suppl. Bessell Decl. ¶ 5. Instead, Plaintiff argues that because she elected to file redacted declarations under Local Rule 5.3(f)(1), she is somehow excused from the requirements of subsection (f) of the Local Rule and contends that Bessell "has no right to receive the unredacted documents at this time." At Ex. B, Plaintiff provides no support for this contention. As a statement, Bessell should be permitted to know the identities of the purported witnesses who are providing testimony against him.

Further, Plaintiff's reliance on Rule 26(c)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and F.S.C. § 485 is entirely misplaced, as those authorities have no bearing on her Motion To File Under Seal. Rule 26 permits to seeking a protective order in connection with discovery. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1). The Code section provides that "the court may grant injunctive relief maintaining the confidentiality of a plaintiff using a pseudonym." F.S.C. § 485(b)(4)(B). Neither is applicable here.

For the foregoing reasons, Bessell requests that the Court deny Plaintiff's Motion To File Under Seal and order Plaintiff to file unredacted versions of the declarations [ECF Nos. 49-2, 49-4, 49-5] or strike them from the record.

<sup>1</sup> While this objection is directed to Plaintiff's Motion To File Under Seal, Bessell also opposes Plaintiff's belated request to excise page numbers from its reply brief. Plaintiff failed to meet and confer prior to filing her motion and exclusively justified those purported efforts. [ECF No. 48.] Plaintiff did not carefully edit her reply papers prior to filing. They are repetitive, wordy, improperly formatted, and contain a myriad of extraneous and irrelevant information. The Court should instruct Plaintiff to the 15-page limit. L.R. 7.1(c)(2).