

From: [Jeremy Marel](#)
To: [Jeremy Marel](#)
Subject: FW: CONFIDENTIAL
Date: Wednesday 11 September 2024 02:43:00 PM

From: Gina Rushton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2023 5:28:13 PM
To: Moira Deeming <Moira.Deeming@parliament.vic.gov.au>
Subject: Re: CONFIDENTIAL

Hi Moira,

To reiterate, we do not think our coverage has defamed you in any way and we have no plans to delete either article or issue an apology.

I will also reiterate, as outlined in my previous email, *Crikey* is happy to issue a correction in Charlie Lewis' article to make clear you did not mention sex workers or abortion in your maiden speech. We are also happy to clarify that the "too extreme" claims were made by multiple Liberal sources to *The Age*.

We have also now offered you several opportunities to provide your claims and perspective to be considered for inclusion in Cam Wilson's article. I am on leave tomorrow but will be sure to check for any legal correspondence from your lawyers over the weekend.

Thanks,

Gina

On Wed, Mar 1, 2023 at 10:31 PM Moira Deeming
<Moira.Deeming@parliament.vic.gov.au> wrote:

Hi Gina,

As requested, all communications will continue in writing. As I've made clear, my lawyers are taking over all my cases on Friday, including the *Crikey* case, if a satisfactory resolution cannot be reached.

I demand that you take down these articles and never republish them in any form, that you publish a retraction and a mutually agreed upon apology by this Friday 3rd of March.

Only then will I be satisfied that the defamation I feel I have suffered, will be remedied and that I can close this case forever.

A broad summary of my cases against Crikey is that:

1. Due to either a total lack of due diligence or deliberate defamation, Crikey published-as facts- negative and derogatory claims about my actions, statements and religious beliefs – which both your journalist and yourself have now admitted, were only personal opinions, allegations and ‘errors’, or which you have simply failed to address at all.
2. Crikey published claims that the previous Liberal Party Prime Minister of Australia *personally* viewed me as “too extreme” and my views “a bit alienating”, which you now admit were only rumours. This means that either Crikey journalists knew these claims were only rumours prior to publishing them as facts, or Crikey journalists made them up entirely.
3. Crikey published the claim that I used my Maiden speech in parliament to speak against “abortion and sex work”- which you now admit was not true. Moreover, your journalist arranged these lies in value laden imagery- claiming- as you admit, entirely falsely- that I “jammed” the two concepts together “like ill-fitting puzzles”. And now you have claimed that this elaborate fabrication was simply ‘an error’. I do not accept that this was an ‘error’ and I do not believe that any fair minded person would.
4. Crikey published speculations about portions of an FOI without first establishing (as many other journalists and outlets did) that the source, the SWLRV group, had not withheld any relevant information or made any untenable claims, regarding them. One good question would have been whether or not the SWLRV group had withheld any of the FOI documents that countered their narrative against me (which they most certainly did). This could have easily been established by taking the time to contact me directly. And as I pointed out in my earlier email, even the SWLRV website has now been updated to include caveats that your journalists failed to include. But rather than automatically publish a correction and an apology, your journalist has doubled down and tried to justify parading his opinions as facts, via other, equally weak arguments. The difference between the SWLRV group and Crikey, is that Crikey and it’s employees have a code of conduct and legal and ethical responsibilities under the Australian Press Council guidelines.

I could go on.

I will be attesting that I have suffered humiliation, vilification and defamation due to the two articles I've referenced- which have both been used as a means to mock and undermine me in my personal and professional capacities.

If your next email is not an acceptance of my terms, I'll just be forwarding it on to my lawyers for my Friday meeting.

Regards,

Moira Deeming