

2580 SORREL STREET  
LAS VEGAS, NV 89146



TELEPHONE

TELECOPIER

October 19, 2022

**CEASE & DESIST LIBELOUS PUBLICATIONS OF ROBERT BEADLES**

**Sent Via U.S. Mail & E-mail:**

American Public Media  
d/b/a APM Reports  
The Kling Public Media Center  
480 Cedar Street  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

The Nevada Independent  
7455 Arroyo Crossing Pkwy., Ste. 220  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89113

KUNR Public Radio  
1664 North Virginia St., MS 0294  
Reno, NV 89557

**RE: Robert Beadles v. APM Reports, The Nevada Independent & KUNR  
Public Radio**

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please be advised that my law firm has been retained to represent Robert Beadles (“Client” and/or “Mr. Beadles”) in this defamation and libel matter. On October 18, 2022, you published an article titled “GOP donor trying to reshape Nevada politics pushes radical conspiracy theories, repeatedly cites antisemitic propaganda” (“Article”). The purpose of this correspondence is to demand that you immediately publicly retract the defamatory and libelous Article. While my Client reserve all rights to pursue additional causes of action, my Client brings to your attention the current state of the law regarding your liability in the present matter.

**YOUR LIBELOUS CONDUCT**

NRS 200.510 defines libel, although it is criminal libel, the definition is applicable for either criminal or civil: “A libel is a malicious defamation, expressed by printing, writing, signs, pictures or the like, tending ... to impeach the honesty, integrity, virtue, or reputation, or to publish the natural defects of a living person ... and thereby to expose them to public hatred, contempt or ridicule.” *Phillips v. State*, 119 P.3d 711, 716-17 (2005). Thus, a writing that tends to expose a person, or in some circumstances a corporation, to contempt, ridicule, aversion, or disgrace or to induce in the minds of right-thinking persons an evil opinion of him

and so cause others to shun or avoid him, is said to be libelous. *Time, Inc. v. Hill*, 385 U.S. 374 (1967).

Additionally, the defamatory comments must imply a “habitual course of similar conduct, or the want of the qualities or skill that the public is reasonably entitled to expect.” *Lubin v. Kunin*, 117 Nev. 107, 111 (2001); *see* Restatement (Second) of Torts § 573 cmt. d (1977). A statement is defamatory when such charges would tend to lower the subject in the estimation of the community, to excite derogatory opinions against him, and to hold him up to contempt. *PETA v. Bobby Berosini, Ltd.*, 111 Nev. 615, 619 (1995). In addition to the statement being false and defamatory, it too must tend or be reasonably calculated to injure the victim’s reputation. *Bongiovi v. Sullivan*, 138 P.3d 433, 448 (2006).

As you are aware, under Nevada law it is unlawful to engage in the defamation of another’s character and reputation. You have made false statements regarding my Client in the Article. You have made it your mission to defame my Client. Your statements have one purpose: to harass my Client. While there are many libelous remarks regarding, “unfounded election claims, “backing candidates who share his radical beliefs”, and “outlandish conspiracy theories”, my Client specifically takes issue with the blatantly false statement that he cites and/or cited “antisemitic propaganda”, and attempted to characterize Mr. Beadles as racist to African Americans and the Asian American community.

As an initial matter, it is undisputed that the Covid-19 began in China. As stated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on November 4, 2021, “COVID-19 (coronavirus disease 2019) is a disease caused by a virus named SARS-CoV-2 and was discovered in December 2019 in Wuhan, China. It is very contagious and has quickly spread around the world.”<sup>1</sup> My Client simply factually identified the location of the inception of Covid-19.

Next, You assert that my Client has “perpetuated outlandish narratives about Black communities.” African American economist and professor Walter Williams once stated, “The welfare state has done to black Americans what slavery couldn't do....And that is to destroy the black family.” Mr. Williams cites institutional racism *and* systemic racism and the single most powerful cause of African American impoverishment in modern society: the decline of the African American family. My Client is not only an entrepreneur and political activist, he is a proud husband and father. The impacts on the decline of the nuclear family on all communities, specifically African American communities, cannot be deemed to be derogatory towards African American. Next, You rely criticism of Angela D. Taylor – Washoe County School District Trustee District E and note her race. My Client’s criticism of Ms. Taylor stems from various matters, including:

- Repeated child abuse of a disabled student that took place over a 6-month

---

<sup>1</sup>[Basics of COVID-19 | CDC](#) (Last Accessed October 19, 2022).

period resulting in a disclosed \$4,400,000.00 settlement for the victim;

- The Professional Equity Lens and Critical Race Theory (“CRT”);
- The handling of the Covid-19 pandemic and relief funding;
- Removal of the first public comment, future agenda items, and approval of agenda items;
- Quality of education of WCSD students, including student proficiency in English, Math, Science, and preparing WCSD students for higher education;
- Decrease in ACT and SAT scores in WCSD and failure to address the quality of education of WCSD students;
- Prior knowledge of former-Trustee Jackie Calvert living outside of her district and tax-payer funds used during investigation;
- Actions resulting in a lawsuit filed in the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for the County of Washoe, entitled *Fiannaca v. Washoe County School District*, Case No. CV21-02232;
- WCSD meeting rooms and venues;
- Misuse of tax payer funds to attempt to censure Trustee Jeffrey Church;
- Requiring WCSD students to declare a gender pronoun; and
- Encouraging teachers to not inform parents of information students tell them.

These expansive topics are surely not racial in any means. You then challenge my Client’s own lineage with no support whatsoever. You failed to identify a single one of the “Several prominent historians contacted for this story say they found no evidence backing up Beadles’ genealogical claims.”

While my Client has publicly disputed the legitimacy and outcome of the 2020 Presidential Election, he has never blamed defeat “on an international jewish conspiracy.” The Article attempts to correlate my Client’s use of the word “they”, one of the most commonly used plural pronouns used universally, with antisemitism. My Client invites challenges and critics of his political, economic, and religious views; however, he cannot stand for blatant libelous publications as a last-ditch effort to “cancel” him and his far-reaching efforts to reinstate political and election integrity in Nevada. The Article is correct that my Client agreed to an interview, but only if he could release the unedited version. Your denial is telling. My Client invites You to present any actual evidence demonstrating any objectively antisemitic remarks or comments. The Article fails to identify a single one.

My Client merely discussing the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” in itself is not antisemitic as the Article blatantly fabricates. As the Article even cites, “Beadles wrote that he neither

agrees nor disagrees with any of the conspiracy theories he cited.” My Client even notes the conspiracy theory itself as a conspiracy and not fact. A portion of the Article is titled “pushes radical conspiracy theories” which the Article demonstrates is patently false. Moreover, simply because my Client has utilized “Gab” is not in itself antisemitic. Also, promoting his Christian beliefs is not antisemitic either. The simple fact is that Your clickbait Article contains nothing supporting its title. In fact, you are the one seeking to exploit Judaism to further your political agenda. While any reader could decipher this within a brief read, the caption itself is inherently misleading and contradicts any journalistic integrity.

Your reliance of my Client’s property rental business providing rental properties for qualified Section 8 individuals is also in poor taste. My Client provides low income housing for individuals who qualify under government programs. Surely you are in support of such programs. However, attempting to characterize Mr. Beadles as racist and antisemitic compromises his property rental business practices as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) under the Fair Housing Act and HUD may refuse to conduct business with my Client and wrongfully deprive him of his business.

Truth cannot be your defense because the Article acknowledges that Mr. Beadles has never supported any antisemitic articles, publications, or texts, specifically the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. Your Article cites no sources to negate the fact that you simply published the false Article. This does not involve any neutral reporting privilege; it involves entirely false statements to further the vendetta you clearly have against my Client. As such, if you fail to cease and desist your libelous conduct and do not publicly retract the Article, my Client will be forced to seek injunctive relief.

### **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Temporary restraining orders are governed by the same standard applicable to preliminary injunctions. *See Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp. v. Reliant Energy Servs., Inc.*, 181 F. Supp. 2d 1111, 1126 (E.D. Cal. 2001). Specifically, a preliminary injunction may be issued if a plaintiff establishes: (1) likelihood of success on the merits; (2) likelihood of irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief; (3) that the balance of equities tips in the plaintiff’s favor; and (4) that an injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008).

Alternatively, the Ninth Circuit has held that district courts may issue an injunction if the first two elements are met and there are “serious questions going to the merits” and there is “a hardship balance that tips sharply toward the plaintiff.” *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1132 (9th Cir. 2011). Above all, a temporary restraining order “should be restricted to serving [its] underlying purpose of preserving the status quo and preventing irreparable harm just so long as is necessary to hold a hearing, and no longer.” *Granny Goose Foods, Inc. v. Bhd. of Teamsters & Auto Truck Drivers Local No. 70*, 415 U.S. 423, 439 (1974).

You have no facts to support your highly libelous Article. Surely my Client has a likelihood of success on the merits of his pending libel case against your false and misleading Article. My Client will suffer irreparable harm if you continue to publish false articles. My Client offered you an interview if the unedited version could be released, you refused.

Since the balance of equities greatly favors my Client, he has graciously agreed to withhold from seeking immediate injunctive relief if you confirm by October 21st, 2022 by 5:00 p.m. PST that You will publicly retract the Article. If You fail to do so, my Client reserves all rights to pursue litigation and seek the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Adam R. Fulton, Esq.*  
Adam R. Fulton, Esq.