

2

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF LANCASTER COUNTY, NEBRASKA

ROBERT J. PROKOP,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 VS.)
)
 THE DAILY NEBRASKAN, A UNIVERSITY)
 OF NEBRASKA PUBLICATION,)
)
 Defendants.)

CASE NO. CI 07-4401

COMPLAINT

LANCASTER COUNTY
 CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT
 07 OCT 18 PM 4:19

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At the time of ~~the~~ commission of the acts mentioned below Plaintiff is a resident of Wilber, Saline County, Nebraska and had always enjoyed the respect, confidence, and esteem of neighbors, as well as of many others in the state of Nebraska. Plaintiff had never been guilty of any crime or offense or violation of law that would have lessen the respect, confidence and esteem which the plaintiff has enjoyed in Wilber and in the state of Nebraska.
2. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned, a University of Nebraska publication residing in the Nebraska ~~Student~~ Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
3. At the time of commission of the acts mentioned below, plaintiff was a public official holding the position of University of Nebraska Regent on the University of Nebraska Board of Regents. During this time plaintiff enjoyed the confidence of his constituents and peers.
4. The Defendant falsely, maliciously, and illegally made and published the Daily Nebraskan, Volume 106, Issue 43, an editorial on Page 4 in the editorial entitled, "Regents must be held to high standards," which were false, scandalous, illegal, defamatory, and malicious statements about the plaintiff's capacity as a public official. Defendant made such statements knowing that they were not true, with the intent to injure plaintiff and to deprive plaintiff of his good name and elective position.



000479764D02

[Handwritten mark]

Defendant further intended to cause plaintiff to not be elected to the Board of Regents. Such editorial is attached to this pleading as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

5. The charges in this writing against plaintiff are false.

6. Defendant well knew that the charges were untrue when they were made.

7. Defendant's editorial is a false and malicious libel. Plaintiff denies all accusations and statements made in Defendant's editorial.

8. Defendant maliciously and wantonly, with intent to injure plaintiff at the time of the posting of the above-mentioned editorial, distributed copies of the publication with the editorial throughout the community and the state.

9. The articles were printed, published and circulated by Defendant with such reckless disregard and carelessness as to their truth or falsity as to indicate an utter disregard of the rights of plaintiff; and the consequences of defendant's actions maliciously, negligently and inexcuseably exposed plaintiff to public hatred and dislike, contempt and ridicule, and impeached plaintiff's honesty, integrity, virtue, and reputation as a person and as a member of plaintiff's profession, and as a direct result of defendant's acts, caused plaintiff substantial and great injury and damage including standing in the political community.

10. A demand for retraction and apology for the editorial was sent by certified mail within seven days of the publication without response.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff requests judgment against defendant for.

1. General damages according to proof of \$500,000.
2. Special damages for pecuniary loss according to proof of \$200,000.

3. Punitive damages as determined by the Court.
4. Costs of suit, and
5. Such other and further relief as this court may deem just and proper.

DATED: October 18, 2007.

ROBERT J. PROKOP, Plaintiff.

BY: 

Robert J. Prokop, Pro Se
320 West Hickory Street, P. O. Box 14