MS. KRAMER: I never would do that.

MR. SCHEUER: I don't -- I don't --

MS. KRAMER: Your Honor --

MR. SCHEUER: -- want anything --

THE COURT: Well, first of all --

MR. SCHEUER: -- negative -- I don't want negative implication to be seen as -- or omission to be seen as confirmation of something.

THE COURT: Well, first of all, you didn't hear me. That's not what I said.

MR. SCHEUER: No. That --

THE COURT: I said her perception that it was voodoo science.

MR. SCHEUER: Right.

THE COURT: Now, let's back up.

Miss Kramer has just finished a lawsuit where she lost on an issue of defamation. If she walked out here and chooses — because only in this room can you make those kinds of comments back and forth and not run the risk of defamation. We're here in a court proceeding. If you go outside and they won in this case and take out of context what's said here in argument and the course of my ruling and says it in such a fashion that it could later be determined to be defamation, then you're back facing this all over again.

Each side has a right to disagree upon the various interpretations reached by the other on the validity of the sides that has been referenced in this