

CNN Wins Defamation Lawsuit as Trump's \$475 Million 'Big Lie' Case Fails



A federal judge has thrown out former President Donald Trump's \$475 million defamation lawsuit against CNN. The lawsuit revolved around CNN's use of the term "big lie" in describing Trump's election fraud claims and its alleged association with Adolf Hitler. U.S. Judge Raag Singhal, nominated by Trump in 2019, ruled late on Friday night that CNN's statements were opinions and not factual assertions, therefore not subject to a defamation claim.

The lawsuit, filed in October 2022, pointed to five instances in which CNN published stories or aired comments referring to Trump's assertions about the 2020 election as his "big lie." This phrase, notably associated with the Nazi regime's use of propaganda, was contended by the lawsuit to deliberately link the former president to one of the most repugnant figures in modern history.

Judge Singhal acknowledged that while CNN's words might be considered repugnant, they did not meet the legal threshold of defamation. He emphasized that using the term "big lie" alone was insufficient to establish an association between Trump and Adolf Hitler. Singhal's ruling occurred in federal court in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, near Trump's Mar-a-Lago resort.

See also: [Trump's Attempt to Relocate Falsified Business Records Case Denied by New York Federal Court](#)

In response to the decision, a Trump spokesperson issued a statement expressing agreement with the judge's findings concerning the repugnant nature of CNN's statements about the former president. The statement also indicated that CNN would be held accountable for its alleged mistreatment of Trump and his supporters. However, it did not specify whether Trump's legal team intended to appeal the ruling.

Don't wait to take the next step forward in your legal career - submit your resume to [LawCrossing](#) today!

The phrase "big lie" became a focal point during Trump's post-election period, as he repeatedly claimed that the 2020 election was fraudulent and stolen from him. He and his supporters contended that the mainstream media, including CNN, unfairly portrayed him as a promoter of falsehoods, which fueled the defamation lawsuit.

Throughout his presidency and beyond, Trump has frequently criticized media outlets whose coverage he disagreed with, with CNN being one of his favorite targets. Despite facing state and federal indictments, he remains the front-runner for the 2024 Republican presidential nomination.

Judge Singhal's ruling emphasized the distinction between opinion and fact in defamation cases. While expressing that CNN's words might be considered repugnant, he stated that they did not meet the legal criteria for defamation. The case brought attention to the delicate balance between freedom of speech and protection against defamation, particularly in the context of public figures like Trump.

The dismissal of Trump's lawsuit against CNN could have broader implications for similar defamation cases involving public figures and media organizations. The ruling reaffirms the importance of distinguishing between expressions of opinion and factual claims when assessing potential defamation claims.

The lawsuit's rejection also highlights the challenges public figures face in holding media outlets accountable for their coverage. Defamation cases involving public figures often require a higher burden of proof, with plaintiffs needing to demonstrate actual malice—meaning the outlet published the statement with knowledge of its falsity or reckless disregard for the truth.

While Judge Singhal's ruling may bring relief to CNN, it is unlikely to be the end of legal challenges involving Trump and media organizations. The former president has a history of pursuing legal action against his critics, and this recent dismissal may not deter him from pursuing further cases in the future.

As Trump's legal battles continue, the case against CNN serves as a reminder of the complexities and intricacies involved in defamation claims. The ruling underscores the significance of differentiating between protected expressions of opinion and false factual statements in the realm of media reporting and political discourse. It remains to be seen how this decision will impact future defamation cases and the broader relationship between public figures and the media.

Don't be a silent ninja! Let us know your thoughts in the comment section below.

