

Exhibit P

August 23, 2024

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Re: *Response to July 22 Letter from Sage Publications, Inc.*

Dear [REDACTED]

On July 22, Sage informed the Authors that, despite the Authors' good faith and earnest efforts to find agreement with Sage on an arbitral forum, Sage will not "agree to jointly submit the Authors' arbitration demand to AAA with a hearing in the District of Columbia under the AAA Commercial Rules." Sage refused to agree to this joint submission because the Authors would not agree to Sage's demand that they preemptively waive certain discovery rights instead of letting an arbitrator decide the proper scope of discovery.

Sage justifies this position by erroneously claiming that the Authors "are not willing or able" to "decide how they intend to prove their claims." For starters, that is no reason to hold an arbitration hostage. Claimants are not required to present the entire theory of their case before an arbitration is even submitted to an arbitrator. It's also nonsense. As the Authors explained in their prior letter to Sage, the Authors provided Sage with a 58-page draft of their detailed arbitration demand, as well as drafts of certain discovery requests that they intend to serve upon Sage—all in the hopes of assuaging Sage's concerns and forging a path forward. Sage, by contrast, still has not provided the Authors with a draft of its response to the demand. Sage has not given the Authors the slightest hint about how it intends to prosecute its case, other than to signal that it will try to avoid discovery into its wrongdoing.

Putting aside Sage's disappointing refusal to compromise and its mischaracterizations of the state of negotiations, the Authors agree that, given Sage's refusal to submit this matter to AAA, "the next step to move the arbitration forward is to exchange proposed California arbitrators." The Authors have thus put together the following slate of five distinguished California arbitrators:

- Hon. David L. Belz, Ret. (Judicate West)
 - See <https://bit.ly/3yU1R3Z>.
- Hon. Kevin J. Murphy, Ret. (ADR Services, Inc.)
 - See <https://bit.ly/3Ax1fl8>.
- Hon. Vincent J. O'Neill, Jr., Ret. (Alternative Resolution Centers)
 - See <https://bit.ly/4dD12f8>.
- Hon. Christopher Warner, Ret. (Judicate West)
 - See <https://bit.ly/3XeRIYX>.
- Hon. John Zebrowski, Ret. (ADR Services, Inc.)
 - See <https://bit.ly/4fY0py1>.

All five are retired judges with esteemed judicial and arbitral careers, spotless reputations, wide experience, and proven neutrality. Any one of them would be well-qualified to address the facts and issues in this case.

We respectfully ask that Sage select one or more of these arbitrators as an agreed neutral. If Sage would like to make multiple selections, we ask that Sage provide a ranking of its choices. If Sage cannot agree to any of these selections, we ask that Sage explain why it cannot do so and provide specific reasons why each of these five arbitrators is unacceptable.

We ask that Sage provide a response to this letter by September 4.

Sincerely,



Tyson C. Langhofer
Philip A. Sechler
Alliance Defending Freedom
44180 Riverside Pkwy
Lansdowne, Virginia 20176
(571) 707-4655
tlanghofer@ADFlegal.org
psechler@ADFlegal.org

Patrick Strawbridge
Steven C. Begakis
Consovoy McCarthy PLLC
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 700
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-9423
patrick@consovoymccarthy.com
steven@consovoymccarthy.com