SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE Central Justice Center 700 W. Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92702	
SHORT TITLE: Kane vs. Karamian	
CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE	CASE NUMBER: **30-2026-01575619-CU-HR-CJC**

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that that the following document(s), Minute Order dated 08/26/26, was transmitted electronically by an Orange County Superior Court email server on August 27, 2026, at 9:12:12 AM PDT. The business mailing address is Orange County Superior Court, 700 Civic Center Dr. W, Santa Ana, California 92701. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013b, I electronically served the document(s) on the persons identified at the email addresses listed below:

BLANK ROME LLP
RYAN.COY@BLANKROME.COM

RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC
ECF@RANDAZZA.COM

Clerk of the Court, by: S. Lopez, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF ORANGE
CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 08/26/2026 TIME: 08:30:00 AM DEPT: C65

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Amber Poston
CLERK: S. Lopez
REPORTER/ERM: Kellan Oveson CSR# 14427
BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: Deputy P. Sung

CASE NO: **30-2026-01575619-CU-HR-CJC** CASE INIT.DATE: 06/05/2026
CASE TITLE: **Kane vs. Karamian**
CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: Harassment

EVENT ID/DOCUMENT ID: 74888922

EVENT TYPE: Motion to Strike - Anti SLAPP
Hooman Abedi Karamian
CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Motion to Strike - Anti SLAPP, 06/16/2026

APPEARANCES
Joseph J. Mellema and Ryan F. Coy, from Blank Rome Llp, present for Petitioner(s).
Evander Frank Kane, Petitioner, not present.
March J. Randazza, from Randazza Legal Group, PLLC, present for Respondent(s).
Hooman Abedi Karamian, Respondent is present.

Alex J. Shephard, from Randazza Legal Group, PLLC, present for Respondent(s) remotely.

Hearing held, participants appearing remotely and in person.

The Court addresses counsel's, Alex J. Shepard, remote appearance.

The Court will allow counsel to appear remotely for this hearing, only; any future hearings counsel will need Court approval.

The Court holds a hearing and addresses counsel regarding request to permit media coverage.

Media Request to Photograph, Record, or Broadcast is read and considered.

Motion to Strike - Anti SLAPP filed by respondent (ROA 35) is read and considered.

Court's ruling which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

The Court sets a further proceeding hearing to confirm respondent's counsel has filed a notice of appeal.

The Status Conference re: Notice of Appeal is scheduled for 08/28/2026 at 02:00 PM in Department C65.

Court orders Clerk to give notice.

The court has read and considered the request to photograph, record or broadcast court proceedings. After consulting counsel for the parties, and considering the factors outlined in California Rule of Court 1.150, the court denies the request.

The court overrules Respondent's Evidentiary Objections, Request for Evidentiary Hearing and Motion to Strike Anti-SLAPP for the reasons stated below.

A cause of action against a person arising from an act by that person in furtherance of the right of petition or free speech under the United States or California Constitutions in connection with a public issue (commonly known as a SLAPP suit, i.e., Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation) is subject to a special motion to strike. CCP §425.16(b)(1); (*Monster Energy Co. v Schechter* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 781, 788; *FilmOn.com Inc. v DoubleVerify Inc.* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 133, 139.)

The court has reviewed all filings and considered the arguments of counsel in this matter, of particular weight to the court are:

CH 100 – filed 6/5/26

Motion to Strike Anti SLAPP filed 6/16/26

Lodging of Exhibit 30 filed 6/18/26

Opposition to Anti SLAPP filed 8/7/26

Declarations of Evander Kane, Ryan F. Coy, and Mara Teigen filed 8/7/26

Respondent's Reply to the Opposition, Objection to Evidence in Support of Opposition, and Witness List and Request for Evidentiary Hearing filed 8/14/26

Petitioner's Response to Respondent's Objections to Evidence filed 8/17/26

Petitioner's Objection to an Evidentiary Hearing filed 8/18/26

Evander Kane's Supplemental Declaration in Support filed 8/24/26

Respondent's Response to Supplemental Declaration in Support filed 8/24/26

Evidentiary Objections and Request for Evidentiary Hearing

Pursuant to CCP §425.16(b)(2), in ruling on a special motion to strike, a judge must consider the pleadings as well as the supporting and opposing affidavits or declarations stating the facts on which the liability or defense is based. (Cal. Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings Before Trial (CJER 2026) Attacks on Pleadings, § 12.132, p. 1226) (Thompson-Reuters, California Judges Benchbook (2026 ed.)

Evidence may be considered at the anti-SLAPP motion stage if it is reasonably possible that the evidence set out in the supporting affidavits, declarations, or their equivalents will be admissible at trial. (*Id.* at 1229; *Sweetwater Union High School Dist. v Gilbane Bldg. Co.*, (2019) 6 Cal.5th at 947, 949.) The declarations filed in connection with a special motion to strike must contain competent admissible evidence within the declarant's personal knowledge. . . if it is reasonably possible that the evidence set out in the supporting affidavits, declarations, or their equivalents will be admissible at trial.. (*Id.* at 1227; *Sweetwater Union High School Dist. v Gilbane Bldg. Co.*, (2019) 6 Cal.5th at 947, 945-47.) (*Id.* at 947.) In evaluating the merits of a SLAPP motion, the court may consider evidence of matters occurring after the complaint was filed. (Cal. Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings Before Trial (CJER 2026) Attacks on Pleadings, § 12.133, p. 1229; *Slauson Partnership v. Ochoa* (2003) 112 Cal.App. 4th 1005, 1021, 1028–1029.)

A judge must apply a "summary-judgment-like" test, accepting as true the evidence favorable to the plaintiff and evaluating the defendant's evidence only to determine whether the defendant has defeated the plaintiff's claim as a matter of law. (Cal. Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings Before Trial (CJER 2026) Attacks on Pleadings, § 12.134, p. 1232; *Monster Energy Co. v Schechter*, supra, 7 Cal.5th at 795.) The respondent provides no authority for presenting witness testimony in a hearing on a SLAPP motion. The respondent asserts the court invited the parties to bring any witnesses they deemed necessary to the hearing set August 26, 2026. This court handles a variety of case types and as a matter of routine invites parties to come prepared when hearings are set with any evidence and witnesses, they intend to present. This was a general directive based on the many case types assigned to this courtroom, it was not a finding that witness testimony when it would be improper under the legal standards the court guided by. For these reasons, the court denies Respondent's request to present witness testimony at the hearing on this motion.

The court has reviewed and considered the 53 evidentiary objections raised by Respondent. The objections are form and do not articulate the factual bases for the form evidentiary objection. The objections are overruled in part for this reason. In addition, the court finds it is reasonably possible that the evidence set out in the supporting affidavits and declarations contain information within the declarant's personal knowledge and there is a reasonable possibility their equivalents will be admissible at trial. For these reasons, the court overrules Respondent's evidentiary objections.

CCP 425.16 Standard of Review

The moving defendant has the initial burden of showing that the challenged cause of action arises from protected free speech or petitioning activity. This burden is satisfied by demonstrating that the conduct underlying the plaintiff's claim fits into a category of protected activity set forth in CCP §425.16(e). . . The burden shifts to the plaintiff to show that the that the plaintiff's claims have at least "minimal merit. (Cal. Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings Before Trial (CJER 2026) Attacks on Pleadings, § 12.118, p. 1164; *Park v Board of Trustees of Cal. State Univ.* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 1057, 1061.)

Given that only a claim that satisfies both prongs of the anti-SLAPP statute is subject to being stricken, a court may choose to analyze only the probability of prevailing and resolve the anti-SLAPP motion on that basis alone. (Cal. Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings Before Trial (CJER 2026) Attacks on Pleadings, § 12.134, p. 1230; *Serova v Sony Music Entertainment* (2022) 13 Cal.5th 859, 872.) The plaintiff's burden of establishing a probability of prevailing is not high. ((Cal. Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings Before Trial (CJER 2026) Attacks on Pleadings, § 12.134, p. 1230*; Monster Energy Co. v Schechter* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 781, 793; *Whitehall v County of San Bernardino* (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 352, 363.) "Probability" means a "reasonable probability" of prevailing, not prevailing by a preponderance of the evidence. (Cal. Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings Before Trial (CJER 2026) Attacks on Pleadings, § 12.134, p. 1230; *Trapp v Naiman* (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 113, 119.)

Given the above, the court will start with Prong 2 analysis, the probability of prevailing.

CCP Section 527.6 defines harassment as "unlawful violence, a credible threat of violence, or a knowing and willful course of conduct directed at a specific person that seriously alarms, annoys, or harasses the person, and that serves no legitimate purpose. The course of conduct must be that which would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress, and must actually cause substantial emotional distress to the petitioner." (§ 527.6, subd. (b)(3).) A course of conduct is defined as "a pattern of conduct composed of a series of acts over a period of time, however short, evidencing a continuity of purpose, including following or stalking an individual, making harassing telephone calls to an individual, or sending harassing correspondence to an individual by any means, including, but not limited to, the use of public or private mails, interoffice mail, facsimile, or email." (§ 527.6, subd. (b)(1).)

The court must also consider challenged conduct is ongoing or likely to reoccur. (*E.G. v. M.L.* (2024) 105 Cal. App.5th 688, 706).

In assessing whether the Petitioner is likely to prevail on his claim pursuant to CCP § 527.6 the court considered all evidence presented and gave great weight to the following:

- Petitioner is a person of public notoriety, subject to many lawsuits alleging violence (including sexual violence), fraud and deception, and various other causes of action unrelated to Anna Kane or the Respondent.
- Family court order Santa Clara July 10, 2024
- Call to action asserted by Respondent - "Free Kensignton"
- Directives of Respondent to find and photograph Petitioner, his 4 minor children under the age of 7, and persons unrelated to Petitioner's public notoriety and/or the many lawsuits involving Petitioner unrelated to Anna Kane
- The many times the Petitioner, and his family, have been contacted by apparent followers of the Respondent (who number over 500,000) seemingly directed at the assertion that Petitioner has kidnapped Kensington is not being cared for appropriately.
- The June 10, 2026 Disneyland event
- The August 21, 2026 – Instagram message received by Petitioner from an unknown source

The court gave minimal weight to the following: The interactions between Respondent and Anna Kane and the interview between Respondent and Anna Kane on May 21, 2026.

The court considered the context of the matters given great weight. Respondent's challenged conduct regarding Petitioner, a public figure, does not clearly focus on matters of public interest including, access to justice, the administration of justice, or fostering a public discussion addressing the many issues surrounding the many lawsuits involving Mr. Kane, unrelated to Anna Kane. Respondent's conduct focuses on an assertion that Petitioner has kidnapped Kensington, despite the Respondent's knowledge of the Santa Calara County Superior Court Order of July 10, 2024 to the contrary. This conduct is amplified by a call to action to his many followers to locate Petitioner when he is with his minor children or locate the respondent's minor children and photograph them.

The court finds the Petitioner's claim has minimal merit, whether reviewed under a standard of a reasonable probably of prevailing or clear and convincing evidence.

<u>The court now considers Prong 1 analysis, protected speech:</u>

The court finds the conduct of Respondent occurred in a public forum, both Instagram and YouTube.

The court finds Petitioner is a person of public notoriety. The court finds Respondent's conduct concerns matters of public interest, in part. Matters of public interest include the many lawsuits alleging violence (including sexual violence), fraud and deception, and various other causes of action unrelated to Anna Kane or the Respondent.

The allegations by Anna Kane regarding family court orders relating to Kensington Kane is a closer call, this is where the context of Respondent's conduct relating to Petitioner and his minor children, despite the Santa Clara Superior Court order of July 10,2024, is revealing. This context leads to the conclusion that the conduct of Respondent involving court orders including Evander Kane, Kensington Kane, and Anna Kane are not matters of public interest and do not relate to, or amplify, the matters that are clearly of public interest, the many lawsuits that do not involve Kensington or Anna Kane and are thus not protected speech pursuant to CCP 425.16.

When causes of action are factually and legally intertwined, and the plaintiff shows the plaintiff will probably prevail on some, but not all, of the causes of action, the judge should deny the motion with respect to all causes of action. (Cal. Judges Benchbook: Civil Proceedings Before Trial (CJER 2026) Attacks on Pleadings, § 12.136, p. 1246; *M.G. v Time Warner,* Inc. (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 623, 637.) Considering a portion of Respondent's conduct relates to matters protected speech, other conduct does not, the court finds the Respondent's SLAPP motion fails under Prong 1.

For all the reasons discussed the court denies the special motion to strike.

The court notes that following the conclusion of the proceedings in this matter, the court filed the request to photograph, record or broadcast court proceedings discussed above.

8/26/26

Judge Amber Pooton