



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JOHN PAUL MAC ISAAC, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
CABLE NEWS NETWORK, INC., )  
*et.al.*, )  
)  
Defendants. )

C.A. No. S22C-10-012 CAK

**PLAINTIFF/COUNTERCLAIM DEFENDANT JOHN PAUL  
MAC ISAAC'S OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF HIS MOTION TO  
DISMISS DEFENDANT/COUNTERCLAIM  
PLAINTIFF'S COUNTERCLAIMS**

/s/ Brian R. Della Rocca  
**Brian R. Della Rocca, Esquire**  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
Compass Law Partners  
51 Monroe Street, Suite 408  
Rockville, Maryland 20850  
Ph: (240) 560-3030  
Fax: (301) 740-2297  
[bdellarocca@compass-law.com](mailto:bdellarocca@compass-law.com)

/s/ Ronald G. Poliquin  
**Ronald G. Poliquin, Esquire**  
I.D. No. 4447  
1475 S. Governors Ave.  
Dover, DE 19904  
Ph: (302) 702-5501  
[ron@poliquinfirm.com](mailto:ron@poliquinfirm.com)

/s/ Joseph D. Stanley  
**Joseph D. Stanley, Esquire**  
I.D. No. 6329  
1140 South State Street  
Dover, DE 19901  
(302)678-8700  
[joe.stanley@schwartzandschwartz.com](mailto:joe.stanley@schwartzandschwartz.com)

September 9, 2023

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Table of Authorities .....	3
Preliminary Statement .....	4
Factual Background .....	5
I.    Parties .....	5
II.   Facts Alleged in Counter Claims .....	5
III.  Actual Facts .....	7
Argument .....	13
I.    Standard of Review .....	13
II.   Claims Barred by 2-year Statute of Limitations .....	14
III.  Inconsistences Between Answers to Amended Complaint and Allegations in Counterclaim .....	16
IV.   Invasion of Privacy by Intrusion .....	18
A.  Intrusion .....	18
B.  Highly Offensive to a Reasonable Person .....	20
V.    Invasion of Privacy by Publication of Private Facts/Matters .....	22
A.  Disclosure .....	22
B.  Highly Offensive to a Reasonable Person .....	23
C.  Legitimate Public Concern .....	24

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
D. True Statement of Facts .....	25
VI. Conspiracy and Aiding and Abetting Counts .....	25
A. Conspiracy .....	26
B. Aiding and Abetting .....	27
Conclusion .....	28

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>PAGE</u>
<i>Anderson v. Airco, Inc.</i> , No. 02C-12-091 HdR, 2004 Del. Super. LEXIS 393, at *10 (Super. Ct. Nov. 30, 2004) .....	26, 27
<i>Atamian v. Gorkin</i> , 1999 Del. Super. LEXIS 666, *9 (Del. Super. Ct. August 13, 1999) .....	25
<i>Beckett v. Trice</i> , 1994 Del. Super. LEXIS 599 (Del Super. Ct. November 4, 1994) .....	21
<i>Ciabattoni v. Teamsters Local 326</i> , No. N15C-04-059 VLM, 2017 Del. Super. LEXIS 362, at *11 (Super. Ct. July 25, 2017) .....	14
<i>Cousins v. Goodier</i> , 2021 WL 3355471, at *7 (Del. Super. Ct. July 30, 2021) .....	26
<i>Dayton v. Collison</i> , No. N17C-08-100 CLS, 2020 Del. Super. LEXIS 310, at *29 (Del. Super. Ct. June 22, 2020) .....	18
<i>Heller v. Dover Warehouse Market, Inc.</i> , 515 A.2d 178, 179-80 (Del. Super. Ct. 1986) .....	13
<i>Lee v. Picture People, Inc.</i> , 2012 Del. Super. LEXIS 159, *7-8 (Del. Super. Ct. March 19, 2012) .....	18
<i>Nix v. Sawyer</i> , Del.Super., 466 A.2d 407 (1983) .....	13
<i>Spence v. Cherian</i> , 135 A.3d 1282, 1288 (Del. Super. Ct. 2016) .....	22
<i>Spence v. Funk</i> , Del.Supr., 396 A.2d 967 (1978) .....	13
<i>Triplex Communications v. Riley</i> , 900 S.W.2d 716, 720, 38 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 765 (Tex.) 1995) .....	27
<i>White v. Riego</i> , No. 04C-10-015 PLA, 2005 Del. Super. LEXIS 67, at *5 (Super. Ct. Mar. 3, 2005) .....	14

## **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

The counterclaim filed by Defendant/Counterclaim Plaintiff Robert Hunter Biden (“Biden”) seeks to impose liability on John Paul Mac Isaac (“Mac Isaac”) (1) for performing services that Biden hired him to do (which required accessing the data); (2) for turning the information over to law enforcement after concerns of seeing illegal activity; and (3) for turning the information over to the attorney for the President of the United States after determining that the information on the laptop may be needed as part of his impeachment defense. Biden’s allegations are nothing more than political talking points under the guise of legal arguments.

Mac Isaac did not seek this limelight. Mac Isaac himself was not particularly political prior to the defamation committed by the Biden political machine. In fact, at the time of all relevant events, Mac Isaac was a registered Democrat. Regardless, Defendant Biden chastises him as a “right-wing nut job” instead of the concerned citizen he was and is today.

## **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

### **I. PARTIES**

Mac Isaac is a private citizen who resides in Wilmington, Delaware, and was the owner of a computer repair shop named “The Mac Shop.”

Biden, who currently resides in California, is the son of the President of the United States, Joseph R. Biden, Jr., and was a customer of The Mac Shop who sought Mac Isaac’s assistance with retrieving data from a Mac computer after damaging the Mac with liquid.

### **II. FACTS ALLEGED IN COUNTERCLAIMS**

For the purpose of this motion, Plaintiff must accept Defendant’s well-pleaded facts in the counterclaims. Biden’s invasion of privacy claims center on a few specific dates. Biden claims that Mac Isaac accessed Biden’s data as early as April 13, 2019. (¶ 9 of Biden’s Counterclaims). Mac Isaac allegedly made a “clone” of the data that he then loaded onto a MacBook of his own in July 2019. (¶ 22 of Biden’s Counterclaims). On or around September 2019, Mac Isaac allegedly sent a hard drive containing the data from Wilmington, Delaware to his father, Richard “Steve” Mac Isaac, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. (¶ 23 of Biden’s Counterclaims). In that same month, Mac Isaac allegedly composed a letter to send to President Trump’s attorney Rudy Giuliani. (¶ 24 of Biden’s Counterclaims). In November 2019, Mac Isaac allegedly printed out materials from the data he maintained to assist then-

President Trump in defending against the impeachment proceedings in the U.S. House of Representatives. (¶ 25 of Biden's Counterclaims).

Mac Isaac also allegedly gave a copy of the data in his possession to his friend, Kristen Riley, to hold in case something happened to Mac Isaac. (¶ 26 of Biden's Counterclaims). No date is cited in this claim, but it likely occurred around the same time as outlined in ¶ 23 of Biden's Counterclaims. According to the counterclaim, Mac Isaac also allegedly gave a copy of the data in his possession (either electronic or printed) to his uncle, Ronald J. Scott, Jr., who in May 2020 was allegedly sending at least summaries of the data he received from his nephew to journalists and Republican members of Congress. (¶ 27 of Biden's Counterclaims).

On August 27, 2020, Mac Isaac allegedly made contact with Rudy Giuliani's lawyer, Robert Costello, regarding the data in his possession. (¶ 29 of Biden's Counterclaims). On August 28, 2020, Mac Isaac allegedly sent another copy of the data in his possession to the home of Mr. Costello in New York. (¶ 31 of Biden's Counterclaims).

On September 24, 2020, Mac Isaac allegedly informed Senator Ron Johnson's staff that he had possession of data that he claimed came from a laptop left at his business by Mr. Biden. (¶ 36 of Biden's Counterclaims).

On October 14, 2020, the New York Post published an article allegedly about the data Mac Isaac had accessed and copied that he claimed belonged to Mr. Biden.

(¶ 39 of Biden’s Counterclaims). There are also many other allegations about people who allegedly received the data from the hard drive from Giuliani, not Mac Isaac.

### **III. ACTUAL FACTS**

#### ***Hunter’s Laptop***

At issue is the fact that, on April 12, 2019, Biden dropped off his Mac Book (“laptop”) at Mac Isaac’s Mac repair shop, returned once a day or two later at Mac Isaac’s request, but never returned. When he dropped off the laptop, Biden provided Mac Isaac with his phone number and email address, both of which he confirmed were his, and, after Mac Isaac explained the data recovery process, signed the work authorization. When Mac Isaac called Biden more than once and left him voicemails to come to pick up his laptop, if Biden didn’t remember doing so, this would have been a pretty clear reminder. Further, when Mac Isaac sent Biden an email with the invoice, again, that would have been a pretty clear reminder that he dropped off his laptop with Mac Isaac. It is simply not logical for a political operative (or Russian operative) to pretend to be Biden then drop off the laptop and then provide Mac Isaac with Biden’s actual contact information.

Not only did Biden not pay for the services but he left the laptop with Mac Isaac, triggering its contractual provisions deeming it Mac Isaac’s property after 90 days. The contract also held Mac Isaac harmless from any damage incurred by Biden as a result.



Biden refuses to admit that he visited The Mac Shop (twice), despite Mac Isaac presenting evidence that he dropped off his Mac computer “Mac” at Mac Isaac’s store. Biden also interprets passages from Mac Isaac’s book in ways that obfuscate the true meaning of the passages (discussed herein) with the hope that this Honorable Court will not read Mac Isaac’s book and glean the true meaning of the passages.

### ***Recognition of Hunter Biden***

Contrary to Biden’s counterclaim, Mac Isaac never claimed he was never able to identify who brought the laptop into his shop. He has consistently said that he was not sure who came into his shop that night. Despite Biden’s insistence that he is recognizable by everyone (he may be now), Mac Isaac did not know what he looked like and, therefore, did not know who he was when he walked into the shop.

When Biden told Mac Isaac his name, that identification coupled with the Beau Biden Foundation sticker on the laptop seemed to confirm who was in the shop. Further, Mac Isaac looked up Biden to see what he looked like and confirmed that the person who dropped off the laptop was, in fact, Biden.

The twisting of Mac Isaac’s words in a way that suits Biden does not change the facts.

### *Data Recovery of Laptop*

Mac Isaac suspected the laptop had a short in the keyboard or trackpad. He then explained to Biden the process of recovering the data, which included accessing the data. He also explained the store policies and the price of the recovery. After this explanation, Biden signed the work order authorizing Mac Isaac to access the data to recover it.

The process was slow since the laptop would need to be charged but would not remain charged for long. While it was charged, Mac Isaac would recover as much data as he could until the laptop shut down. Then Mac Isaac would have to charge the laptop again, find where he had left off (by reviewing the files), and begin the recovery again.

Further, when recovering data, professionals try to verify that no corruption of data occurred. The best files to use in this verification are video files. Mac Isaac opened some of the larger video files to confirm that they were not corrupted. Unfortunately, many (most) of these video files were homemade pornography featuring Biden. Although disgusting, the video files were not corrupted so, in the end, Mac Isaac determined that his recovery was successful and called Biden and left a voicemail telling him to purchase an external hard drive onto which he could transfer the data from the store server.

Biden did as he was told and returned to the shop with the external hard drive. Mac Isaac then completed the recovery and contacted Biden to tell him to pick up his laptop and the hard drive. He never returned and the rest is history.

### ***FBI***

After obtaining the rights to the laptop pursuant to the contract signed by Biden, Mac Isaac grew uneasy with the seemingly illegal activities cataloged in the laptop. As he was taught to do at the Apple Store and in accordance with his own convictions, he made contact with the FBI. Soon thereafter, on December 9, 2019, Mac Isaac gave the laptop, the original hard drive, and the original work order to the FBI.

### ***Rudy Giuliani***

After making a determination that the authorities had not disclosed the existence of the laptop to the President of the United States for use during his impeachment trial, Mac Isaac felt compelled to do so himself. By the time he made this decision, the laptop had been in the possession of the FBI for a few months. Mac Isaac first approached members of Congress about the laptop but, when he failed to receive responses, he took it upon himself to contact the attorney for the President of the United States – Rudy Giuliani.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Mac Isaac never actually spoke with or met Mr. Giuliani. All of his interactions were with Mr. Giuliani's attorney, Robert Costello.

It was not until 2023 that Mac Isaac met Giuliani in person. As noted by Biden in his counterclaim, Mac Isaac was invited to attend an event by the Metropolitan Republican Club on April 17, 2023. He was one of the honorees at the event along with Giuliani. During that event, he briefly met Giuliani. Unlike the political slant Biden alluded to in the counterclaim, Mac Isaac did not assist with planning the event, he was simply invited and he attended.

***October 14, 2020 (NY Post Article)***

Mac Isaac provided no information about Biden to the NY Post. All information had been provided by someone else and caught Mac Isaac off guard when he found out about it. His only role in the article was in confirming who he was and what happened. He did not confirm any of the information presented in the article that came from the laptop.

***“Interviews”***

Biden points out interviews in which Mac Isaac participated in an attempt to show that Mac Isaac relished in the spotlight. In fact, reporters from the Daily Beast, CNN, and CBS (and possibly others) did not politely request an interview with Mac Isaac. They forced their way into his shop when Mac Isaac unlocked the door to let a customer out. They barraged him with questions and threatened not to leave until he answered their questions. The reporters not only twisted his words but also put words in his mouth (i.e., reference to Seth Rich). The entire interview can be heard

on the website of the Daily Beast (<https://www.thedailybeast.com/man-who-reportedly-gave-hunters-laptop-to-rudy-speaks-out-in-bizarre-interview>).

Mac Isaac had never been involved in any situation like this and was uncomfortable and scared that such a powerful family would seek retribution. His answers were nervous responses to questions and the things he anticipated would be used against him (i.e., he is legally blind).

### ***Financial Capitalization by Mac Isaac***

Mac Isaac's sole source of income was torn from him as a result of the Biden Presidential campaign-led backlash to the October 14, 2020, NY Post article. Out of concerns for his own safety, Mac Isaac had to shutter his business.

Mac Isaac wrote his book for a few reasons: (1) to provide an accurate account of what happened from the time Biden dropped off his laptop at Mac Isaac's shop to the immediate aftermath of the October 14, 2020, NY Post article; (2) to have something to do since he no longer had a business to run; and (3) to survive.

Mac Isaac's book merely tells the story of what happened. The only information from the laptop included in the book was information that had already been publicly released by others. No new information from the data on the laptop appeared in Mac Isaac's book.

## ***Biden's Book***

Throughout the counterclaim, Biden hems and haws about how embarrassing the content of the laptop was while, at the same time, failing to identify what content and if it was even his content. At the same time, Biden wrote and released a book describing his very personal and embarrassing struggle with drug abuse.

Anyone who “wins” the struggle against drug abuse should be applauded. However, this abuse should not be an excuse to destroy the life of someone else. Biden had a very clear picture of his comings and goings in his book yet failed to remember details like bringing Mac Isaac his laptop and returning another time with an external hard drive.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

For the purpose of judging a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim pursuant to Superior Court Civil Rule 12(b)(6), all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint must be accepted as true. *Spence v. Funk*, Del.Supr., 396 A.2d 967 (1978); *Nix v.* 396 A.2d 967 (1978); *Nix v. Sawyer*, Del.Super., 466 A.2d 407 (1983) *Heller v.* 466 A.2d 407 (1983) *Heller v. Dover Warehouse Market, Inc.*, 515 A.2d 178, 179-80 (Del. Super. Ct. 1986). A motion to dismiss is the proper vehicle for a statute of limitations defense where the pleading itself demonstrates that the claim was brought after the statutory period has run. Counterclaims are

affirmative actions and, consequently, are subject to the applicable statute of limitations. *Adames v. Adames*, C.A. No. N19C-06-189 JRJ (Del. Super. Ct. June 5, 2020) citing *Am. Home Products Corp. v. Norden Laboratories, Inc.*, 1992 WL 368604, at \*3 (Del. Ch. Dec. 11, 1992)

## **II. BIDEN’S CLAIMS ARE BARRED BY 2-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS**

In Delaware, claims of invasion of privacy are subject to a two-year statute of limitations period. *Ciabattoni v. Teamsters Local 326*, No. N15C-04-059 VLM, 2017 Del. Super. LEXIS 362, at \*11 (Super. Ct. July 25, 2017). Further, Delaware follows the “time of discovery” rule which starts the clock for the statute of limitations. *See White v. Riego*, No. 04C-10-015 PLA, 2005 Del. Super. LEXIS 67, at \*5 (Super. Ct. Mar. 3, 2005).

Here, Biden originally filed his Answer with Counterclaims in Federal Court against Mac Isaac on March 17, 2023. Any actions by Mac Isaac concerning Biden prior to March 17, 2021, are not actionable.

In Count One of his counterclaims, Biden claims that Mac Isaac intruded upon Biden’s seclusion by accessing the data on Biden’s Mac. Here, according to the counterclaim, Mac Isaac first accessed the information on Biden’s Mac computer on or around April 13, 2019. Biden also alleges that Mac Isaac created a “clone” of the data in July 2019. Biden states in September 2019, Mac Isaac sent a hard drive

containing the data to his father, Steve Mac Isaac. The latest date alleged in Biden's claim that Mac Isaac arguably accessed Biden's data was when Mac Isaac sent a copy of the data to Rudy Giuliani's lawyer, Robert Costello on August 28, 2020. Therefore, the statute of limitations period for these acts expired at the earliest on April 12, 2021 (when he first accessed the data) and at the latest August 28, 2020, when the data was sent to Costello. Either way, any plausible claim expired on August 28, 2022.

In Count Two of his counterclaim, Biden claims that Mac Isaac intruded on Biden's privacy by publishing private matters/facts. Although Mac Isaac had no part in the publication of the data on the laptop, any potential liability concerning the publication of private matters took place at the latest on October 14, 2020, in the New York Post article. Biden also discusses YouTube videos published in December 2020 which would also fall outside of the statute of limitations. Biden's conspiracy and aiding and abetting claims would also be time-barred as they are inextricably connected to the tort claims.

Further, the two-year statute of limitations for these claims began from the "date upon which it is claimed that such alleged injuries were sustained." *See Del. Code Ann. Tit. 10, § 8119*. The alleged injuries were clearly sustained on October 14, 2020, when the NY Post article was published, at the latest. With that said, as discussed herein, Mac Isaac was unaware that the NY Post article was going to be



published until just prior to its publication. Further, Mac Isaac did not take part in any disclosure to the NY Post or to anyone else other than those specifically disclosed in the Second Amended Complaint and in his book.

### **III. INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN ANSWERS TO AMENDED COMPLAINT AND ALLEGATIONS IN COUNTERCLAIM.**

Biden continues to refuse to admit that the laptop was his. It is noteworthy that, in Biden's answer to Mac Isaac's Second Amended Complaint, many responses were "Mr. Biden is without knowledge sufficient to admit or deny the allegations..." In Paragraph 17 of the answer, Biden claims he is "without sufficient knowledge" about asking Mac Isaac for assistance in recovering his data. Answer ¶ 17. Yet, in Paragraph 152, he flat-out denies leaving his laptop at Mac Isaac's shop. Answer ¶ 152. In Paragraph 22 of his answer, Biden claims he is "without knowledge" about never picking up the laptop. Answer ¶ 22. However, in Paragraph 154 of the answer, Biden admits that he never returned to the shop. Answer ¶ 154.

Biden's answer goes even further to obfuscate the facts. In Paragraph 156 of the answer, Biden claims that the allegation is unclear about "what 'laptop' is being referred to." Answer ¶ 156. The Second Amended Complaint makes it clear which laptop is at the center of the controversy. This is just another game Biden began to play in his depositions and continues in his answer to the Second Amended Complaint.

Although Biden “is without knowledge” as to his whereabouts on April 12, 2019, Mac Isaac knows exactly where he was. Additionally, financial records show frequent uses of Wells Fargo ATMs where significant withdrawals were made – all within a few miles of Mac Isaac’s shop. Biden’s confused and dishonest responses prove fatal to all facts alleged in his counterclaims.

Paragraphs 35 and 157 of the Second Amended Complaint show that Biden’s own attorney contacted Mac Isaac to ask about the Mac the day before the NY Post story broke. Second Amended Complaint ¶¶ 35 & 157. However, in Biden’s answer, while Biden admits that George Mesires was his attorney, Biden is “without knowledge sufficient to admit or deny the allegations.” Answer ¶¶ 35 & 157. If Biden’s response is to be believed, Mesires, his personal attorney at that time, was in the business of representing clients without being asked to do so.

As discussed above, Biden gave Mac Isaac his contact details when he visited Mac Isaac’s shop on April 12, 2019. Biden confirmed that the contact information was his. Mac Isaac used this information (both phone number and email address) to contact Biden about his laptop. While Biden denies it, he received the information from Mac Isaac because he followed Mac Isaac’s direction to purchase an external hard drive. Assuming his denials are true, which they are not, Biden would have received voicemail messages and emails from Mac Isaac about his computer. Would this not have raised any alarms in his head if he had not dropped off the laptop

himself? For the reasons stated above and below, Biden's counterclaims should be dismissed with prejudice.

#### **IV. INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION**

To state a claim for intrusion upon seclusion, Biden must show that Mac Isaac intentionally intruded, physically or otherwise, upon his solitude or seclusion or his private affairs or concerns in a manner that would be highly offensive to a reasonable person. *Dayton v. Collison*, No. N17C-08-100 CLS, 2020 Del. Super. LEXIS 310, at \*29 (Del. Super. Ct. June 22, 2020). The key element to this tort is that there must be an act of intrusion. *See Lee v. Picture People, Inc.*, 2012 Del. Super. LEXIS 159, \*7-8 (Del. Super. Ct. March 19, 2012). "To intrude means to enter without invitation." *Id.*

##### ***A. Intrusion***

While Biden claims he did not give consent to Mac Isaac to access the data on his Mac, the evidence shows otherwise. The work order, shown as Exhibit A of the Second Amended Complaint, contains not only Biden's signature authorizing the work done but also Biden's contact information. Biden does not contend that he did not sign the work order and he presents confusing responses to whether he even dropped off the laptop with Mac Isaac. He either doesn't recall or denies it altogether. However, we do know that there is a work order with Biden's signature and his contact information. As mentioned above, it makes no sense that an

“operative” would sneak into Mac Isaac’s shop with a laptop containing Biden’s information and provide Mac Isaac with Biden’s correct information. If the purpose was to hurt President Biden’s candidacy (which had not even been announced on April 12, 2019), it seems odd that Biden’s contact information would have been used.

Further, after fully informing Biden of the procedures for the recovery, he signed the work order. One cannot recover data without first accessing the data. As discussed above, only portions of the data could be transferred at one time requiring Mac Isaac to confirm where he left off by viewing the files. Finally, in order to confirm the data was not corrupted, Mac Isaac viewed random files (typically large video files) to check for data corruption. By accessing the files, Mac Isaac was able to confirm the data was not corrupt. This was all explained to Biden prior to when he signed the work authorization. The work authorization was all the invitation Mac Isaac needed to access the data.

Biden’s claims that the “boilerplate terms of the Repair Authorization” were “well below the signature line” does not impact the fact that Biden, a trained attorney, signed the document. *See* Counterclaim ¶ 6. Further, Biden refers to the Repair Authorization as a “typical small-print adhesion clause for which there was no proper notice or opportunity to bargain or negotiate.” *See* Counterclaim ¶ 8. First, the text is not abnormally small. In fact, the text seems to be the same size as the

description of the work to be performed. Next, Mac Isaac had the authority to modify the contract if he was asked by Biden to do so. Biden did not ask for any revisions to the contract. Finally, Biden was also free to seek assistance from another repair shop. The fact that Biden, an attorney, did not ask for any modification of the contract and transacted business with Mac Isaac weighs heavily against Biden's claim that the contract was unenforceable.

Biden knowingly gave Mac Isaac permission to access his data. Biden breached the agreement by failing to pay Mac Isaac for his services and failing to return to the shop to pick up his data. Now, Biden has failed to allege the essential element of intrusion upon seclusion – that Mac Isaac accessed Biden's data without invitation. Even if this claim were not barred by the statute of limitations, it should fail because of the clear evidence that Biden invited Mac Isaac to access his data.

### ***B. Highly Offensive to a Reasonable Person***

While many of the files on Biden's Mac seem to be of the kind that "would be highly offensive to a reasonable person," Biden, himself, seemed to share the information with others. Much of the material that a reasonable person would find most offensive (sexually explicit photos) was voluntarily shared by Biden with others through the website, "Pornhub."<sup>2</sup> Additionally, other information discovered

---

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/hunter-biden-uploaded-videos-of-himself-having-sex-p3vjkw0k>.

on the laptop Biden's lack of concern about using his father's political ties to close deals with foreign countries, some of whom are considered adversaries with the United States (i.e., People's Republic of China).<sup>3</sup> The use of the "reasonable person" standard should clearly not apply to Biden.

Since Biden invited Mac Isaac to access the files, he cannot now claim that Mac Isaac intruded upon his privacy and that the intrusion was highly offensive to him. The invitation to access the files itself negates the claim of intrusion. Further, the fact that Biden may have suffered some embarrassment because of his actions does not give him a cause of action for invasion of privacy by intrusion. *See Beckett v. Trice*, 1994 Del. Super. LEXIS 599 (Del Super. Ct. November 4, 1994). He invited Mac Isaac in with full knowledge of what data that Mac Isaac would see. As far as embarrassment, Biden posted homemade pornography on Pornhub and wrote a book outlining his debauchery. It seems what would embarrass a reasonable person does not embarrass Biden.

Biden has failed to properly allege key elements of the tort of invasion of privacy by intrusion and Mac Isaac respectfully requests that this Honorable Court dismiss Count I with prejudice.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://oversight.house.gov/release/comer-reveals-biden-family-members-receiving-payments-from-chinese-energy-company%E2%82%AC/>

## V. INVASION OF PRIVACY BY PUBLICATION OF PRIVATE FACTS/MATTERS.

To state a claim for invasion of privacy by publication of private facts/matters, Biden must show that the facts/matter “publicized is of a kind that (a) would be highly offensive to a reasonable person, and (b) is not of legitimate concern to the public.” *Spence v. Cherian*, 135 A.3d 1282, 1288 (Del. Super. Ct. 2016) (citing *Restatement (Second) of Torts § 652D*).

A matter has been given publicity when it is “made public, by communicating it to the public at large, or to so many persons that the matter must be regarded as substantially certain to become one of public knowledge.” *Restatement (Second) of Torts § 652D cmt. a.* “It is not an invasion of privacy to communicate a fact concerning one’s private life to just one person, or even to a small group.” *Spence* at 1288.

### A. Disclosure

Originally, Mac Isaac disclosed some of the information to his father and uncle in hopes of getting their input as to what he should do. It was determined that Mac Isaac should disclose the information to the FBI, which he did. He also gave a copy to his friend, Kristin, but did not provide her with a bootable copy, only with the instructions that, if something were to happen to him, she get the drive to Giuliani. Kristin could not have accessed the drive because she did not possess the

knowledge of how to access it. Plus, she is a loyal friend to Mac Isaac, so she just held it for him.

After recognizing that President Trump did not seem to have the information from the laptop available for his defense, despite being in the possession of the FBI since December 2019, Mac Isaac then disclosed the information to Mr. Costello with the expressed intent that the information be disclosed solely to Mr. Giuliani, the President's attorney.<sup>4</sup>

Prior to the publication of the NY Post article, Mac Isaac only disclosed the information to his father, uncle, the FBI, and Mr. Costello.<sup>5</sup> That disclosure, to a small group for specific purposes, investigation by the FBI into potential criminal activity and for use by Giuliani in his defense of President Trump in the impeachment, does not rise to the level required by the tort of intrusion by publication.

### ***B. Highly Offensive to a Reasonable Person***

As Biden has failed to adequately allege that Mac Isaac “published” the information on the laptop to a large enough group of people to trigger this tort, one must not even delve into the discussion of whether the information published (by

---

<sup>4</sup> Isaac discussed the information on the Mac with his father and his uncle in order to seek advice and assistance from them. The Biden family is very powerful, and Isaac is a private citizen so he became concerned about what the Biden's would/could do to him and sought advice from his family.

<sup>5</sup> As mentioned, he did not share what was on the drive with Kristin.



others, not Mac Isaac) would be considered “highly offensive to a reasonable person.” If this Court must analyze this element of the tort, as discussed above, such an analysis might not be the appropriate standard considering Biden’s proclivities.

### *C. Legitimate Public Concern*

Even if Biden properly alleged the other elements of the tort of invasion of privacy by publication, which he has not, the information that was published by others is certainly of “legitimate public concern.” As discussed above, the information discovered on the laptop seems to clearly show Biden’s use of his father’s political power to close deals with foreign countries with whom the U.S. shares an adversarial relationship. The fact that Biden was involved in these deals while making homemade pornography and abusing drugs is certainly of legitimate public concern.

Despite the overwhelming evidence of information that constitutes “legitimate public concern,” that analysis does not matter in the case of Mac Isaac since Mac Isaac, himself, did not disclose the information to the “public at large.” He solely shared the information with a small group of individuals, those with the authority to investigate whether the data held criminal information and/or information that should have been available to the U.S. President during his impeachment trial. Mac Isaac had no control over what those individuals chose to do with it thereafter.

#### ***D. True Statements of Fact***

“[U]nder § 652D, not only must the communications at issue be publicized, but they must also represent *true statements of fact*.” *Atamian v. Gorkin*, 1999 Del. Super. LEXIS 666, \*9 (Del. Super. Ct. August 13, 1999). Is Biden claiming the information disclosed by others (again, not by Mac Isaac) is true? He only tacitly mentions in Paragraphs 5 and 6 and in footnote 1 of his counterclaim that “some of the information” obtained by Mac Isaac belonged to Biden. Counterclaim ¶¶ 5 & 6. In order for a claim of invasion of privacy by publication of facts/matters to be successful, the information disclosed must be true. Nowhere in the counterclaim does Biden identify any specific information publicly disclosed (by others – not by Mac Isaac), that was true. With this glaring omission coupled with the facts that Mac Isaac *did not* disclose the information to the public, there was no “embarrassing” information published that Biden did not already publish himself and that the information disclosed by others was clearly of *legitimate public concern*, Biden has failed to properly allege key elements of the tort of invasion of privacy by publication of private facts/matters and Mac Isaac respectfully requests this Honorable Court to dismiss Count II with prejudice.

#### **VI. CONSPIRACY AND AIDING AND ABETTING COUNTS**

Biden’s remaining claims of conspiracy (Counts Three and Four) and aiding and abetting (Counts Five and Six) fail along with his claims of invasion of privacy

by intrusion and invasion of privacy by publication of private facts/matters. Neither conspiracy claims nor aiding and abetting claims are independent causes of action. There must be some underlying tortious conduct. *See Cousins v. Goodier*, 2021 WL 3355471, at \*7 (Del. Super. Ct. July 30, 2021). For these claims to survive a motion to dismiss, Biden must have stated valid claims for invasion of privacy by intrusion and invasion of privacy by publication of private facts/matters – which he has not done. As the alleged counts in the counterclaim are not actionable as invasions of privacy, they are not actionable as “conspiracy, or aiding and abetting.” *Id.* With that said and in recognition that a tort could have conceivably been committed by someone else, although no other party is included in this counterclaim, for the additional reasons set forth below, Biden’s counts for conspiracy and aiding and abetting fail.

#### ***A. Conspiracy***

Delaware follows the language of the *Restatement (Second) of Torts* when determining whether a civil conspiracy was present. Specifically, *Restatement* § 876(a) defines civil conspiracy as “the combination of two or more persons or entities either for an unlawful purpose or for the accomplishment of a lawful purpose by unlawful means, resulting in damage.” *Anderson v. Airco, Inc.*, No. 02C-12-091 HdR, 2004 Del. Super. LEXIS 393, at \*10 (Super. Ct. Nov. 30, 2004).

One cannot be part of a conspiracy without the specific intent to cooperate with the other conspirators. *See Triplex Communications v. Riley*, 900 S.W.2d 716, 720, 38 Tex. Sup. Ct. J. 765 (Tex.) 1995). While the agreement need not be expressed in words, “it has been recognized that ‘accidental, inadvertent, or negligent participation in a common scheme does not amount to a conspiracy.’” *Anderson* at \*19 (citing *In re Methyl Butyl Ether Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 175 F. Supp.2d 593, 634 (S.D.N.Y. 2001)).

At no point in the counterclaim does Biden provide any factual allegations that support a claim that Mac Isaac’s intent was to get the information on the hard drive released to the public. Mac Isaac has been very clear and has never deviated about why he contacted the FBI and Mr. Costello, which has been expressed throughout this opposition as well.

### ***B. Aiding and Abetting***

In Delaware, liability for aiding and abetting requires proof of three elements: (1) underlying tortious conduct, (2) knowledge, and (3) substantial assistance or encouragement. *See Anderson v. Airco, Inc.*, No. 02C-12-091 HdR, 2004 Del. Super. LEXIS 393, at \*22 (Super. Ct. Nov. 30, 2004). Biden has not properly alleged that there was any underlying tortious conduct.

Biden has not alleged that Mac Isaac had knowledge of any tortious conduct that would arise from his actions. While Delaware recognizes that a negligent act

can create liability for aiding and abetting tortious conduct, the aider and abettor must still be generally aware that he is providing substantial assistance or encouragement to the tortfeasor. Biden's counterclaims are replete with conclusory allegations masquerading as facts and fail to present any facts that Mac Isaac knew that he would be aiding a tort. Perhaps in Biden's overly politicized world, it would make sense. To a common citizen, however, he was just trying to get the information to the authorities and had no idea it would be used as part of a political attack.

Mac Isaac never expressed any type of loyalty to President Donald Trump, nor did he express any dislike for President Joseph Biden, despite what Biden attempts to say in his counterclaim. Mac Isaac respects the office of the President and would have done the same thing if Donald Trump, Jr. had dropped off a laptop with incriminating information on it and that information could be used by President Biden in his defense. Biden's counterclaim assumes that everyone thinks like he does and, in doing so, Biden fails to properly allege any cause of action.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, John Paul Mac Isaac respectfully requests that the Court dismiss the counterclaims against John Paul Mac Isaac with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian R. Della Rocca

**Brian R. Della Rocca, Esquire**

*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

Compass Law Partners

51 Monroe Street, Suite 408

Rockville, Maryland 20850

Ph: (240) 560-3030

Fax: (301) 740-2297

[bdellarocca@compass-law.com](mailto:bdellarocca@compass-law.com)

/s/ Ronald G. Poliquin

**Ronald G. Poliquin, Esquire**

I.D. No. 4447

1475 S. Governors Ave.

Dover, DE 19904

Ph: (302) 702-5501

[ron@poliquinfirm.com](mailto:ron@poliquinfirm.com)

/s/ Joseph D. Stanley

**Joseph D. Stanley, Esquire**

I.D. No. 6329

1140 South State Street

Dover, DE 19901

(302)678-8700

[joe.stanley@schwartzandschwartz.com](mailto:joe.stanley@schwartzandschwartz.com)

September 9, 2023

*Attorneys for Plaintiff John Paul Mac Isaac*