

What is the domestic law on the freedom of expression?

Please see domestic law.

Who were the judges that decided on each of the domestic cases brought forth by Maya Engels?

Not relevant.

Is it possible to report or block commenting on Friendzone posts?

Yes, Friendzone users can delete and block comments or they can report posts, comments and messages amounting to hate speech, threats or inciting to violence, related to violence and criminal activity.

Has Artemidia ratified the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties?

Yes.

How can the ratio of positive to negative comments replying to Mr. B's post be described?

Up to the teams to assess based on the facts of the case.

On which legal basis was the restraining order issued?

Please see domestic law.

On what grounds did the court reject the petition to join the naked photos of the applicant as evidence in the case? (Point 10)

Please see the text of the case.

On what basis did the court set up a misdemeanor if such a request was not made by the applicant? (Point 10)

Please see domestic law part of the case

Why did the court apply a restraining order if such a sanction is not provided for in Art. 532 of the Criminal Code? (Point 10)

Please see domestic law.

Do articles 13 and 14 of the ECHR need to be argued in conjunction with both article 6 and 8?

Up to teams.

Accordingly to the ECtHR case law (e.g. A. v. Croatia, par. 82), article 6 cannot be invoked in criminal proceedings in which the applicant is not the accused, therefore, is it correct that the complaint is under the article 6?

Questions of applicability of Article 6 or any other Article to the facts of the case should be addressed by the teams.

Artemidia is a party to the Protocol no. 12 to the ECHR (par. 19 of the case). Therefore, would it be possible to extend the scope of the complaint under article 14 to the Protocol no 12?

Up to teams to decide.

Is it possible to block Friendzone users from contacting you on the platform?

Yes.

Does the Friendzone platform have the power to remove comments on Friendzone?

Yes, it does.

What position does the applicant hold in the "DOV" company she works for?

Not relevant outside the text of the case.

According to domestic law, is a charge under Art. 78 of the Criminal Code (misdemeanour against public order) a criminal charge that requires an indictment by the prosecutor's office or is it deemed an administrative offence which the court may pursue on its own?

Please see the text of the case.

Did the court of first instance dismiss Ms. Engel's appeal against the prosecutor's decision to discontinue the investigation by implication when it ordered Mr. B to pay a fine of EUR 200,-?

Please see the facts of the case.

Is there law, concerning the liability of social media companies of their user's postings, established in Artemidia?

Please see domestic law part of the case.

How many comments were published under defendant's Friendzone status? Was he able to remove them, if he wanted?

There were 720 comments. Yes, Friendzone allows users to delete or remove comments.

How long have the comments remained untouched?

The comments remain on Friendzone. Mr B did not delete them and the applicant did not ask Friendzone to remove them. In view of the very high number of users Friendzone did not remove them on its own motion.

Did the police look for the naked photographs and questioned the defendant about them?

See the facts of the case.

Given all the offensive comments regarding Ms. Engel on Mr. B's profile, could Mr. B. delete those comments once they were posted under his posts?

Yes.

How did Mr. B's followers respond to the second post on his Friendzone profile that Ms. Engel «continued to poison his life by dragging him to courts»? In particular, did Ms. Engel herself receive negative messages from Mr. B's followers again?

There were no comments, as Mr. B turned off the possibility to comment on his public posts when proceedings were initiated. There is no information available as to any further messages received by the applicant.

Apart from Ms. Engel's complaint, were there any previous constitutional complaints of discrimination? If so, were they declared inadmissible or examined on the merits?

There have been some previous cases, vast majority of the complaints were rejected without reasoning, in line with the applicable legislation governing the constitutional complaints lodged with the Constitutional Court.

In point 4 it is mentioned that Mr B "engaged in various forms of cyber harassment". For how long did Mr B harass Maya?

Please see facts of the case.

What kind of deadlines are there in Artemidia for the courts and tribunals to make decisions?

There are no such deadlines.

Exactly what values of the Artemidian Constitution does the point 16 refer to?

Please see facts of the case and domestic legislation.

Is the applicant's submission strictly limited to the four articles (6, 8, 13, 14 of the Convention) mentioned under Point 18 or may we claim the violation of other fundamental rights protected by the Convention (e.g. protocols, etc...)?

Up to the teams to decide.

May we assume that there had been major disagreements during the former relationship of Maya Engel and Mr. B, to which Mr. B's behaviour can be attributed to?

Please read the facts of the case.

"It also transpires from this report that the perpetrators of such acts do not seem to receive dissuasive punishments by the courts, which do not consider such offence to be of real gravity" Does this mean that the juridical outcome of our case complied with similar outcomes in analogous cases in Artemedia?

Up to teams to argue.

After the prosecutor's office upheld the decision discontinuation of the investigation on 25 August 2017, the applicant lodged an appeal against this decision. The first instance court examined it on 10 May 2018 almost one year later. Is there any time limit in the Artemedia law system?

No.

Did the applicant have a problem with her employer due to Mr B's offensive comment about the company she was working for?

For relevant facts see the facts of the case.

How did the court hear Mr B's two former partners' sayings?

According to regular procedures and laws for adducing evidence.

To what extent were the threats on the applicant's life, in Mr. B's communications, detailed and immediate?

In his e-mails, text messages and phone calls Mr B repeatedly threatened the applicant that he would physically attack her. He said that she would never be at peace and he would have his revenge when she least expects it. He said that he would never give up on her and he might attack her even when she thinks he has given up.

In three phone calls he also threatened that he will kill her.

After the prosecutor's offices' decision on 25 August 2017 on discontinuing the criminal investigation, was the investigation reopened before the first instance court's decision on 10 May 2018?

Please read the facts of the case.

Before the cases were lodged against Mr. B, was there any previous record of "jealous and controlling behaviour," (paragraph 3) and if yes, what type?

Please see the facts of the case.

Did the Applicant have the opportunity to present her arguments regarding her claim for compensation in an oral and public hearing (with the meaning of Art. 6 ECHR) during the proceedings of the criminal complaint concerning hate speech on Friendzone?

Yes, the courts held oral and public hearings.

Did Mr B have a possibility to regulate the comments on his post in general and specifically to disable the comment function, to delete single comments or to implement a filter function?

He could delete comments, close the post for commenting or block users.

Does the Applicant have any other possibilities to claim compensation in civil proceedings?

For relevant facts, read the facts of the case.

What is Maya Engel's specific job title?

Not relevant, please see the case.

Are there any state reports submitted by Artemidia regarding their goals for resolving gender discrimination? i.e. Reports submitted to The Commissioner for Human Rights

Please see facts of the case.

What is the religious background of the country?

Artemidia does not have a state religion and its citizens are of various religious affiliations.

In his environmentalism activism, has Mr B ever targeted other individuals, be it online, on his radio show, or in person?

No.

What are the repercussions of Mr. B's actions on Ms. Engel's career?

For relevant facts see the case.

What are the requirements which need to be fulfilled in order for a violation of the individual's right not to be discriminated against to be found (by the Constitutional Court) under the 2017 Anti-discrimination Act?

Please see domestic law part of the case.

What is an exact title of Maya Engel's position in «DOV»?

Not relevant, please see the case.

Were Maya Engel and/or the prosecutor's office aware of the post from 1st September 2018, if yes, how did they learn about it?

Please see facts of the case.

Did Maya Engel claim just satisfaction before the Constitutional Court?

Yes

How many complaints to the police on hate speech/cyber bullying (e.g. with regards to the art. 532 of Artemidian criminal code) were lodged by women in Artemidia and how many criminal cases were initiated according to these complaints?

For relevant facts see the case.

How many complaints based on discrimination against women were satisfied by the Constitutional Court of Artemidia?

Vast majority of anti-discrimination cases were rejected by the Constitutional Court. Over 80% of the complaints were lodged by women.

When did Maya Engel apply for the prosecutor's office on the issue of hate speech post after police took a decision to discontinue the investigation?

12 September 2017.

Which traditional values enshrined in the Constitution are flouted by the nude photographs?

Please see facts and domestic law.

What would be an example of measures to ensure the protection of traditional values enshrined in the constitution?

For relevant facts see the case, argumentation is up to teams.

According to Article 81 of the Law on Internet Communications who are aimed to be protected in case of unawareness of an offense conducted at the moment of its publication?

Unclear question.

Could we reference other articles of the Convention to support Maya's claims of violation under the convention? - For example, with regards to article 6, the courts have historically found that when article 3 (on torture) had been breached, there was an automatic assumption that Article 6 was also violated in most circumstances. Therefore, could we use such as a foundation in arguing that article 6 was breached. [Mr B physiologically tortured the applicant]

Up to teams to decide.

In the first criminal complaint, when did Maya lodge the appeal of the judgement?

12 September 2017.

Within the written submission for the respondent, is the main objective to ONLY rebut every claim brought forward by the applicant or what should we do?

Up to the teams to decide the argumentation strategy.

What are the relevant articles regulating the defamation and the offence of blackmail in the criminal code of Artemidia? Are these crimes investigated ex officio or upon complaint?

For relevant facts please see the case. All crimes can be investigated either ex officio or on the basis of a complaint.

Does the friendzone social media provide any platform to the profile owner to remove or disable the comments?

Yes.

According to paragraph 11, in the aftermath of the Mr. B's non-conformity with the court's decision to issue restraining order should Mrs. Maya Engel complain to relevant authorities to enforce the decision or it is enforced ex-officio?

She should complain, but it can also be enforced ex-officio.

Besides a claim for non-pecuniary damage before the criminal court or a complaint before the Constitutional Court, did the Applicant have any other available remedy under Artemidian legislation to seek compensation for the moral damages sustained by her?

No.

Does national legislation permit the domestic authorities to conjoin and examine both of the Applicant's complaints - for cyber harassment and hate speech - under one procedure?

No.

Does Artemidia's legislation provide any opportunities for domestic authorities to engage the actions of the Friendzone administrators in terms of deletion of the post or any other moderation of the discussion?

Please see domestic law.

With respect to the social media comments and personal messages Maya Engel received from Mr B's followers, which of those quoted were comments, which were messages and, if any, which were sent from within Artemidia and which from outside the country?

Majority of comments were from Artemidia, for the relevant facts, please see the case.

Does the 2017 NGO report by Themis identify any specific examples of hate speech and does it give a breakdown of the sex of perpetrators and victims? If so, what are the examples and what is the breakdown by sex of perpetrators/victims?

The report by Themis specified that the majority of victims were women and members of minority groups. In 72% of the cases the perpetrators were men.

Is DOV an Artemidian state-owned oil company?

No.

What is the exact content of the constitutional provision about the traditional values of Artemidia?

Art 12 of the Constitution - The family shall enjoy special protection of the state. Family is the basis of Artemidian society.

Did Artemidia take any steps toward asking Friendzone to remove the posts and comments at stake?

Please see facts and answers to clarification questions.

In the complaint concerning cyber harassment, did the first-instance court uphold the decision to discontinue the investigation, as the judge did not mention it?

See the facts of the case.

Did the overall conduct of Mr. B have any consequences on the applicant's professional life?

No.

What are the specific gender stereotypes that the applicant invoked before the constitutional court in paragraph 17 of the Case?

Up to teams to decide.

Is Ms. Maya Engel a person of public interest? Has she developed any public activity in the area of feminism?

Please see facts of the case.

Is it possible to approach offence of dignity with civil law procedural means in Artemidia?

Please see facts and law of the case.

In Artemidia, is the constitutional court part of the centralised court system or is it a separate entity, if yes, can you please clarify the criteria for the submission of claim in the Constitutional Court of Artemidia?

See the facts of the case. The court is separate from regular courts. The court found the applicant's claim manifestly ill-founded. It did so without giving reasons in line with domestic law.

How many people from all Artemidia's population are registered in Friendzone (in percentage and in number)?

Approximately 40% of the entire population. Friendzone is mostly popular among 20-50 years old people.

Could you publish the very text of the NGO report mentioned in Point 15 of the Case, i.e. the report the Applicant invoked in her appeal regarding the prosecutor's decision to uphold the local police authority's decision of 20th September 2017 to discontinue the criminal investigation, or if not the whole text of the report, then at least the part of it which was relevant and crucial for the Applicant to invoke it?

For relevant facts, please see the case.

Could you publish the legal provisions that proscribe and regulate the restraining orders which were imposed on Mr. B.?

Please see the case and domestic law part.

Is Artemidia a member of the European Union?

No.

In paragraph 6 the facts mention that "a number of offensive comments were posted on Mr B's profile by his followers". Were these offensive comments posted about Mr B or Ms. Engel.

Please see facts of the case.

In paragraph 7 the facts state that Ms Engel had to "undergo treatment by a psychiatrist and counselling with a psychologist". Can you confirm what psychological harm she was being treated for?

Stress, severe anxiety, panic attacks, agora phobia and depression.

Are we allowed to infer that our country is an EU member(& use EU law) since it uses the euro?

No.

According to para. 24 of the Case, when first-instance court upheld the decision to discontinue the investigation, only prosecutor can lodge an appeal with the court of appeal. Meanwhile, as it follows from para. 11, the applicant appealed the decision to discontinue proceedings. Is there any exceptions?

Please see the law part of the case.

Whether Artemidia made any derogations when signing Istanbul Convention or CEDAW? What's the reason of non-ratification of these conventions for decades?

No. Up to the teams to argue the reasons.

Is there any official statistics regarding crimes of hate speech, cyber harassment and stalking against women?

Please see facts of the case. No, there are no official statistics, only NGO reports.

The first question refers to the following quote from the case: Where an offence under Article 397 of the Criminal Code is committed by electronic means, the author and/or co-author of the publication will be prosecuted as the principal offender. Where such an offence is committed by means of a social media platform, those responsible for the individual social media profile shall not be prosecuted as the author of the publication if they can establish that they were unaware of the offence at the moment of its publication or if prompt action had been taken to remove the offending material as soon as they had become aware of it. What does it mean that those responsible for the social media platform are unaware of the offence at the moment of publication? Does the text refer to the situation where more than one person is responsible for the social media platform and one of them does not know that the other one published an illegal material? Or does it refer to the fact that those responsible for the social media platform are unaware that the published material is contrary to national law?

“Those responsible for the individual social media profile” means simply the individual who is the social media platform user with a profile on the platform, e.g. a Friendzone profile.

Our second question is whether in the state of Artemidia one could bring a claim for compensation to the civil courts after the ruling of the criminal courts, stating that the facts presented do not qualify as criminal offences? Or does the ruling of the criminal courts is binding in regard to the claim for compensation?

Please see the facts of the case. Victims are entitled to bring their civil claims in the context of the criminal proceedings.

Statistics figures from the report of the international NGO Human Rights International concerning women in Artemidia who are victims of discrimination based on sex: in their right of access to justice; their criminal complaints lodged that are treated through the lens of family values and the role of women in the society including the figures in favor of the perpetrators of discrimination against women and the perpetrators of hate speech who's acts do not seem to receive dissuasive punishments by the courts according to the report?

For relevant facts, see the case and answers above to the clarification questions.

The degree of consensus or lack of it in Artemidia concerning the protection of public morals regarding soft pornography?

For relevant facts, see the case. Argumentation is for the teams.

The composition and genders of the First Instance Court and the Constitutional Court including the verdict/s of the female judge/s if they were part of the composition?

The panels had balanced gender composition.

Are the Applicant's and the Respondant's Written Submissions constrained by Articles 6, 8, 13 and 14 of the Convention pointed in the case (Par. 18, page 4) or is it possible to extend the argument to other Articles of the Convention?

Up to teams to decide.

Is Artemidia an European Union's member State?

No.

In paragraph 13, page 3, the following statement is made: “...The offensive comments were not published by him and Mr B did not have resources of a media outlet to moderate the discussion on his Friendzone profile, even if his profile was accessible to the general public”. Does it mean that Mr B was not technically able to delete or remove the comments (for example, because only Friendzone's managers have the ability to delete comments and a user does not have the permissions required to remove other users' comments) or Mr B could remove them but he did not have as many resources as a media outlet could have in order to moderate/delete/control them?

Yes, he could remove them but did not do so.

Firstly we are having doubts about that Artemidia has signed but not ratified „Istanbul treaty” and CEDAW. Does it mean in Artemidia’s law system, that this country does not respect those treaties at all or just some specific parts of them?

For facts, please see the case.

Secondly, did the applicant resign or was dismissed from her job in the DOV as the result of her former partner’s social media post?

No.

What information on applicant's Friendzone profile is publicly visible?

Only name and profile photo. She could be contacted by users who are not her Friendzone “friends”.

Have there been any civil remedies available to the applicant with regard to the alleged hate speech, such as civil lawsuit for defamation?

Please see the case.

On what grounds did the first-instance court in the first set of proceedings uphold the restraining order when it found Mr. B guilty of a misdemeanour?

On the basis of the findings of the investigation (paragraph 8).

In relation to the judicial proceeding of Artemidia, what is the iterprocessal that criminal cases follow? In addition, what is the role the police has during the proceeding?

Please see facts of the case and domestic law.

In relation to the object of the case, are the Courts of Artemidia obliged to decide about all the questions and matters presented in the complaint and relative to the case? In the affirmative case, what are the consequences of the lack of pronouncement about these matters?

Artemidian courts follow ECHR case-law on providing reasoning to their decisions.

What are the reasons Artemidia – a Member State of the Council of Europe - expressed for not ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women?

No reasons officially proclaimed.

Is the constitutional complaint of paragraph 17 and the discrimination complaint of paragraph 22 the same complaint?

Yes.

Did Ms. Engel undertake any civil law action to protect her rights and if so, what were these actions?

Please see facts of the case, domestic law and responses to clarifications questions.

What is the responsibility for comments or content of posts on the Friendzone portal, i.e. what are the regulations of the portal's privacy policy?

Please see the answers to clarification questions above.

Which are the legal basis of the restraining order and 200 Euro fine, ordered by the first instance court (paragraph 10)?

Please see the facts and domestic law of the case.

Do the victims have an active role during the judicial process?

Please see the facts and law part of the case.

What is specifically prescribed in the Artemidia's Constitution regarding family and family values?

Please see the answers to clarification questions above.

What exactly does the term „not have resources of a media outlet to moderate the discussion” mean? Does it mean, for example, that he had no technological ability to moderate the discussion and delete the comments, or , for example, that he couldn't affect on who will set up a comment and what type of comments will be posted, but that he still had the ability to delete comments.

Please see facts of the case, domestic law and responses to clarifications questions.

What are the traditional and family values prescribed by the Constitution of Artemidia?

Please see the answers to clarification questions above.

What are the differences between the terms „criminal investigation" and „criminal proceedings" in this case?

Please see the case.

On what basis this has been assessed that he did not fulfill the signs of act from article no. 532 which concerns cyber harassment and cyber stalking but this act was qualified as misdemeanour against public order? Was it made by assessor (expert witness) or by someone else, for example policeman?

The relevant authorities examined the situation and assessed the classification of the acts within the scope of their authority on the basis of the available evidence, according to the relevant legislation.

In case of criminal complaint concerning hate speech on Friendzone which article and legal basis in the court's opinion were not fulfilled what caused that speech of hatred used by defendant was not classified as unlawful?

Please see above answers to the clarification questions.

Should we attach judgements of Artemidia's courts as annexes to our case> If so, we would like to ask for sending them to us.

For relevant facts, please see the facts of the case.

It is noted in par. 24 of the case that in case of discontinuation of criminal investigation the victim can lodge an appeal with the prosecutor's office. If it upholds the decision to discontinue, the Applicant can appeal against it to the first-instance court. After that no further appeal is possible for the alleged victim. In some circumstances only the prosecutor's office can lodge an appeal with the appellate court. However, it is stated in par. 11 of the case that a decision of the first-instance court to discontinue the proceedings brought by the Applicant concerning cyber harassment was upheld by the court of appeal. Clarification question: Was the decision of the first-instance court

to discontinue the proceedings concerning cyber harassment appealed against by the prosecutor to the court of appeal? If yes, on what grounds? If not, how was the Applicant able to appeal against this decision if such an appeal was prohibited by the Artemidian law?

Please see the facts of the case and domestic law.

It is stated in par. 29 of the case that the person shall not be prosecuted for an offence under Article 397 of the Criminal Code if prompt actions have been taken to remove the offending material as soon as they became aware of it. Clarification question: Which prompt actions were available for Mr B under Artemidian law to remove comments of his followers posted on his Friendzone profile (for example, was he technically able to delete them by himself, could he send such a request to an Internet provider, etc.)?

See answers above.

It is noted in par. 15 of the case that the Applicant filed an appeal against the decision of the prosecutor to discontinue her criminal complaint concerning hate speech and argued gender discrimination before the court of first instance. It is also stated in par. 22 that the issues of discrimination could be raised before the Constitutional court. Clarification question: Was the Applicant's argument on discrimination addressed in any way by the first-instance court that reviewed the complaint and was this court competent to take any actions to bring the police and prosecutor's office to liability because of their discriminative approaches? Or was it only the competence of the Constitutional court (as the court of first instance) to directly address the issue of discrimination and remedy it?

Only the Constitutional Court.

Regarding the criminal complaint on hate speech were the indications of the court part of its reasoning of the rejection of the applicant's appeal?

See the facts of the case.

Is it possible according to the law of Artemidia for claims for non-pecuniary damage to be submitted by the victims seeking for just satisfaction before civil courts?

Please see answers above.

How many Friendzone friends does Maya Engel have?

For relevant facts, please see the case.

With regard to the 2017 Anti-discrimination Act in Artemidia, have there to date been any cases where the Constitutional Court has ruled in favour of female applicants who have raised an allegation of discrimination based on sex against the State authorities?

Please see answers above.

According to the facts of the case, the investigation of the naked photographs of Ms Engel was conducted during the first criminal proceedings for cyber harassment, yet the judge who commented on them was the one considering the second criminal proceedings on hate speech: in which proceedings were the naked pictures issue then raised and assessed, in the first one or in the second one?

The relevant facts and evidence were a part of both criminal files.

With regard to the comments made on Friendzone, with whom lay the power to control or delete them – with Mr. B himself or with Friendzone?

Please see the answers above.

Is the local NGO Themis often referred to in international organizations and, specifically, international courts?

Yes, ECtHR has considered its reports in prior cases against Artemidia.

What are the main activity spheres of the local NGO Themis?

Please see the facts of the case.

Did the State alleged any preliminary exception during the process at the European Court?

Please see the facts of the case.

The process of friendly resolution took place as a part of the process? If yes, who initiated this process?

Please see the facts of the case.

Besides the constitutional complain mentioned in paragraphs 18 and 22, it exists within the Artemidia's jurisdiction any legal remedy that tutel the Human Rights?

Please see the facts of the case.

Does the criminal court itself have full competence to decide whether the action falls under category of criminal offence and to publish legally binding decision which would necessitate police authorities or prosecutor's office for further proceedings and obligate them by stated legal opinion?

Please see the facts of the case.

Based on what assessment did the police authorities and prosecutor's office proceed when considering that the act did not reach the intensity and means of a threat required for a classification of a crime of cyberstalking and cyber harassment under Article 532 of the Criminal Code.

For relevant facts, please see the text of the case and the domestic law.

Could you please provide the complete documentation from previous domestic legal proceedings, including the calculation of moral damage requested by the applicant and explicit applicant's legal claims demanded?

This is not possible. For relevant facts please see the case.

In the Friendzone post of Mr. B, Maya Engel is accused of being a part DOV in polluting the environment in addition to being a man-hating woman and posing naked in front of a camera. While the first accusation regarding the environmental pollution is not connected to accusations regarding the personal life of Maya Engel. It was given the information that Mr B searched for the name of Maya Engel on Google over 10.000 during their relationship. Are there any connections between these searches and the accusation against "DOV",

introducing Maya Engel as man-hating feminist woman and also the reason behind the public anger against Maya Engel based on this post?

For relevant facts please see the case.

The NGOs reports state that crimes of cyberstalking and cyber harassment are not punished when committed against women as it is seen in avoidance of the mental damage affecting Maya Engel during the trials. Does the ‘threshold’ of intensity required for the assessments of the crime of cyberstalking and cyber harassment under Article 532 refer to the wording of Article as ‘the sole purpose of harassing’ or should it be assumed that the jurisprudence requires these acts to not be punished when committed against women?

Please see facts of the case, domestic law and responses to clarification questions.

Does the wording of “all elements of the crime of hate speech”, as mentioned in the paragraph 16, imply that “publicly ridiculing, expressing contempt and urging hatred” are cumulatively listed as being the elements of the crime of hate speech under Article 397?

Please see facts of the case and domestic law.

The applicant complained that article 6,8,12 and 14 had been violated. On which grounds did she complain?

It is up to the teams to decide.

Have the applicant been able to get help from a public defender?

For relevant facts see the case.

Can we go beyond the legal qualification of the case?

Up to teams to argue.

Are other Mr B’s posts on Friendzone public, or just this one?

He is a public figure, while some of his posts are private.

Is the impugned Mr B’s post on Friendzone removed?

The posts are still there, please see the answers to the clarification questions above.