what appears in the videos viewed by the Defendants. Rather, he skirts around this factual issue by asserting the videos are "edited" because the video is zoomed in, slowed down, and brightened. These so called "edits" are identical to referee reviews at any professional sporting event, whether to determine whether the athlete or object is in-bounds, or ascertaining which athlete last touched the ball. Ultimately, the content of the video is not changed. The fact is that Mr. Posey's testicle is exposed regardless of if it was for a moment. Rather than directly addressing the video, Mr. Posey simply states that exposure would be "impossible." This self-serving testimony is clearly refuted by the actual video evidence, which clearly evidences exposure:

Decl. of Jonathan Broyles, pg. 248 of PDF.

In the same vein, Mr. Posey purposefully ignores the entire context of Defendants' statements. All their statements were made in the context of legislative reform because Mr. Posey's public performance was not illegal. The focus of the statements was not on Mr. Posey's exposure. Rather, the Defendants were expressing concern over the public nature of drag performances, especially when