

# The Naked Truth

By Reg P. Wydeven  
September 7, 2014

When my wife and I started dating, I was pretty much petrified 24 hours a day. We had always been close friends before we started dating. She was, and still is, a perfect 10. I was, and sadly still am, a nerdy doofus.

She looked so pretty on our dates that I would get flustered and say stupid things. Or worse, I would just gaze upon her beauty and not realize she just asked me a question. Then I would say even stupider things. Like use the word “stupider.”

I didn't want to slip up and lose the perfect woman and tank our friendship in the process. That's a lot of pressure. Needless to say, I perspired a lot.

That's why I'm glad there was no such thing as 'Dating Naked' when we were courting.

'Dating Naked' is a new reality TV show on VH1. The network claims that today's world of online dating makes “it hard to see people for who they really are.” The show's new “social experiment” provides contestants with a dating experience “where before they bare their souls they bare everything else first.”

On a desolate tropical island, contestants go on three naked dates. At the end of each episode, they choose which date they would like to continue seeing back home.

I'm pretty confident that had I appeared on that show when I was dating, I would have had a heart attack before I undid the third button on my Guess button-fly, stonewashed jeans.

These contestants, however, have no problem flaunting their wares. I'm assuming many of them are aspiring actors hoping to get a little *exposure*. One dater, though, feels she was overexposed.

Jessie Nizewitz, a contestant on 'Dating Naked,' is suing Viacom, VH1's parent company, for \$10 million. The 28-year-old model from New York claims that during a scene where she was playfully wrestling on a beach with her date, an un-blurred shot of her crotch aired.

Nizewitz says that producers assured her that when the show aired, the contestants' genitals would be blurred. Since the airing, she asserts that she has been “humiliated on social media.”

According to the lawsuit, which was filed in Manhattan, images of Nizewitz's uncensored privates were made very public by being disseminated on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and Tumblr. She is seeking \$10 million for a tort known as the intentional infliction of emotional distress. The gaffe resulted in Nizewitz suffering from “severe emotional distress, mental anguish, humiliation, and embarrassment.”

In addition, she also claims the incident tanked a blossoming romance because her date never called her again after the show aired.

To prevail, Nizewitz will have to prove that Viacom either intentionally or recklessly aired the footage, which is doubtful considering hefty FCC fines. In addition, she would also have to show Viacom knew or should have known the airing would cause her great emotional distress. Finally, Nizewitz would have to prove that she actually did suffer emotional distress.

I know I'm getting old, because I was a little emotionally distressed after finding out that such a show even existed. I guess they don't call it the boob tube for nothing.

*This article originally appeared in the Appleton Post-Crescent newspaper and is reprinted with the permission of Gannett Co., Inc. © 2014 McCarty Law LLP. All rights reserved.*