

# Megyn Kelly's Law Background Hits on Why O'Reilly Settlement Is So Monumental to the Allegations

---

 [ijr.com/the-declaration/2017/10/1003705-megyn-kellys-law-background-hits-oreilly-settlement-monumental-allegations/](https://www.ijr.com/the-declaration/2017/10/1003705-megyn-kellys-law-background-hits-oreilly-settlement-monumental-allegations/)

10/23/2017

---

On Monday, NBC's "Megyn Kelly Today" host [Megyn Kelly](#) sat down with former Fox News anchor Juliet Huddy for the first time since Huddy reached a settlement over sexual harassment allegations with former Fox host [Bill O'Reilly](#).

During the segment, Huddy touched on her own experience going up against the "machine" of corporate lawyers and some of the reasons why it's often hard to speak up when something isn't right.

The conversation turned to the "Fox News playbook" and her lawyer, Douglas Wigdor, highlighted two other accusations against the network. One from reporter Lidija Ujkic, who claimed she was discriminated against for disclosing her pregnancy, and the other from radio host Jessica Golloher, who said she was fired the day after she complained about harassment.

Kelly, who earlier in the show gave her [own account](#) of dealing with the human resources department, didn't dispute their claims, but made sure one thing was perfectly clear: In America, a person is innocent until proven guilty.

"I practiced law for 10 years," she politely interjected. "These are allegations. They are yet unproven. Fox News hasn't had its day in court and it gets to have that."

She added that "invalid claims can be settled," for the simple fact that the time, energy, and money it would take to go to court doesn't outweigh the amount it would take to settle, which she labeled "the nonsense of litigation."

However, on the flip side of that coin, Kelly explained that one of the reasons the recent New York Times article about [O'Reilly's settlement](#) with Lis Wiehl has garnered so much attention isn't because a settlement equates guilt, but because of the shocking number in the headline: "\$32 million is not nuisance value," she declared. "That's a huge number."

[O'Reilly](#) has vehemently denied the allegations in the article as "crap," and the network claimed it wasn't aware of the terms before signing the host's new contract, worth \$25 million.

If the network truly didn't know about the agreement, Kelly noted that the enormous sum of money begs the question: "Why didn't they know?"