
MINUTES of the COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday 22 June 2016 at 10.30 am
Gate House, 1 Farringdon Street, London EC4M 7LG

Present: Sir Alan Moses, Chairman
Richard Best
Lara Fielden
Janette Harkess
Gill Hudson
David Jessel
Matthew Lohn (**Items 1 – 12**)
Neil Watts
Elisabeth Ribbans
Peter Wright (**Items 1 – 6 & 13**)
Nina Wrightson

In attendance: Elizabeth Bardin, Executive Assistant to Chairman
Ben Gallop, Head of Complaints
Michelle Kuhler, PA to CEO and minute taker
Bianca Strohmman, Head of Complaints
Matt Tee, Chief Executive

Also present: Members of the Executive:

Xavier Bastin
Ciaran Cronin
Niall Duffy
Isabel Gillen-Smith
Alistair Henwood
Robyn Kelly
Vikki Julian
Holly Pick
Charlotte Urwin
Hugo Wallis

Observers:

1. Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

2. Declarations of Interest

Peter Wright declared an interest in Items 7 -12. He left the meeting for these items.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2016 as a true and accurate record.

4. Update by the Chairman

The Chairman thanked all the committee members who made it to the day's earlier breakfast event on reporting of suicide.

External Affairs

The Chairman updated the committee on recent events, including speeches given at the launch of the new edition of McNae's Essential Law for Journalists, the Media Society and National Liberal Club.

5. Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

6. Complaint 02430-16 Prescott v The Times

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint not be upheld.

A copy of its ruling appears in **Appendix A**.

7. Complaint 01450-16 Miscavige v Daily Mail

The committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint be upheld.

A copy of its ruling appears in **Appendix B**.

8. Complaint 01999-16 Tam v Express.co.uk

The committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint not be upheld.

A copy of its ruling appears in **Appendix C**.

9. Complaint 02078-16 Tam v Mail Online

The committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint not be upheld.

A copy of its ruling appears in **Appendix D**.

10. Complaint 01512-16 Dunn-Shaw v Daily Mail

The committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint not be upheld.

A copy of its ruling appears in **Appendix E**.

11. Complaint 01513-16 Dunn-Shaw v Kent Online

The committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint not be upheld.

A copy of its ruling appears in **Appendix F**.

12. Complaint 00437-16 Soliman v Daily Mail

The committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint not be upheld.

A copy of its ruling appears in **Appendix G**.

13. Complaints not adjudicated at a Complaints Committee meeting

The committee confirmed its formal approval of the papers listed in **Appendix H**.

14. Discussion paper: Complaints Procedures

Following discussion it was agreed that an expanded version of the paper would be recirculated to all members for further discussion and agreement.

15. Any other business

No other business was raised.

16. Date of Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Wednesday 3 August 2016.

The meeting ended at 1.20pm

**Michelle Kuhler
PA to CEO**

APPENDIX A

**Decision of the Complaints Committee
02430-16 Prescott v The Times****Summary of complaint**

1. Lord Prescott complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that The Times breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "Big John back on terracotta in zero year", published on 12 June 2015.
2. The article was a political sketch which drew on an interview the complainant had given the previous day. It noted that he is known for his use of language, and described his interview as a "joy to hear".
3. As the complaint was submitted more than four months after publication, it was considered against the online version of the article only.
4. The complainant said that the article's reference to his once having remarked, after disembarking from an aeroplane, that it was "great to be back on the terracotta" was inaccurate; he had never said those words. He said that in 2014 he had made public his position in his Daily Mirror column, and the Daily Mail had published a correction that same year. The complainant said that The Times had not contacted him in advance of publication to check the accuracy of the quotation, and the complainant was concerned that there had been a failure to take care not to publish inaccurate information.
5. The newspaper said that to the many well-documented examples of the complainant's "verbal creativity", it appeared that another had been added for which no source could now be found. It said that public figures renowned for their way with words have always had memorable phrases attributed to them, even when they might not have said them in the way in which they are now remembered. It said that it was genuinely difficult to know what might reasonably constitute taking care over the accuracy of quotations in such circumstances. It questioned whether, for example, journalists should always check transcripts of Winston Churchill's speeches before quoting something which he is universally thought to have said.
6. The newspaper said that an online search for the phrase complained of produced dozens of results which attributed the phrase to the complainant, the earliest having apparently been published in the Guardian in April 1999, 16 years before publication of this article, and 15 years before the complainant first challenged it. It said that the phrase had been quoted in many profiles published since then, including in a panel of quotations which accompanied a profile of the complainant written by the same journalist as the article under complaint, and published in the same newspaper, in 2006; it was not aware of any complaint about the material at that time.

7. The complainant had initially raised concerns about the article with the journalist directly, but had written to the newspaper's previous address and so his letter took some time to be received. As soon as the newspaper knew that the complainant was not satisfied with the journalist's response and wished to pursue his complaint, the newspaper published his denial in print and as a footnote to the online article. Upon receipt of the IPSO complaint, submitted ten months after publication of the article, the newspaper amended the online article to remove any reference to the disputed quotation, including from the headline. It also moved the published denial so that it appeared before the text of the article itself. It read as follows:

"This article has been amended to take account of the following published correction:

Correction: We said in a parliamentary sketch (June 12) that Lord Prescott had once, on alighting from an aeroplane, expressed relief at being 'back on terra cotta'. Lord Prescott assures us that he did not utter these much-quoted words. We are happy to put this on record."

Relevant Code provisions

8. Clause 1 (Accuracy)
- (i) The press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information, including pictures.
 - (ii) A significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distortion once recognised must be corrected, promptly and with due prominence, and – where appropriate – an apology published.

Findings of the Committee

9. The complainant was alleged to have said the disputed words at least 16 years prior to publication of the article under complaint. During that period, they had been widely published and regularly included on lists of quotations from the complainant, including most notably in the same newspaper in 2006 (in a panel which accompanied a sketch by the same journalist). It had not been challenged on that occasion. Given the passage of time, the newspaper was unable to provide material to support its position that the quotation was accurate, and for the same reason the Committee was ultimately unable to establish what exactly the complainant had said. The newspaper was, however, able to demonstrate that the quotation had previously been widely reported, and for a long time had gone undisputed. While the complainant had written in his newspaper column in 2014 that the quotation had been misattributed, by that time it had already become closely associated with him. The article was a political sketch which characterised the complainant's use of words as an endearing trait; it was not unkind in tone. In these particular circumstances, the newspaper was not required to put the quotation to the complainant in advance of publication, and the failure to identify the published correction did not constitute a failure to take care over the accuracy of the article. There was no breach of Clause 1 (i).

10. The complainant is known for his use of language, and the article was a light-hearted look at the phraseology he employs in his position as a prominent political figure. In the Committee's view, it was not significantly inaccurate or misleading to attribute the quotation to him, without also making clear that he had denied having said it. While the Committee welcomed the newspaper's recognition of the complainant's concerns, and its positive responses to the complaint, the publication of his denial was not required under the terms of the Code. There was no breach of Clause 1 (ii).

Conclusions

11. The complaint was not upheld.

APPENDIX B**Decision of the Complaints Committee
01450-16 Miscavige v Mail Online****Summary of complaint**

1. David Miscavige complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that Mail Online breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "Exclusive: inside the 'bromance' of Tom Cruise and Scientology founder David Miscavige: How they gamble and smoke cigars together and share a special language – but Miscavige secretly recorded the movie star", published on 2 December 2015.
2. The article reported details of "exclusive interviews" with former members of the Church of Scientology, which concerned Tom Cruise and his relationship with the complainant, the leader of the Church of Scientology.
3. The article said that Gold Base, the Church headquarters, had been Mr Cruise's "home from home", and that he had been treated like "Scientology royalty". It said that a field had been sown with wild flowers to create a meadow for him, and it detailed the efforts the Church had gone to in order to "impress" Mr Cruise's friend, a footballer, including by "laser levelling a field" to create a football pitch. It also described an occasion when the complainant and Mr Cruise was alleged to have returned from a Las Vegas gambling trip with "bundles of cash".
4. In addition, the article reported that Gary Morehead, former head of security at Gold Base, had claimed that the complainant had arranged for secret cameras to be installed to record members of the Church, including Mr Cruise. The article also reported that several former members of the Church had made allegations that they had been required to live in poor conditions.
5. The complainant said that the publication had relied on sources who were "disaffected former members", none of whom had contemporaneous knowledge of the Church. He said the allegations contained in the article had already been disproved or denied, and the publication had failed to report this. Further, several of the allegations had been put to his representatives in advance, and the publication had been informed that that they were completely untrue and should not be published.
6. He said the publication had inaccurately reported that members of the Church had been filmed secretly. In fact, auditing sessions were recorded with members' knowledge and consent, and the footage was only used as a training aid for prospective auditors.
7. He denied that a field had been "laser levelled out" to impress Mr Cruise's friend. That friendship only began in 2003, several years after the publication's sources were dismissed from the Church.

8. In addition, the allegation that a field had been sown with wild flowers for Mr Cruise had been disproved more than 20 years previously. He said that one of the publication's sources was on record confirming that "the wildflower planting never occurred".
9. The complainant also denied the report that he and Mr Cruise had returned from a Las Vegas gambling trip with "bundles of cash", and that they lived in luxury on the base while others worked in harsh conditions.
10. The publication said that the complaint fell outside IPSO's remit: the individuals mentioned in the article – with the exception of the footballer – were American; the events had taken place in America; and the piece was commissioned, written and edited by journalists working for its US division. The story had therefore been written to comply with American law and journalistic conventions, not the British Editors' Code of Practice. In light of this, it declined to defend its story in response to IPSO's investigation.
11. Before IPSO's involvement in the matter, the publication informed the complainant that Mr Morehead had told its writer that the complainant had asked him to put a second secret set of cameras in an auditing room, and he had done so. The allegation that the complainant had secretly recorded Mr Cruise was supported by Mr Cruise's former auditor, and by sources relied upon by the magazine Vanity Fair in a report on Scientology that it published in 2012.
12. The publication said that the story that a field was levelled to impress the footballer was based on information provided by Mr Cruise and the complainant's former chef. The claim was also supported by Mr Morehead. The fact they were not members of the Church at that time did not mean that they could not have known what had occurred. Similarly, the report about a meadow of wild flowers was confirmed by two former Scientologists, and had been told by a number of former high-ranking members of the Church; it was a story that was well known to the general public. It considered that the source who had previously denied the story had been acting as a spokesperson for the Church at that time. The report concerning the treatment of staff on the base came from three trusted sources, all of whom were former Scientologists.
13. The publication told IPSO that it had contacted the complainant for comment in advance of publication, but had been provided with a response that was "unpublishable". In response to the direct complaint, the publication had amended the article to include the complainant's denial.

Relevant Code provisions

14. Clause 1 (Accuracy)
 - i) The Press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information, including pictures.
 - ii) A significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distortion once recognised must be corrected, promptly and with due prominence, and - where appropriate - an apology published. In cases involving the Regulator, prominence should be agreed with the Regulator in advance.

iii) The Press, whilst free to be partisan, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact.

Note

15. IPSO did not accept the publication's assertions regarding jurisdiction, and the publication was therefore obliged to demonstrate it had fulfilled its obligations under the Editors' Code. The publication however maintained its position on jurisdiction throughout IPSO's investigation; the Committee adjudicated on the complaint on this basis.

Findings of the Committee

16. The publication had failed to demonstrate that it had complied with its obligations under Clause 1 of the Code.
17. While it had published accounts provided by former members of the Church of Scientology, and attributed them accordingly, it had not demonstrated the process by which it had regard for the complainant's previous denials of the allegations, and nor had it explained why it had failed to include his representative's position, explained prior to publication, that the allegations which had been put to him were untrue. As such, the Committee was unable to conclude that the steps taken prior to publication showed that Mail Online had taken care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information.
18. Furthermore, the complainant had contended that the article had contained inaccuracies which – on their face – could have been significant. Where the publication had not provided a defence of the accuracy of the article, or its decision not to publish a correction, the Committee could not conclude that it had complied with its obligations under Clause 1 (ii). The complaint under Clause 1 was upheld.

Conclusions

19. The complaint was upheld.

Remedial action required

20. In circumstances where the Committee determines that there has been a breach of the Editors' Code, it can require the publication of a correction and/or adjudication as a remedy to the breach. In this case, the Committee determined that an adjudication was an appropriate remedy.
21. The adjudication should be published in full on Mail Online, with a link on its homepage for 24 hours; thereafter it should be archived in the usual way. The headline to the adjudication should refer to the subject matter of the article and make clear that IPSO had ruled against Mail Online in relation to the complaint; it should be agreed with IPSO in advance. The terms of the adjudication for publication are as follows:

Following the publication of an article headlined “Exclusive: inside the ‘bromance’ of Tom Cruise and Scientology founder David Miscavige”, published on 2 December 2015, David Miscavige complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that Mail Online breached Clause 1 (Accuracy).

IPSO’s Complaints Committee upheld the complaint, and has required Mail Online to publish this adjudication.

The article reported details of “exclusive interviews” with former members of the Church of Scientology, which concerned Tom Cruise and his relationship with the complainant, the leader of the Church of Scientology. It gave details of the special treatment Mr Cruise received at Gold Base, the Scientology headquarters; reported claims that some Church members were poorly treated; and said that the complainant had arranged for cameras to be installed to secretly film members of the Church, including Mr Cruise.

The complainant said the claims made in the article had already been disproved or denied. Further, several of the allegations had been put to his representatives in advance, and the publication had been informed that that they were completely untrue and should not be published.

The publication said that the complaint fell outside IPSO’s remit: the individuals mentioned in the article were American; the events had taken place in the United States; and the piece was commissioned, written and edited by journalists working for its US division. The story had therefore been written to comply with American law and journalistic conventions, not the British Editors’ Code of Practice. In light of this, it declined to defend its story in response to IPSO’s investigation.

IPSO’s Complaints Committee found that Mail Online had failed to demonstrate that it had complied with its obligations under Clause 1 of the Code. It had not demonstrated the process by which it had regard for the complainant’s previous denials of the allegations, nor had it explained why it had failed to include his representative’s position, explained prior to publication, that the allegations which had been put to him were untrue. It had also failed to provide a defence of the accuracy of the article, or its decision not to publish a correction. The complaint under Clause 1 was upheld.

APPENDIX C

Decision of the Complaints Committee 01999-16 Family of Paul Tam v Express.co.uk

Summary of Complaint

1. The family of Paul Tam complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that Express.co.uk breached Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "GRAPHIC CONTENT: British tourist dies after being stabbed in the head during sick mugging", published on 26 March 2016.
2. The article reported that Paul Tam, a British tourist, had died in a San Francisco hospital a month after being stabbed in the head during a street robbery. It said that Mr Tam had been "ambushed by an unidentified man and woman" who had attempted to take his bag. It said that Mr Tam's niece, who had been with him at the time, had been unharmed. The article included a CCTV video of the incident, and three still images taken from it. The piece said that the police were still searching for both suspects and were treating the attack as a murder investigation.
3. The complainant accepted that the newspaper had a right to report on Mr Tam's murder; however, he said that the publication of the CCTV footage showing the "horrific details" of the attack – one day after his death – was insensitive. He said that other publications had chosen only to publish stills of the video, or had simply described the attack, with no loss of effect.
4. The complainant said that the video, which had shown Mr Tam in fear and pain, had been used as "click bait" so that the publication could profit from his friend's death. This was demonstrated in the "graphic content" headline, which attracted readers to the footage. He noted that the article had rated "third-most clicked-through" on the day of its publication.
5. The publication said that it could only imagine how deeply upsetting Mr Tam's death must have been for his family; however, it considered that the murder of a British citizen in the US was a matter about which the British public had the right to be informed. It said that it had a duty to report on such matters, however tragic.
6. The newspaper said that the US authorities had released the video in order to help them identify Mr Tam's attackers; it was unsure of the exact media agency through which it had obtained the material. It noted that virtually all UK media outlets had published it.
7. The newspaper said that it had not embellished or sensationalised the video, and its content was not "gratuitously gory". The video had not shown Mr Tam's face during or after the attack, or the weapon; it had shown the attack at a distance and at night; the body movements and facial features of the victim and his attacker could not be seen; it lasted 42 seconds, and had not shown Mr Tam's death. The newspaper noted that had it not published the video, it would have described the

attack in the same detail in writing. It accepted that the video was “graphic” in that it had shown an act of random violence; it would not have published it if it had shown the victim suffering or receiving medical treatment.

8. The newspaper said that the video had been marked “graphic content” to give readers advance warning of its content; it strongly denied that the label had been used to encourage readers to watch it. It considered that any account of Mr Tam’s death, published at any time, could have caused distress to his family and friends.

Relevant Code provisions

9. Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock)
In cases involving personal grief or shock, enquiries and approaches must be made with sympathy and discretion and publication handled sensitively. These provisions should not restrict the right to report legal proceedings.

Findings of the Committee

10. The Committee wished to express its sincere condolences to Mr Tam’s family and friends for their loss.
11. News organisations play an important role in reporting crimes, matters about which the public have a legitimate right to be informed. The Committee acknowledges that reports of serious crimes – even when handled responsibly and with proper sensitivity – will risk causing distress to victims, their family members and friends. However, Clause 4 does not prohibit the reporting of distressing events, such as violent crimes; it requires instead that, in such cases, and insofar as is possible, publication is handled sensitively.
12. In reaching its findings on sensitivity, the Committee had particular regard for the nature and contents of the video, the manner in which it was presented within the article, and the circumstances in which the video had been obtained.
13. The footage showed a horrifying moment; however, it was shot from a distance, was grainy, and did not include sound. Neither Mr Tam’s face nor the weapon used were visible, and while it clearly depicted Mr Tam fleeing from his attacker before falling to the ground, the quality of the video was such that the specific moment of injury could not clearly be seen.
14. The footage was published as an illustration of the incident described in the article and was therefore directly relevant to the story. The article itself was presented as a straight news piece. The manner in which the video was published did not humiliate or demean Mr Tam, nor his death.
15. The video had been released by the San Francisco Police department 18 days after the incident had taken place, and Mr Tam’s family had been given notification of release, and of its contents, some days prior to publication. The footage had been released to a number of media outlets, in an attempt to find Mr Tam’s attackers, and had been widely published, including on police social media accounts.

16. The Committee understood that watching the video of Mr Tam’s attack must have been extremely distressing to those who knew him. However, in circumstances where the family were notified in advance by the police that the video would be circulated to media outlets for publication, and given the way in which it was presented in this case, the Committee did not consider that its inclusion in the article represented a failure to handle publication sensitively in breach of Clause 4.

Conclusion

17. The complaint was not upheld.

APPENDIX D

Decision of the Complaints Committee 02078-16 Family of Paul Tam v Mail Online

Summary of Complaint

18. The family of Paul Tam complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that Mail Online breached Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "The horrifying moment a British tourist was fatally stabbed in the head trying to flee a bag snatcher on a busy San Francisco street", published on 26 March 2016.
19. The article reported that Paul Tam, a British tourist, had died in a San Francisco hospital a month after being stabbed in the head during a street robbery. It said that CCTV footage showed a man wielding a knife as he chased Mr Tam, attacking him twice before taking his bag. It said that Mr Tam's niece, who had been with him at the time, had been unharmed. The article included the CCTV video, and three still images taken from it. The piece described both the attacker and his "female accomplice", and said that the matter was "now being investigated as a homicide".
20. The complainant said that the CCTV footage had been published the day after Mr Tam's death, when family and friends were still in shock, and that its publication had made the grieving process "very difficult" for them. He said that police had informed Mr Tam's brother that the video would be released, and he was given general information about its contents. He had asked for the identity of his daughter, Mr Tam's niece, to be protected, but he had not been given the opportunity to object to the video's release and believed he had "little choice" but to agree.
21. The complainant said that the video was "exceptionally graphic" and noted that it had appeared with a capitalised warning that it contained "graphic content". While he noted that its publication in the US might have assisted the criminal justice process there, it served no purpose to publish the video in the UK. He said that while it was black-and-white CCTV footage, Mr Tam's fear and pain were clearly visible and that the image would be "forever embedded" in his mind.
22. The complainant said that the video had been used as "click bait" so that the publication could profit from Mr Tam's death. This was demonstrated by the "graphic content" headline, which encouraged readers to watch the footage. He noted that advertising had been carried on the page. He said if there had been a genuine desire to appeal for witnesses then the article would have made that clear, and it would have given contact details for the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD).
23. The publication said that it was sorry that the video had caused distress at such a difficult time; this had not been its intention. While it understood that the footage

was – by its very nature – upsetting, it did not consider that its publication raised a breach of the Code.

24. The publication said that the police had released the video to the media in order to appeal for information from the public. The publication said it has a significant US readership and had published the video because there was a clear public interest in exposing the crime and assisting the police with their investigation. It noted that numerous other US-and UK-based websites had also published the video.
25. The police had explained that Mr Tam’s brother was consulted before the video was released. He had known its contents, and he had not raised any objections at that time. The only issue that had been raised concerned Mr Tam’s niece: the family had requested for the portion of the film in which she featured to be omitted; the police had edited the film accordingly. The police had made clear that the video would not have been released had the family objected to it.
26. The publication said that the footage was not gratuitous or gory: it was grainy, black-and-white CCTV footage, and it had not shown the incident close up. The police had also noted that “you really don’t see the vicious attack – you see the victim being chased around and then you see the victim falling to the ground”. While the police had wanted to show the “viciousness and savagery” of the attack, they had made clear that they would not have released a video that was “too graphic”.
27. The publication said that it had been fully aware of its obligation to handle the story with sensitivity. It had decided that advertising should not precede the video, and a warning was placed on the film itself so that readers would be aware that the content might be upsetting. It said that it is commercially funded and its news pages therefore carry advertising; it was not fair to suggest that the presence of advertising on this story had rendered it “click bait”.

Relevant Code provisions

28. Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock)
In cases involving personal grief or shock, enquiries and approaches must be made with sympathy and discretion and publication handled sensitively. These provisions should not restrict the right to report legal proceedings.

Findings of the Committee

29. The Committee wished to express its sincere condolences to Mr Tam’s family and friends for their loss.
30. News organisations play an important role in reporting crimes, matters about which the public have a legitimate right to be informed. The Committee acknowledges that reports of serious crimes – even when handled responsibly and with proper sensitivity – will risk causing distress to victims, their family members and friends. However, Clause 4 does not prohibit the reporting of distressing

events, such as violent crimes; it requires instead that, in such cases, and insofar as is possible, publication is handled sensitively.

31. In reaching its findings on sensitivity, the Committee had particular regard for the nature and contents of the video, the manner in which it was presented within the article, and the circumstances in which the video had been obtained.
32. The footage showed a horrifying moment; however, it was shot from a distance, was grainy, and did not include sound. Neither Mr Tam's face nor the weapon used was visible, and while it clearly depicted Mr Tam fleeing from his attacker before falling to the floor, the quality of the video was such that the specific moment of injury could not clearly be seen.
33. The footage was published as an illustration of the incident described in the article and was therefore directly relevant to the story. The article itself was presented as a straight news piece. The manner in which the video was published did not humiliate or demean Mr Tam, nor his death. The Committee welcomed the publication's decision not to precede the video with advertising.
34. The video had been released by the San Francisco Police department 18 days after the incident had taken place, and Mr Tam's family had been given notification of release, and of its contents, some days prior to publication. The footage had been released to a number of media outlets, in an attempt to find Mr Tam's attackers, and had been widely published, including on police social media accounts.
35. The Committee understood that watching the video of Mr Tam's attack must have been extremely distressing to those that knew him. However, in circumstances where the family were notified in advance by the police that the video would be circulated to media outlets, for publication, and given the way in which it was presented in this case, the Committee did not consider that its inclusion in the article represented a failure to handle publication sensitively in breach of Clause 4.

Conclusion

36. The complaint was not upheld.

APPENDIX E

**Decision of the Complaints Committee
01512-16 Dunn-Shaw v Daily Mail****Summary of complaint**

1. Jason Dunn-Shaw complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation on behalf of his partner Martin Boyd and on his own behalf that the Daily Mail breached Clause 1 (Accuracy), Clause 2 (Privacy) and Clause 12 (Discrimination) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "The judge, his gay lover and a mysterious online tirade at his critics", published on 27 February 2016, and in an article headlined "Judge in gay lover row and a lewd quip about Chuka on Facebook", published on 29 February. The articles were also published online with the headlines "Judge's gay lover used his name to launch online tirade against critics who were angry at 'lenient' sentence for drink-driver" and "Judge in row over online antics of his gay lover who left crude comments on his Facebook page including lewd quip about Chuka Umunna", respectively.
2. The 27 February article reported that the complainant's user account on a newspaper website was used to comment on an article reporting proceedings at Canterbury Crown Court in which he had presided in his capacity as a part time judge. It reported that the complainant's account had been used to "attack" others who had posted comments criticising his decision to suspend a jail sentence for a dangerous driver. It reported that barristers working at Canterbury Crown Court had said that the comments in question had been subject to an "'explosion of rumours and speculation' for many weeks". The article reported that the complainant had said that he did have an account on the newspaper's website, but that he did not comment on his own cases as doing so would be improper, and that the comments were likely to have been left by his partner, with whom he shared the account. The article reported that the complainant and his partner were "regulars at pubs, bars and restaurants in the Margate area".
3. The 29 February article reported that the complainant had left a "series of lewd, politically-charged and foul-mouthed comments on his personal Facebook account". It also reported that the account had supported a petition to "force the BBC to refer to David Cameron as the 'Right-wing Prime Minister'". It referred to the 27 February article, and reported that the complainant had explained that his "long-term partner" was responsible for the comments on the local news website.
4. Both articles were accompanied by a photograph of the complainant in a suit, captioned: "The Judge: Jason Dunn-Shaw", and by a photograph of his partner dressed as a woman. In the 27 February article, this photograph was captioned: "The Lover: Martin Boyd, pictured in 1993, was an active member of the Soho social scene". In the 29 February article, the photo was captioned "Lover: Martin Boyd, pictured left, in 1993". In addition, both articles reported that photographs

on social media showed that his partner was an “active member of the Soho social scene” around a “legendary drag queen”, who was named in the articles.

5. The online version of the 29 February article stated that “a judge has been embarrassed by the online antics of his gay lover who left a series of lewd, politically-charged and foul-mouthed comments on his Facebook account”. The captions to the photographs in the online articles were longer, but substantively similar. The remainder of the online versions of the articles also were substantively similar to the print version of the articles.
6. The complainant said that he had been in a relationship with his partner for 25 years, and they had entered into a civil partnership in 2007. In the context of articles which juxtaposed his image with a photograph of his partner dressed as a woman with the respective captions “The Judge” and “The lover”, the complainant said that the reference to his partner as his “gay lover” implied that their relationship was impermanent, dissolute and that they were promiscuous. He said that it was a pejorative reference to their sexuality, and inaccurate. The complainant said that they are described as married on his partner’s Facebook page, which also contained a post from 21 January 2016 marking 25 years since their first date. The complainant said that the newspaper had accessed his partner’s Facebook prior to publication, and would therefore have been aware of the true nature of their relationship.
7. In relation to the 27 February article, the complainant said that the reference to he and his partner being “regulars at pubs, bars and restaurants in the Margate area” gave the inaccurate impression that they were visiting these establishments in search of sexual encounters, and that it contributed to the context in which the phrase “gay lover” was a pejorative reference to their sexual orientation. The complainant said that his partner had posted about four establishments on his Facebook page, and that each post referred to the dining and the quality of the food.
8. The complainant said that the reference to his and his partner’s sexuality was not genuinely relevant to the story in either article.
9. The complainant said that the photograph of his partner showed him at a Christmas fancy dress party for work colleagues. The complainant said it had been taken from his partner’s Facebook page, and that this represented an intrusion into his privacy. He said that the newspaper could have used an innocuous, contemporary photograph of his partner, rather than a photograph which, in the context of articles which referred to his partner being an active member of the social scene around a well-known drag artist, suggested that he was a transvestite.
10. The complainant said that the Facebook comments which were the subject of the 29 February article were not made on his own profile, and that his Facebook account was privacy protected. It followed that the newspaper had searched for Facebook comments he had made to his partner. The complainant said that this was an intrusion into he and his partner’s privacy. The complainant noted that in

response to the complaint, the newspaper made clear it had re-visited his partner's Facebook profile after the articles were published, which supported the allegation that the newspaper had intruded into his partner's private life.

11. The comments which were the subject of the 27 February article were left on the Kent Online website. The complainant said that in order for the newspaper to discover that the pseudonymous user account on the Kent Online website was registered to his name, it must have accessed, directly or indirectly, information held by Kent Online. The complainant said that the accessing of this information represented an intrusion into his privacy.
12. The newspaper said that to the best of its knowledge, the complainants were in a happy, romantic relationship, and that the phrase "gay lover" was not inaccurate. It said that in the reporter's telephone conversation with the complainant prior to publication, the complainant had ended the call when the reporter had tried to ask him about his partner. The newspaper said it was not aware of the length of the relationship or the civil partnership until after publication. It said that the word "gay" is not pejorative in itself, and that the words "gay lover" are factual, not pejorative.
13. The newspaper said that the complainant's partner's open Facebook account contained many photographs of him and the complainant enjoying meals and trips in the Margate area. The reference to them being "regulars at pubs, bars and restaurants in the Margate area" did not contain the implication alleged by the complainant. It said that the statement was intended to show that the couple were a gregarious couple, well-known to people in and around Margate; this was relevant to the article because the complainant had said that his partner had posted the comments on Kent Online.
14. The newspaper said that the complainant had told the journalist that his partner was the author of the comments under his username, which were the subject of the article. In this context, the nature and closeness of the relationship between the complainant and his partner was an integral part of the story. The newspaper said that the complainant and his partner's sexual orientation was therefore genuinely relevant to the story, and there was no breach of Clause 12 (ii).
15. The newspaper said that the image of the complainant's partner was taken from his open Facebook account, and provided a 'screengrab' of the relevant page. It denied the image implied that his partner was a transvestite or that he wore women's clothes habitually. The newspaper said it selected the photograph because it was interesting and funny. The newspaper said that there were no privacy setting on the complainant's Facebook account when the 29 February article was written, and it provided 'screengrabs' of some of the complainant's Facebook comments to demonstrate that they were publicly accessible.
16. The newspaper said a source from the Margate area had said he had heard from people he knew, who came into contact with staff at Canterbury Crown Court, that comments critical of the complainant's judgements on Kent Online were being

robustly and often rudely responded to by a user account named “Querelle”. The source said it was rumoured that these comments were being left by the complainant in response to his critics. The newspaper said that the journalist established that “Querelle” was the complainant’s username because the complainant had used the same unusual username on three publicly available social media accounts, where it appeared alongside his real name.

17. The newspaper offered to remove the words “gay lover” from the online articles, and offered to publish the following apology on page 2 of the newspaper:

News articles on February 27 and 29 about allegedly inappropriate social media posting referred to Judge Jason Dunn-Shaw’s partner as his ‘gay lover’. We have since been informed that, in fact, Mr Dunn-Shaw and his partner have been in a relationship for 25 years and in civil partnership since 2007. We apologise to both for any distress caused.

18. The complainant said that it was untrue that anyone at Canterbury Crown Court had ever speculated as to the identity of “Querelle”. He provided IPSO with letters from the former Chairman of the Kent Bar Mess and from a local court reporter in support of this position. He said that his identity as “Querelle” could only have been ascertained by searching for his name alongside the word “Querelle”; a search for simply “Querelle” would not have revealed that he had any connection with the name. It followed that the newspaper had already linked his name to “Querelle”. The complainant said that the only way they could have done so is by access to information held on the account by Kent Online. The complainant rejected the newspaper’s offer to publish the apology.

Relevant Code Provisions

19. Clause 1 (Accuracy)

- i. The Press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information or images, including headlines not supported by the text.
- ii. A significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distortion must be corrected, promptly and with due prominence, and — where appropriate — an apology published. In cases involving IPSO, due prominence should be as required by the regulator.
- iii. A fair opportunity to reply to significant inaccuracies should be given, when reasonably called for.
- iv. The Press, while free to editorialise and campaign, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact.

Clause 2 (Privacy)

- i. Everyone is entitled to respect for his or her private and family life, home, health and correspondence, including digital communications.
- ii. Editors will be expected to justify intrusions into any individual's private life without consent. Account will be taken of the complainant's own public disclosures of information.

Clause 12 (Discrimination)

- i. The press must avoid prejudicial or pejorative reference to an individual's, race, colour, religion, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation or to any physical or mental illness or disability.
- ii. Details of an individual's race, colour, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, physical or mental illness or disability must be avoided unless genuinely relevant to the story.

Findings of the Committee

20. Newspapers and magazines have editorial freedom to publish what they consider to be appropriate, provided that the rights of individuals – enshrined in the terms of the Code, which specifically defines and protects these rights – are not unjustifiably compromised. The Committee acknowledged that the complainant and his partner found the use of the phrase “gay lover” to be offensive. However, any offensiveness of this term did not in itself fall within IPSO’s remit; the issue raised under Clause 12 (Discrimination) was whether the phrase “gay lover” was a pejorative or prejudicial reference to the complainant and his partner’s sexual orientation, and whether details of their sexual orientation were genuinely relevant to the story.
21. The phrase “gay lover” did not contain any specific pejorative term, but suggested that the relationship between the complainant and his partner was less substantial and committed than was in fact the case. However, the mere fact that the relationship was homosexual did not mean that the newspaper, by referring to the relationship in casual terms, had disparaged their sexual orientation. The Committee did not establish that the phrase “gay lover” had a pejorative meaning in respect of the complainant’s or Mr Boyd’s sexual orientation, and there was no breach of Clause 12 (i).
22. Prior to publication, the complainant had told the newspaper that the comments made by his Kent Online account had probably been left by his partner. In these circumstances the nature of their relationship, reference to which disclosed their sexual orientation, was genuinely relevant to the articles. There was no breach of Clause 12 (ii).
23. In addition to the term “gay lover”, the articles under complaint also employed the terms “partner” and “boyfriend”. The 29 February used the term “long-term partner”. The Committee recognised that the phrase “gay lover” misrepresented the relationship between the complainant and his partner, given its duration and the fact that they had entered a civil partnership. However, the length of their relationship, and whether or not they were civil partners were not significant details in the context of the articles, which made clear that Mr Boyd was the complainant’s partner. The phrase “gay lover” was not significantly misleading such as to raise a breach of Clause 1. The reference to the complainant and his partner being “regulars at pubs, bars and restaurants in the Margate area” did not suggest that they had visited these establishments in order to find sexual encounters. The article was not misleading in the manner alleged, and there was no breach of Clause 1

on this point. Nevertheless, the Committee welcomed the newspaper's offer to publish an apology.

24. The mere fact that the newspaper had viewed the complainant's partner's publicly accessible Facebook account did not represent an intrusion into his private life. The photograph of his partner dressed as a woman at a work party had been posted on this account, such that it was publicly accessible. The photograph had been publicly disclosed by the complainant's partner and simply showed him attending a party in fancy dress. In this context, the publication of this photograph did not raise a breach of Clause 2. The caption on the photograph made clear that it had been taken in 1993. Beyond showing that the complainant's partner had once dressed as a woman, the article did not suggest that his partner was a transvestite, and this aspect of the complaint did not raise a breach of Clause 1.
25. The Committee noted the complainant's position that his Facebook account was private. However, the newspaper had provided screengrabs which demonstrated that comments made by the complainant were publicly accessible. Having regard for the content of the comments, and taking into account the complainant's public disclosure of the information in question, this aspect of the complaint did not raise a breach of Clause 2.
26. The word "Querelle" and the complainant's name were publicly linked on the internet on three separate social media accounts. This could be ascertained simply by searching the word "Querelle" alongside the complainant's name, which the newspaper said it did after hearing rumours about the complainant's identity as "Querelle". The complainant's denial that there were any such rumours and the two letters he provided in support of this position was not sufficient reason to reject the newspaper's account, given that these individuals may simply not have been party to the rumours in question. The newspaper had given a credible explanation of how it identified the complainant as "Querelle" without accessing the information Kent Online held on the account. The Committee did not establish that the newspaper had intruded into the complainant's privacy in the manner alleged. There was no breach of Clause 2 (Privacy) on this point.

Conclusions

27. The complaint was not upheld.

APPENDIX F

**Decision of the Complaints Committee
01513-16 Dunn-Shaw v Kent Online****Summary of Complaint**

1. Jason Dunn-Shaw complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that Kent Online breached Clause 2 (Privacy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in relation to the information it held on his visitor account for its website.
2. On 27 February, the Daily Mail published an article alleging that the complainant's account on a local newspaper website had been used to criticise comments left by other users on two news articles. The two news articles in question were published on Kent Online.
3. The earlier Kent Online article reported court proceedings in which the complainant had presided in his capacity as a recorder, and had suspended the prison sentence of a woman who had pleaded guilty to dangerous driving. On this article, "Querelle" had defended the complainant's sentencing decision, which others had commented was too lenient. One individual commented that "querelle, if you are related or a friend [of the defendant] just say so because otherwise your remarks are beyond comprehension". "Querelle" responded to this comment by saying that he had "no connection of any kind".
4. The later Kent Online article reported proceedings in which the complainant had acted as counsel for the defence. On this article, "Querelle" had also commented in support of the judge's sentencing decision, which again, others had commented was too lenient. In the comments thread on this article, Querelle explained that he had watched the court proceedings. Others had left comments speculating that "Querelle" was the defendant, or had a connection to the defendant.
5. The Daily Mail article reported that the complainant had said that he had not made these comments, and that they had probably been made by his partner, who also used the same account to post comments on Kent Online content.
6. The complainant said that he had set up the user account on Kent Online's website by providing his email address, name and other personal details. He said that the account had been set up so that comments were made under the pseudonym "Querelle". The complainant said that in order for the Daily Mail to have identified that this was his account, they must have accessed information Kent Online held on the account. The complainant said that for this reason, he believed that Kent Online had disclosed the fact that he operated the account to the Daily Mail. The

complainant said that the disclosure of this information represented an intrusion into his privacy.

7. The publication denied that it had revealed the identity of the individual who had set up the "Querelle" user account. It said that it did not know how the Daily Mail had identified him as the owner of the account. Nevertheless, it said that if an individual had been suspicious of the comments left by "Querelle" on the basis of detailed knowledge of the proceedings in question, this individual could enter the word "Querelle" into a search engine, along with the names of those involved in the proceedings. By doing so, the individual would find that the complainant's name is openly linked to another internet profile under the name "Querelle" on a different website.
8. The complainant said that the first journalist to identify that "Querelle" was his account was a reporter from Kent Online. He said that the comments left by "Querelle" did not demonstrate detailed knowledge of the proceedings other than those disclosed in open court. In relation to the fact that the name "Querelle" is linked to his name on another internet forum, the complainant said that this information is only revealed when both his name and "Querelle" are searched together. The complainant said that only an individual that already knew the connection between his name and "Querelle" could use a search engine to find evidence for the connection on another internet forum.

Relevant Code Provisions

9. Clause 2 (Privacy)
 - i) Everyone is entitled to respect for his or her private and family life, home, health and correspondence, including digital communications.
 - ii) Editors will be expected to justify intrusions into any individual's private life without consent. Account will be taken of the complainant's own public disclosures of information

Findings of the Committee

10. "Querelle" had commented extensively on two articles reporting proceedings at Canterbury Crown Court in which the complainant had been involved. On the earlier article, one individual invited "Querelle" to state whether he was related to, or friends, with the defendant. On the later article, others had speculated that "Querelle" was the defendant, or had a connection to the defendant.
11. The word "Querelle" and the complainant's name were publicly linked on the internet via his account on the internet forum. This information could be obtained by searching the word "Querelle" alongside the complainant's name. It followed that an individual seeking to identify "Querelle", and suspecting that the account may be operated by the complainant, could confirm that this was the case via a

simple internet search. In these circumstances, the Committee did not establish that the publication had disclosed to a third party the information it held on the complainant's user account. There was no breach of Clause 2 (Privacy).

Conclusions

12. The complaint was not upheld.

APPENDIX G

**Decision of the Complaints Committee
00437-16 Soliman v Daily Mail****Summary of Complaint**

1. Fadel Soliman complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that the Daily Mail breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "Campus cleric: It's fine to hit wife who doesn't please you", published in print on 9 January, and "'It's fine to hit a wife who doesn't please you': What Islamic cleric is telling students as he tours British universities unchallenged... and he's not alone", published online on 9 January 2016. He also complained about an article headlined "Daily Mail Comment: Socially acceptable?" published on 9 January 2016.
2. The first article said that the complainant, an Islamic cleric, was among a "string of extremist speakers" touring British universities. It referred to a series of YouTube videos in which it said the complainant spoke in favour of hitting women, and outlined the case for sex slavery and polygamy. It reported that the complainant "advises physical punishment for wives who have displeased their husbands", and had said that "the hitting must be done with a small stick". It said that he also explained why it was "necessary" to hit a wife after "passing through two stages of non-physical interaction". The article included a denial from the complainant that he supported domestic violence.
3. The online version of this article was accompanied by a video, which showed short clips from the complainant's lecture at Sheffield University, as well as from his YouTube videos in relation to domestic violence, polygamy and sex slavery. It was identical to the print version, aside from the headline and sub-headlines. The relevant sub-headlines of the online article read: "Egyptian cleric Fadel Soliman told students to do the hitting with a stick", and "Preacher's one of many extremists permitted to voice views unchallenged".
4. The second article was a comment piece which asked why students had tried to ban Germaine Greer from a lecture for saying that "men don't become proper women after sex-change surgery", when no such action had been threatened against the complainant despite him offering advice to Muslims "on the correct way to hit their wives".
5. The online and print versions of the second article were identical.
6. The complainant denied saying, either to students or in his "Islamophobia" series of YouTube videos, that "it's fine to hit a wife who doesn't please you"; that he told students to "do the hitting with a stick"; or that it was "necessary" to hit women. He said that during the video, he was explaining a verse from the Qur'an which says "as to those women on whose part you fear disloyalty and ill-conduct, admonish them first, next refuse to share their beds (and last) spank them". He said that he then put across the views of an Islamic scholar who believed that after two stages of non-physical interaction, a small stick should be used to hit a wife in order to signify that the situation had become more serious, and divorce would be the next step. The complainant said that his own view was that divorce, rather than

- a physical warning, should be the next stage in the process; he said that he was opposed to domestic violence. He said that at the end of the video, he had emphasised that the Prophet Mohammed explicitly forbade such beating of women, and that men are not free to beat their wives. He said that the article was an unfair “cut and paste” job designed to portray him as an extremist.
7. The complainant denied that he had referred students to his YouTube videos when speaking at the five universities; he noted that the newspaper had only attended one of these lectures, and was not in a position to know what was said at the others. He also said the video accompanying the online article, which included clips from his YouTube videos on domestic violence, polygamy and sex slavery, had been selectively edited; he denied promoting polygamy and sex slavery, and was in fact opposed to both.
 8. The complainant also denied he was an “extremist”. He said that he has engaged with governments, police and academics to help with de-radicalisation of Muslim extremists. He said that among Muslims, he is viewed as a moderate thinker, and emphasised that he does not support Al-Qaeda, ISIS or the killing of innocent civilians. He said that the newspaper had ignored the weight of his work against extremism.
 9. The newspaper denied that it was inaccurate to report that the complainant had said “it’s fine to hit a wife that doesn’t please you”, that he “told the students to do the hitting with a stick”, or that it was “necessary” to hit women. It said that in his YouTube video, the complainant had said that the Qur’an tells husbands to adopt a process of three consecutive stages in relation to a disloyal wife; the complainant then quoted the views of an Islamic scholar who advocated “the physical stage” of this process. The newspaper said that the complainant had appeared in the video holding a *sewak* (small twig), which the scholar had advised should be used to strike a woman during the process. It said that the complainant clearly advocated “the physical stage” of the process, and was effectively telling his audience that “it’s fine” to hit a wife. It quoted a passage from the video in which the complainant said that the next warning “must” involve something physical, and said that this justified the assertion that he had said it was “necessary” to hit a woman. In the overall context of what the complainant said in the video, it said that it was not inaccurate to report that the complainant defends domestic violence.
 10. The newspaper acknowledged that the complainant does not support Al-Qaeda, ISIS or the killing of innocent civilians; nonetheless, it defended its characterisation of him as an “extremist” because his views were extreme compared to the “norms of acceptable behaviour in the UK in 2016”. It gave a number of examples of what it said were the complainant’s extreme views, including: instructing young male Muslim students to control their wives’ behaviour and to demand submissiveness from them; that wives should be “admonished”, treated coldly and hit with a stick if they do not conform; the advancement of views that Islam allows relationships between slaves and their masters; and views in relation to the appropriate relationship between young men and women, which it characterised as supporting a degree of segregation of the sexes.
 11. The newspaper said it was not under an obligation to show the complainant’s videos in full, and that the clips shown were an accurate representation of his view.

Relevant Code Provisions

12. Clause 1 (Accuracy)

- i) The Press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information or images, including headlines not supported by the text.
- ii) A significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distortion must be corrected, promptly and with due prominence, and — where appropriate — an apology published. In cases involving IPSO, due prominence should be as required by the regulator.

Findings of the Committee

13. In his YouTube video on domestic violence, the complainant had said that in Islam “men are not free to beat their wives”, and that physical warnings are not “justification for men to physically abuse their wives”. However, the complainant had also spoken in detail about wives being given a physical “warning” before divorce in order to “escalate the intensity of the warning”, and that a small twig – which he displayed during the video – should be used to administer the “warning”. He also relayed a conversation he had with a woman who was considering converting to Islam, during which he persuaded her that this “physical stage” was a useful and necessary part of the process.
14. In the full context of the video, the Committee did not consider that it was significantly misleading to summarise the complainant’s position as “it’s fine to hit a wife that doesn’t please you”, that it is “necessary” to hit women, or “the hitting should be done with a stick”. The newspaper had made clear the nature of the stick in the article; this did not undermine its right to criticise his position. Similarly, it did not consider that it was significantly misleading of the second article to say that he was offering “Muslims advice on how to beat their wives”. There was no breach of Clause 1 in relation to either article.
15. The Committee recognised that the articles’ characterisation of the complainant as an “extremist” reflected an assessment of his views. Such an assessment is a matter of opinion. The Committee acknowledged that an allegation of extremism is a serious one; however, it has a broad meaning and, as a statement of the newspaper’s opinion, is something to which the Code grants considerable latitude. However, the fact that the statement is a matter of opinion does not in itself absolve a newspaper of its obligations under Clause 1. The newspaper had provided a number of examples from the complainant’s YouTube videos which it believed supported its position: namely, the views expressed in relation to husbands’ treatment of their wives, sex slavery and the segregation of young men and women. The Committee wished to make clear that it was not making a judgement on whether the complainant was an “extremist”; rather, it had to decide whether the newspaper had provided sufficient evidence to support its characterisation of him in this way. In this context, while acknowledging the complainant’s position that he does not support Al-Qaeda, ISIS or the killing of innocent civilians, as well as the counter-extremism work he has conducted, the Committee considered that the newspaper had provided a sufficient basis to support its characterisation of his views as “extreme” in the context of generally accepted values and attitudes in Britain. There was no breach of Clause 1.
16. The newspaper was not in a position to know whether the complainant had referred to his series of YouTube videos in his lectures at each of the five

universities; however, it had produced video evidence that he had done so at Sheffield University. In the context of the article as a whole, it was not significantly inaccurate to report that he had mentioned his videos at all five lectures; there was no breach of Clause 1.

17. The video that accompanied the online article contained clips from three of the complainant's YouTube videos. It was clear the video contained clips, rather than the full videos, and the article said that the full videos were available online. In any event, the Committee did not consider that the clips shown gave a misleading representation of the complainant's views on these issues as set out in the full videos; there was no breach of Clause 1.

Conclusions

18. The complaint was not upheld.

APPENDIX H

Paper No.	File Number	Name v Publication
623	12317-15	Levi v The Times
672	01446-16	Booth v Daily Mail
673		Third party
674		Request for review
675	00456-16	McConnell v Ardrossan & Saltcoats Herald
676		Third party
677		Request for review
680		Third party
681		Request for review
684		Third party
685		Request for review
692	00828-16	Tarun v The Sun
693	01493-16	A woman v Shropshire Star
694	01797-16	A woman v Lincolnshire Echo
696		Third party
697		Request for review
698	02096-16	Coles v Hunts Post
699	01157-16	Nylan v Blackpool Gazette
700		Third party
701		Request for review
702	02093-16	Smith v The Scottish Sun
703	01688-16	Nichols v The Sun
706	02067-16	Sheridan v The National