

MINUTES of the COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday 20 April at 10.30am
Via Video Conference Call

Present

Lord Edward Faulks (Chairman)
Nazir Afzal (*Items 1 to 9*)
Andrew Brennan
David Hutton
Alastair Machray
Helyn Mensah
Asmita Naik
Mark Payton
Andrew Pettie (*Items 7 to 15*)
Peter Wright

In attendance:

Charlotte Dewar, Chief Executive
Michelle Kuhler, PA and minute taker
Lauren Sloan, Head of Complaints

Also present: Members of the Executive:

Elizabeth Cobbe
Jane Debois
Rosemary Douce
Alice Gould
Sebastian Harwood
Emily Houlston-Jones
Natalie Johnson
Martha Rowe
Sean Sutherland

Observers:

Jonathan Grun, Editors' Code of Practice Committee

1. Apologies for Absence and Welcomes

Apologies were received from Janette Harkness and Miranda Winram. The Chairman welcomed Jonathan Grun and Martin Trepte as observers. He also welcomed Alastair Machray to his first Complaints Committee meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 2 March.

4. Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

5. Update by the Chairman – oral

The Chairman noted that this was Lauren Sloan's last Committee meeting as Head of Complaints before her departure in May. He noted that all at IPSO were very sorry to see her go and gave a huge thank you on behalf of all staff and Committee members for her skilful contributions to IPSO over the past four years.

IPSO had been looking for a replacement for Head of Complaints and hoped to have the replacement appointed very shortly.

6. Complaints update by Head of Complaints

The Head of Complaints noted that recent complaints traffic had been fairly quiet. She noted that an interesting Clause 16 (Payment to criminals) complaint would be coming to the Committee in the future.

7. Complaint 00474-21 A Woman v lep.co.uk

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should be partly upheld, under Clause 7 (Children in sex cases). **A copy of the ruling appears in Appendix A.**

8. Complaint 10506-20 Russian Direct Investment Fund v The Times

The Committee discussed the complaint and agreed to confirm its decision in correspondence.

9. Complaint 29252-20 Coulson v blackpoolgazette.co.uk

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should be upheld. **A copy of the ruling appears in Appendix B.**

10. Complaint 11343-20/11344-20 A man v mirror.co.uk/express.co.uk

The Committee discussed the complaint and agreed to finalise its decision in correspondence.

11. Complaint 28280-20 A man v Isle of Wight County Press

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should be upheld. **A copy of the ruling appears in Appendix C.**

12. Complaint 11891-20 Islamic Human Rights Commission v thejc.com

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should be no be upheld. **A copy of the ruling appears in Appendix D.**

13. Complaints not adjudicated at a Complaints Committee meeting

The Committee confirmed its formal approval of the papers listed in **Appendix E.**

14. Any other business

There were no other business.

15. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 25th May 2021.

The meeting ended at 1.40pm

Appendix A

Decision of the Complaints Committee – 00474-21 A woman v lep.co.uk

Summary of Complaint

1. A woman complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that lep.co.uk breached Clause 2 (Privacy), Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief and shock), Clause 6 (Children), Clause 7 (Children in sex cases), Clause 11 (Victims of sexual assault) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article published in January 2021.

2. This decision is written in general terms, to avoid the inclusion of information which could identify a victim of sexual assault.

3. The article reported on a court case in which the defendant pleaded guilty to sexually assaulting a child. It gave the age range of the child at the time of the abuse, and an indication as to when the abuse stopped. It contained information from the Victim Personal Statement of the child, and described the circumstances in which the assaults had taken place. The defendant was named in the article.

4. The complainant said the article contained details which implied the relationship between the victim and the defendant in breach of Clause 7. She said that the information in the article was private, and that its publication was upsetting and an intrusion into the child's privacy and grief and shock in breach of Clause 2 and Clause 4, respectively. The complainant also said that she was not aware that a Victim Personal Statement would be read in court, or that this could be published, which she also considered a breach of Clause 2. The complainant also said that the article breached Clause 6 as, whilst she was not in school at the time of publication due to lockdown restrictions, the child was very anxious about returning due to a fear of gossip and having been identified as the victim by the article.

5. The publication did not accept a breach of the Code. It noted that the article did not name the victim, nor give the victim's age, address, school, or describe the victim's appearance or any distinguishing features. It said that the article did not give the location or timing of when the crimes took place, and said that it could have happened at any point during the defendant's life or in a variety of circumstances. It said the article neither stated, nor alluded to, a relationship between the defendant and the victim. It noted that other information was read out in court and that it deliberately chose not to include this in the article in order not to identify the victim, or the victim's relationship to the defendant.

6. With regards to the complaint concerning privacy, the publication said that the Victim Personal Statement was read out in open court. The publication said such statements are an important part of the proceedings and can have a direct impact on the sentence imposed by the court. It noted that guidance makes clear that such statements may be reported in the media, and that the judge referred directly to the statement when sentencing the defendant. The publication also noted that there was further information from the proceedings that it did not include in the

article, but that the information it did choose to include was relevant in order to paint a picture of the defendant. The publication said that, therefore there was not a reasonable expectation of privacy over the information under complaint, and that it was in the public interest to publish it.

7. The publication said it was important to understand the nature of the offences for which the defendant was convicted as the charges which the defendant faced covered a range of potential criminality. It said that therefore it was imperative to explain the evidence presented to the court in order to present a fair and accurate account of the proceedings as required by law, and that doing so did not intrude into the complainant's grief and shock in breach of Clause 4.

8. The publication recognised that both the impact of the offences and court proceedings would have been extremely traumatic for the victim, but as it did not accept that either the victim or the victim's school were identified; it said Clause 6 was not engaged.

Relevant Code Provisions

Clause 2 (Privacy)*

- i) Everyone is entitled to respect for their private and family life, home, physical and mental health, and correspondence, including digital communications.
- ii) Editors will be expected to justify intrusions into any individual's private life without consent. In considering an individual's reasonable expectation of privacy, account will be taken of the complainant's own public disclosures of information and the extent to which the material complained about is already in the public domain or will become so.
- iii) It is unacceptable to photograph individuals, without their consent, in public or private places where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy.

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.

Clause 6 (Children)*

- i) All pupils should be free to complete their time at school without unnecessary intrusion.
- ii) They must not be approached or photographed at school without permission of the school authorities.

iii) Children under 16 must not be interviewed or photographed on issues involving their own or another child's welfare unless a custodial parent or similarly responsible adult consents.

iv) Children under 16 must not be paid for material involving their welfare, nor parents or guardians for material about their children or wards, unless it is clearly in the child's interest.

v) Editors must not use the fame, notoriety or position of a parent or guardian as sole justification for publishing details of a child's private life.

Clause 7 (Children in sex cases)*

The press must not, even if legally free to do so, identify children under 16 who are victims or witnesses in cases involving sex offences.

In any press report of a case involving a sexual offence against a child -

i) The child must not be identified.

ii) The adult may be identified.

iii) The word "incest" must not be used where a child victim might be identified.

iv) Care must be taken that nothing in the report implies the relationship between the accused and the child.

Clause 11 (Victims of sexual assault)

The press must not identify or publish material likely to lead to the identification of a victim of sexual assault unless there is adequate justification and they are legally free to do so. Journalists are entitled to make enquiries but must take care and exercise discretion to avoid the unjustified disclosure of the identity of a victim of sexual assault.

*The Public Interest

There may be exceptions to the clauses marked * where they can be demonstrated to be in the public interest.

1. The public interest includes, but is not confined to:

Detecting or exposing crime, or the threat of crime, or serious impropriety.

Protecting public health or safety.

Protecting the public from being misled by an action or statement of an individual or organisation.

Disclosing a person or organisation's failure or likely failure to comply with any obligation to which they are subject.

Disclosing a miscarriage of justice.

Raising or contributing to a matter of public debate, including serious cases of impropriety, unethical conduct or incompetence concerning the public.

Disclosing concealment, or likely concealment, of any of the above.

2. There is a public interest in freedom of expression itself.

3. The regulator will consider the extent to which material is already in the public domain or will become so.

4. Editors invoking the public interest will need to demonstrate that they reasonably believed publication - or journalistic activity taken with a view to publication - would both serve, and be proportionate to, the public interest and explain how they reached that decision at the time.

5. An exceptional public interest would need to be demonstrated to over-ride the normally paramount interests of children under 16.

Findings of the Committee

9. It is a fundamental principle of open justice that court proceedings may be reported by the media in an open and transparent way. Nonetheless, the terms of Clause 7 impose strict constraints on court reporting of cases involving child victims of sexual offences in recognition of their exceptionally vulnerable position.

10. The Committee recognised that the publication had taken steps to reduce the likelihood that the child would be identified as the victim of the assaults for which the defendant had been convicted. However, Clause 7 (iv) imposes an obligation on a newspaper to take care that nothing in the report of proceedings implies the relationship between the defendant and the victim. The article had reported information heard in court regarding the circumstances in which the offences had taken place which the Committee considered was sufficient to imply the relationship between the defendant and the victim in breach of Clause 7.

11. The Committee acknowledged that the publication of details taken from the Victim Personal Statement had caused the complainant and the child distress and expressed its sympathy. The statement had been read in open court during the course of the proceedings and, as a result, had been placed into the public domain. In circumstances where the child had not been identified in the article, publication of this information did not represent a breach of Clause 2 or Clause 4 of the Code, separate to the issues already addressed under Clause 7.

12. The complaint under Clause 6 (Children) related to concerns that the child's time at school might be affected in the future by the publication of the article. Given that the child had not been identified in the article, publication did not amount to an unnecessary intrusion into the child's time at school. There was no breach of Clause 6.

Conclusion

13. The complaint was upheld under Clause 7.

Remedial Action Required

14. Having upheld the complaint under Clause 7, the appropriate remedy was the publication of an adjudication.

15. The Committee considered the placement of its adjudication. In exercising its powers to determine the nature, extent and placement of a remedy to a breach of the Code that it has established, the Committee will have regard to a number of factors including the seriousness of the breach, its placement within the article, and its prominence. The Committee is also obliged to act proportionately.

16. The adjudication should be published on the newspaper's website, with a link to the full adjudication (including the headline) appearing in the top 50% of stories on the publication's website for 24 hours; it should then be archived in the usual way. The headline to the adjudication should make clear that IPSO has upheld the complaint, give the title of the newspaper and refer to the complaint's subject matter. The headline must be agreed with IPSO in advance.

17. The terms of the adjudication for publication are as follows:

A woman complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that lep.co.uk breached Clause 7 (Children in sex cases) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article published in 2021. Clause 7 of the Code requires that care must be taken that nothing in the report of legal proceedings implies the relationship between the accused and the child. IPSO upheld the complaint and has required lep.co.uk to publish this decision as a remedy to the breach.

The article reported on a court case in which the defendant pleaded guilty to sexually assaulting a child. It contained information which described the circumstances in which the assaults had taken place, were reported and the impacts of the prosecution on the child. The defendant was named in the article.

The complainant said that the article had contained details which had identified the relationship between the child and the defendant.

The newspaper said that the details reported in the article were necessary in order to enable the public to understand the facts of the offence. It provided explanations as to why it did not believe that the details in the article were likely to contribute to

the identification of the victim, and said it had deliberately left out information which may have led to the identification of the victim, or their relationship with the defendant.

The Committee recognised that the publication had taken steps to reduce the likelihood of the victim's identification, but the article had reported information heard in court regarding the circumstances in which the offences had taken place which the Committee considered was sufficient to imply a relationship between the defendant and the victim. The complaint was upheld as a breach of Clause 7.

Date complaint received: 15/01/2021

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 27/05/2021

Independent Complaints Reviewer

The publication complained to the Independent Complaints Reviewer about the process followed by IPSO in handling this complaint. The Independent Complaints Reviewer decided that the process was not flawed and did not uphold the request for review.

Appendix B

Decision of the Complaints Committee – 29252-20 A woman v blackpoolgazette.co.uk

Summary of Complaint

1. A woman complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that blackpoolgazette.co.uk breached Clause 2 (Privacy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "Staff member tests positive for coronavirus at Poulton school", published on 26 November 2020.

2. The online article reported that a class bubble at a named school had been told to self-isolate for 14 days after "a staff member in a Year One class" tested positive for Covid-19. The article stated that the headteacher had told parents a "member of [the] school community" had tested positive for the virus, noting that the school "had been very fortunate that this was the first time that it had to take the action of sending a class bubble home to self-isolate".

3. The article was also promoted on the publication's Facebook page. It was shared with the same headline "Staff member tests positive for coronavirus at Poulton school". It also shared an image showing the outside of the school, with a caption above reading: "A positive Covid-19 case at a Poulton primary school has been confirmed, prompting an infant class bubble to self-isolate."

4. The complainant said that the article, and the subsequent social media post, breached her right to privacy under Clause 2. Although she was not named in the article, she considered that she was identifiable as the staff member who had tested positive for Covid-19. The result of her test had not been common knowledge within the school community before the article's publication and the letter issued by the headteacher to parents had not mentioned that the affected individual was a member of staff, but rather a "member of the school community". She said the newspaper's decision to refer to her as "a staff member in a Year one class" rendered her identifiable to those within the school community and beyond: there were only two members of staff for Year One and given that she was absent from work prior to receiving her test results, it would be clear which staff member was being referred to. She said this had been confirmed in subsequent conversations with parents at the school, who suggested they had been unaware of who had tested positive until they read the article. Furthermore, the complainant said she had been identified as the subject of the article by a neighbour, who was unconnected to the school. This had caused her further distress whilst she was dealing with the long-term effects of the virus. She added that the article made it more difficult for her to return to school, feeling stigmatised by the ordeal.

5. The complainant expressed further concern that the journalist who had written the piece was a parent at the school. The complainant felt this had influenced the

newspaper's decision, particularly when it had not reported on similar incidents at other schools in the area in the same way.

6. The newspaper did not accept that the article, or Facebook post, constituted a breach of the Code. While it accepted that the article could identify the complainant to members of the school's community, it said that it was a "widely held understanding" within this community prior to the publication of the article that the complainant had received a positive test result, as her class had been sent home and placed in isolation. It added that the journalist who had written the story had children at the school, said that the positive case, and their identity, was the "only topic of conversation amongst parents" prior to the article's publication. The newspaper did not accept that the complainant could be identified by those in the wider community, given that it did not name her or provide further details about her. It suggested that an "intimate knowledge" of the school was required to deduce who the specific staff member who tested positive for Covid-19 was.

7. The publication accepted that the official communication from the school's headteacher to parents referred to a "member of the school community" and did not specify whether the individual who had tested positive for Covid-19 was a pupil or member of staff. However, it argued that this communication still left a "shadow" of rumour and supposition amongst parents at the school.

8. The publication further argued that there was a clear public interest in the reporting of Covid-19 cases, particularly in educational settings in order to protect vulnerable members of society. It added that the newspaper had a responsibility to inform the community during a public health emergency of the risk of wider infection, what actions had been taken to mitigate against this and where the potential risk came from and which children may have been potentially exposed to the risk.

9. Notwithstanding this, within 24 hours of the article's publication, after being contacted by the complainant, in a gesture of goodwill, the newspaper amended the online article and removed it from its Facebook page. The updated version of the article reflected the headteacher's statement, referring to "a member of the school community" rather than a "staff member" in a Year One class.

10. During IPSO's investigation, the newspaper apologised for the distress caused and said that the concerns raised by the complainant had prompted it to reflect upon and consequently revise its approach to the reporting of positive Covid-19 cases. It stated that reporters were now required to contact employers in such circumstances prior to publication.

Relevant Code Provisions

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. In considering an individual's reasonable expectation of privacy, account will be taken of the complainant's own public disclosures of information and the extent to which the material complained about is already in the public domain or will become so.

iii) It is unacceptable to photograph individuals, without their consent, in public or private places where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy.

*The Public Interest

There may be exceptions to the clauses marked * where they can be demonstrated to be in the public interest. The public interest includes, but is not confined to:

- Detecting or exposing crime, or the threat of crime, or serious impropriety.
- Protecting public health or safety.
- Protecting the public from being misled by an action or statement of an individual or organisation.
- Disclosing a person or organisation's failure or likely failure to comply with any obligation to which they are subject.
- Disclosing a miscarriage of justice.
- Raising or contributing to a matter of public debate, including serious cases of impropriety, unethical conduct or incompetence concerning the public.
- Disclosing concealment, or likely concealment, of any of the above.

There is a public interest in freedom of expression itself.

The regulator will consider the extent to which material is already in the public domain or will become so.

Editors invoking the public interest will need to demonstrate that they reasonably believed publication - or journalistic activity taken with a view to publication - would both serve, and be proportionate to, the public interest and explain how they reached that decision at the time.

Findings of the Committee

11. The complainant said that the publication had published her private medical information without consent, and that she had been identified as the subject of the article by people in her community. The publication denied any breach of the Code; it said she was not identifiable as the person concerned, and in any case people within the school community were already aware of her identity as the person with Covid. Furthermore, the publication argued that there was a public

interest in reporting the information to reduce the risk of onward transmission. The questions for the Committee to consider were: whether the complainant was identifiable from the information contained in the article; whether the complainant had a reasonable expectation of privacy in respect of her diagnosis with Covid-19; and whether, if the complainant did have a reasonable expectation of privacy, the publication of the information could nonetheless be justified in the public interest.

12. The Committee found that the article included sufficient information to identify the complainant as the recipient of the positive test result. It identified the school, the year group and the fact she was a staff member; only two individuals could meet this description. Coupled with the complainant's absence from school, this was sufficient to identify her to people who already had some knowledge of her role within the local community.

13. The question of whether an individual has contracted Covid-19 is clearly a matter relating to their health, and therefore was information in respect of which the complainant had a reasonable expectation of privacy. This had to be balanced, however, with the public health considerations which arise from a pandemic, and the role a local newspaper plays in protecting the health of the wider community.

14. The Committee noted that the school had informed parents of the existence of a positive Covid-19 case within the school community, and had outlined the steps it had taken to address this; it had not considered the inclusion of further information about the identity of the complainant necessary in order to discharge its duty to protect the health of the wider school community. The publication was entitled to make its own assessment about what was in the public interest. In the view of the Committee, however, the publication had not provided sufficient justification for its decision to include additional information about the complainant's role in the school by which she could be identified, given the steps that had been taken by the school to address the potential risks. The complainant's positive Covid test result was medical information, and she had a reasonable expectation that it would remain private. The publication of this information without her consent breached Clause 2 of the Code.

Conclusion

15. The complaint was upheld.

Remedial Action Required

16. Having upheld the complaint, the Committee considered the remedial action that should be required. Given the nature of the breach, the appropriate remedial action was the publication of an upheld adjudication. The headline of the adjudication must make clear that IPSO has upheld the complaint, and refer to its subject matter; it must be agreed in advance. This should be published on the newspaper's website and Facebook page, with a link to the full adjudication

appearing on the newspaper's homepage for 24 hours; it should then be archived in the usual way.

17. The terms of the adjudication are as follows:

Following an article published on 26 November 2020 headlined "Staff member tests positive for coronavirus at Poulton school", a woman complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO) that blackpoolgazette.co.uk had intruded into her privacy in breach of Clause 2 (Privacy) of the Editors' Code of Practice. IPSO upheld the complaint and has required blackpoolgazette.co.uk to publish this decision as a remedy to the breach.

The online article, which was also shared on social media, reported that a class bubble at a named school had been told to self-isolate for 14 days after "a staff member in a Year One class" tested positive for Covid-19.

Whilst the article did not name the complainant, she considered herself to be readily identifiable from the information included within it, both to members of the school community and the wider community. She said that the article went further than the statement issued by the headteacher of the school which stated that "a member of the school community" had tested positive for Covid-19. She believed that this amounted to an intrusion into her private life as she had a reasonable expectation of privacy over the state of her health, in breach of Clause 2.

The newspaper denied that the article intruded into the complainant's privacy. It disagreed that she could be identified by those outside the school's community. In addition, the publication cited a clear public interest in reporting on positive Covid-19 cases to its readers and alerting them to potential risks.

The Committee found the article included sufficient information to identify the complainant as the recipient of the positive test result. This was medical information relating to the complainant's health in respect of which she had a reasonable expectation of privacy. Nonetheless, the Committees recognised that this had to be balanced with the public health considerations arising from a global pandemic of a highly infectious virus. Whilst the newspaper was entitled to make its own assessment about what was in the public interest, the Committee found that the newspaper had not provided sufficient justification for its decision to include additional information about the complainant's role in the school by which she could be identified. In the view of the Committee, the article amounted to an intrusion into the complainant's private life by publishing, without consent, private medical information. There was a breach of Clause 2 of the Editors' Code.

Date complaint received: 28/11/2020

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 18/05/2021

Appendix C

Decision of the Complaints Committee 28280-20 A man v Isle of Wight County Press

Summary of Complaint

1. A man complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that the Isle of Wight County Press breached Clause 1 (Accuracy), Clause 2 (Privacy) and Clause 6 (Children) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "SOLD FOR SEX AND ABUSED BY HUSBAND / Living a hell at home", published on 25 September 2020.

2. The article was an account of a woman described as a "survivor of horrendous domestic abuse". The article was referenced on the front page with the banner "SOLD FOR SEX AND ABUSED BY HUSBAND". The article explained that the woman had "told the County Press" that her husband was an abuser and had told her story through a "chilling poem", which accompanied the article. She had also been given a pseudonym in the article. The article reported that the woman's husband, who she had since left, had abused her and had "sold his wife for sex, tracked her movements via her phone and timed her when she was permitted to go out." The article also reported he had opened the results of a medical test and lied about its contents. It also said that the police and courts had sided with the husband over the woman. The article described her husband as a "man in a position of high power and considerable finances". Neither the wife, husband nor children were named or photographed in the article.

3. The article also contained multiple quotes directly attributed to the woman. She said that she had "learnt that I've been through coercive control, sexual coercion, rape, GBH, grooming, exploitation, trafficking and imprisonment." She said that her husband had power over her in her workplace, had groomed her and "opened up seven bank accounts in my name without my knowledge, which he loaded up with hundreds of thousands of pounds, and cleared them the day I left". She said that she had now started high-intensity complex PTSD therapy with the NHS, moved out and had started a new hobby. The article included biographical details about the husband and wife as well as information regarding their conduct and behaviours. The article was followed by the poem written by the woman, which described the abuse she said she had experienced, and one line used a pet name unique to this woman/family.

4. The article also appeared online under the headline "Isle of Wight woman speaks of domestic abuse horror", in substantially the same format.

5. The complainant, who said he was the husband of the woman in the article, was complaining on his and his children's behalf. He said that the article was inaccurate in breach of Clause 1. He said that he had not abused his wife, and provided copies of notifications of "no further action" letters received from the police, after the police had investigated the allegations by his wife. He also provided notes from a child protection conference which repeated that many of the claims his wife made were considered to be false. He also said that her social media posts showed that she did go out with friends during their period together. He said that it was inaccurate to state that he had opened her mail or lied about her health to her, and had opened bank accounts in her name. He further stated that both social services and the police had found her work was not threatened due to him. He also said it was inaccurate to report that he had sold his wife for sex, and that this allegation had not been made previously, or been reported to the police.

6. The complainant said it was misleading to report that the police and courts "took his side" when he received residency of the children, as there had been thorough investigations by both the police and social services that found that there was not enough evidence to prosecute him and concluded that his children should be returned to his custody. He also said it was inaccurate to report that the woman was receiving treatment for PTSD through the NHS, as he had seen her medical records during the court case.

7. The complainant said that the article also breached his right to privacy under Clause 2. He said that both he and his children were identifiable from the information published in the article, as it accurately described certain biographical details about him, his wife, the recent changes to their domestic circumstances, and other information relating to their conduct and behaviour. The complainant said that the effect of this was exacerbated as he lives in a small town on the Isle of Wight.

8. The complainant said that the article had also intruded into his children's time at school in breach of Clause 6. He said that his children were being monitored by social services and their teachers. He noted that the allegations in the article had been repeated to one of his children at school. He said that his other children had received comments and questions at school, and that one of his children had said that friends' parents do not allow their children to come to his home.

9. The publication did not accept a breach of the Code, but deleted the article upon receipt of the complaint as a gesture of goodwill. It said the woman in the article had sent the newspaper her poem, at which point a journalist with previous experience of speaking to victims of domestic abuse, spoke at length with the woman. The journalist said that the experiences of the woman matched what she had previously written about domestic abuse victims, in that their partners were not convicted of crimes and the victims are often not believed. The woman said she was speaking to an abuse support group and the NHS. The newspaper emailed the abuse support group, and after receiving no response followed up with a phone call, but was unable to speak to the woman's councillor – it assumed

this was due to reasons of confidentiality. The woman had also written a very detailed blog of her experiences which she shared with the newspaper, and the information contained within the blog corresponded to what she had said during the interview.

10. The publication said that prior to writing the article it had been aware that the police and courts had sided with the woman's husband – indeed, this was the angle of the story. The publication said it knew that the husband would have denied the allegations. It said that the woman felt she had no power, and that the article and her poem was a way of her having a voice and expressing her opinion. The publication said that it was very difficult to “prove” deeply personal domestic situations, and that it was important for victims, even where the police or courts had not found in their favour, to be able to tell their story. It said it made sure to anonymise the article on this basis.

11. The publication also said that the article was not presented as a straightforward news article, and that it was framed as a first-person narrative. It said it was framed from the outset as “her story” and, in addition to the multitude of quotes, the poem was framed as “she told the County Press”. It said that readers would understand that the article was being told from the woman's side and was only one version of events. It also made sure to state that both the police and courts had taken the husband's side.

12. The publication did not accept that the complainant was identified by anyone outside of the people with whom he had already discussed the events. The publication said it had taken care to remove any information which could identify him to a larger audience, such as the town they lived in, the number of children they had, and it had changed the woman's name. It also said it had amended lines in the poem which specified the duration of the marriage and had named a specific location.

13. The publication said the information that was included within the article could not identify a specific person. It said that some of the information the complainant said identified him was not mentioned in the article. It also noted that, as the town was not specified, the article could relate to anyone within the Isle of Wight's population of 140,000 people. The publication also said that the complainant did not have a high public profile and his name was not widely known. It said that, therefore, writing that the man was in a position of power and had considerable finances did not identify him. It said that the pet term in the poem would not be known to anyone not close enough with his wife to know the circumstances described and that the conduct and behaviours described could be true of many people.

14. The publication also stated that the complainant had set up a fake social media account and that a relative of the complainant had also posted comments under her own name on the publication's website, referring to her familial relationship to the complainant. The publication said this could have led to the identification of the complainant, rather than the anonymised article itself. It said no one had

contacted it identifying him, and that it had not been asked to remove it by the police, courts, or social workers.

15. The publication said that as the children could not be identified in the article, there was no breach of Clause 6. It also noted that as some of the complainant's children were six and under, they would be unaware of the article, and noted that a document provided by the complainant said that they may become aware of it in the future. It said that any comments from other pupils could not be demonstrated to have resulted from the article as opposed to other sources.

16. The complainant accepted that he had created a fake social media profile and that a family member had commented on the article, but stated that he had been identified multiple times prior to these comments by people who were not aware of the details of his case.

Relevant Clause Provisions

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 private and family life, home, physical and mental health, and correspondence, including digital communications.
- ii) Editors will be expected to justify intrusions into any individual's private life without consent. In considering an individual's reasonable expectation of privacy, account will be taken of the complainant's own public disclosures of information and the extent to which the material complained about is already in the public domain or will become so.
- iii) It is unacceptable to photograph individuals, without their consent, in public or private places where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy.

Clause 6 (Children)*

- i) All pupils should be free to complete their time at school without unnecessary intrusion.
- ii) They must not be approached or photographed at school without permission of the school authorities.
- iii) Children under 16 must not be interviewed or photographed on issues involving their own or another child's welfare unless a custodial parent or similarly responsible adult consents.
- iv) Children under 16 must not be paid for material involving their welfare, nor parents or guardians for material about their children or wards, unless it is clearly in the child's interest.
- v) Editors must not use the fame, notoriety or position of a parent or guardian as sole justification for publishing details of a child's private life.

The Public Interest

There may be exceptions to the clauses marked * where they can be demonstrated to be in the public interest.

1. The public interest includes, but is not confined to:

- Detecting or exposing crime, or the threat of crime, or serious impropriety.
- Protecting public health or safety.
- Protecting the public from being misled by an action or statement of an individual or organisation.
- Disclosing a person or organisation's failure or likely failure to comply with any obligation to which they are subject.
- Disclosing a miscarriage of justice.
- Raising or contributing to a matter of public debate, including serious cases of impropriety, unethical conduct or incompetence concerning the public.
- Disclosing concealment, or likely concealment, of any of the above.

2. There is a public interest in freedom of expression itself.

3. The regulator will consider the extent to which material is already in the public domain or will become so.

4. Editors invoking the public interest will need to demonstrate that they reasonably believed publication - or journalistic activity taken with a view to publication - would both serve, and be proportionate to, the public interest and explain how they reached that decision at the time.

5. An exceptional public interest would need to be demonstrated to over-ride the normally paramount interests of children under 16.

Findings of the Committee

17. The Committee made clear that it is of significant public interest for the press to be able to report on domestic abuse. It noted that IPSo is not in a position to make a ruling over whether either parties' allegations were accurate, and that its role was to find whether the publication breached the Editors' Code. In such sensitive and personal cases, the press has a responsibility to ensure that it is reporting in a responsible and accurate way, and to balance the rights of all individuals involved.

18. The publication accepted that the complainant was the man referred to in the article, but said that it was impossible to prove allegations as personal as those relating to domestic issues, and so it had anonymised the article in order to be able to tell the woman's story. It also said it had taken care to portray the story as being from the woman's point of view and had made clear that the police and courts had found in her husband's favour. However, the publication retained an obligation to ensure that it took care over the accuracy of published claims, and to distinguish claims from established facts.

19. While some aspects of the woman's account in the article were clearly attributed to her as claims, the article had stated as fact that the complainant's wife was a "survivor of horrendous domestic abuse", that her husband had sold her for sex, tracked her movements, timed when she was permitted to go out and lied to her about the contents of a private medical letter. These were extremely serious claims of behaviour, some of which would amount to criminal conduct. The publication accepted that its sole source of information was the woman herself; it had attempted to speak to her counsellor but had been unable to do so. It had not taken other steps, such as contacting the complainant or any official source, to test the allegations. Given the nature of the allegations and the limited steps that the publication had taken, the Committee found that their presentation in this form represented a failure to take care over the accuracy of the article and was a breach of Clause 1(i). The accusations were very serious and damaging to the complainant and were therefore significant and required clarification. The publication had offered a right to reply to the complainant, but this did not meet the requirements of Clause 1(ii). There was therefore a further breach of Clause 1(ii).

20. The article also contained several claims which had been made by the complainant's wife and which were presented as direct quotes from her. They were clearly distinguished as the comments of his wife, and not as established fact, and the publication of these claims did not breach Clause 1.

21. The complainant had noted a number of biographical details and information relating to the conduct and behaviour of both him and his wife that he said could make him identifiable as the husband. The Committee considered that the extent of biographical information contained in the article reduced the possible pool of families this article could relate to. The article also gave details about the his wife's behaviours and conduct that had the potential to identify the family within the local

community. When taken together, these personal and biographical details about the complainant had the clear potential to identify the complainant and his children as the subjects of the article, and the complainant as the subject of the allegations. The Committee found that the allegations against the complainant related his family life, in respect of which he had a reasonable expectation of privacy. Clause 2 was therefore engaged.

22. The Committee then considered whether the publication of this information was justified in the public interest. The Committee recognised the importance of the right of freedom of expression generally, and specifically noted the public interest in reporting on matters of significant public interest, such as domestic abuse. The Committee noted, further, the importance of balancing the right of individuals to give an account of their experiences with the rights of individuals who may challenge that account. The publication had recognised that the woman's account could be given without infringing the rights of the husband and children; indeed, it sought to do so by anonymising the woman. However, in this instance, the article contained extensive information about the complainant and his children and their family life, which made them identifiable as the subject of the article. The information about him and the children, including the disputed allegations, was plainly information about their private lives in respect of which they had a reasonable expectation of privacy and its publication was an unjustified intrusion in breach of Clause 2.

23. The relevant part of the Editors' Code relating to the complainant's children was Clause 6(i) which states that all pupils should be free to complete their time at school without unnecessary intrusion. The complainant had stated that his children had faced problems at school after the publication of the article, where allegations about their father had been repeated to them. Publication of the article, in circumstances where the children were identifiable, represented an unnecessary intrusion into their time at school. As the publication had not identified an exceptional public interest there was a breach of Clause 6.

Conclusions

24. The complaint was upheld under Clause 1, Clause 2 and Clause 6.

Remedial action required

25. Having upheld the complaint, the Committee considered what remedial action should be required. In circumstances where the Committee had established a breach of Clause 1, Clause 2, and Clause 6, the appropriate remedial action was an adjudication.

26. The Committee considered the placement of the adjudication. The print article had featured on page 3, with a banner referencing the article on the front page. The Committee therefore required that the adjudication should be published on page 3 or further forward in the newspaper, with a reference to the adjudication on the front page. The headline to the adjudication should make clear that IPSO

has upheld the complaint, reference the title of the newspaper and refer to the complaint's subject matter. The headline must be agreed with IPSO in advance.

27. The adjudication should also be published online, with a link to this adjudication (including the headline) being published on the top 50% of the publication's homepage for 24 hours; it should then be archived in the usual way. The headline to the adjudication should make clear that IPSO has upheld the complaint, give the title of the publication and refer to the complaint's subject matter. The headline must be agreed with IPSO in advance.

28. The terms of the adjudication for publication are as follows:

Following an article published on 25 September 2020 headlined "SOLD FOR SEX AND ABUSED BY HUSBAND / Living a hell at home", a man complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that the newspaper had breached Clause 1 (Accuracy), Clause 2 Privacy and Clause 6 (Children) of the Editors' Code of Practice. IPSO upheld this complaint and has required the Isle of Wight County Press to publish this decision as a remedy to the breach.

The article was an account of a woman described as a "survivor of horrendous domestic abuse". The article was referenced on the front page with the banner "SOLD FOR SEX AND ABUSED BY HUSBAND" advertising the article on the front page of the newspaper. The article explained that the woman had "told the County Press" that her husband was an abuser and had told her story through a "chilling poem", which accompanied the article. The article reported that the woman's husband, who she had since left, had abused her and had "sold his wife for sex, tracked her movements via her phone and timed her when she was permitted to go out." The article also reported he had opened medical letters and lied about their content. It said that the police and courts had sided with her husband and he had acquired residency of the children. The article contained biographical details about the man and his wife, as well as references to their conduct and behaviour.

The complainant, who said he was the husband of the woman in the article, was complaining on his and his children's behalf. He said that the article was inaccurate in breach of Clause 1. He said that he had not abused his wife, and provided notifications of no further action from the police. He also provided notes from a child protection conference which repeated that many of the claims his wife had made were considered to be false. He also said that her social media showed that she did go out with friends during their period together. He said that it was inaccurate to state that he had opened her medical test results, and that she had lied about suffering from a serious illness. The complainant said that both social services and the police had found that her work was not affected by him. He also said that whilst there had been bank accounts which were opened in his wife's name and then emptied, this had been done so by his wife, and not by him. He also said it was inaccurate to report that he had sold his wife for sex, and that this allegation had not been made previously, or been reported to the police. The complainant said that whilst he was not named in the article, the biographical details about him and his wife, as well as references to their conduct and behaviour

made him identifiable. He also said that his children had faced problems at school since the publication of the article, including allegations from the article being repeated to his children at school.

IPSO made clear that domestic abuse is an important and sensitive issue of significant public interest. The press plays a critical role in highlighting such issues, however, when doing so the press has a responsibility to ensure that it is reporting in a responsible and accurate way and to balance the rights of all individuals involved. IPSO was not making a finding on the accuracy of the allegations, but whether there had been a breach of the Editors' Code.

IPSO found that the article had stated as fact that the complainant's wife was a "survivor of horrendous domestic abuse", that her husband had sold her for sex, tracked her movements, timed when she was permitted to go out and had lied about medical information relating to her after he had opened a letter addressed to her.

IPSO found that where the publication had failed to demonstrate how it had taken care not to publish inaccurate information there was a breach of Clause 1.

IPSO also considered that the biographical details and information relating to the conduct and behaviour of both him and his wife rendered the complainant identifiable as the husband in the article. The Committee found that the allegations against the complainant related his family life, in respect of which he had a reasonable expectation of privacy and the information was not justified nor in the public interest. There was a breach of Clause 2.

IPSO had found that the complainant was identifiable in the article, and his children had faced problems at school after the publication of the article, where allegations about their father had been repeated to them. The allegations related to serious, intimate and inaccurate allegations and amounted to an intrusion into their time at school. Publication of the article, in circumstances where the children were identifiable, represented an unnecessary intrusion into their time at school, and there was a breach of Clause 6.

Date complaint received: 28/09/2020

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 10/06/2021

Appendix D

Decision of the Complaints Committee – 11891-20 Islamic Human Rights Commission v thejc.com

Summary of Complaint

1. Islamic Human Rights Commission complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that thejc.com breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) and Clause 12 (Discrimination) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "Government lawyer joined rally featuring call for removal of Jews from Israel", published on 27 May 2020.

2. The complaint was made on the complainant's own behalf and on behalf of Nazim Ali and Imam Muhammed al-Asi, with their consent. The article reported on an annual Al Quds Day rally, which in 2020 was held online. It said that previously "The JC has reported on how past Al Quds Day marches witnessed calls for extreme violence against Israel". The article described who was present and spoke at the rally, as well as containing a quote from a "campaigner against antisemitism" which stated "I don't think anybody should associate with a toxic event like this. It is beyond understanding how someone who works for the Government Legal Department can possibly justify her appearance when the event is clearly linked to the violent and radical Islamist ideologies of the ayatollahs in Iran." The article also referred to how "In June 2017, Nazim Ali faced a police investigation after he was filmed suggesting Zionists were responsible for the Grenfell Towers fire tragedy in West London. After consideration, the Crown Prosecution Service decided not to prosecute." The article also contained a quotation from Imam Muhammad al-Asi which stated "There are certainly some of the Jewish faith who have the freedom to settle in the Holy Land. But there are definitely many more others who don't have the right to be there. So our concern in the future should be on trying to figure out those of the Jewish faith who have been hijacked by Zionism and sort them out from the Zionist culprits and war criminals that have to be defeated, and have to withdraw by force because that is the only option left for them by their own choice. Begin to speak about who can stay in Palestine."

3. The complainant, one of the groups who organised the rally, said that the article was inaccurate in breach of Clause 1. It noted that the rally took place every year for almost 40 years and that it took place online this year. It refuted that participants at the event had called "for extreme violence against Israel".

4. The complainant also said that referring to the police investigation of Nazim Ali's comments regarding the Grenfell Towers tragedy were not relevant to the story or the calls for extreme violence. It also said that to omit to refer to a third party campaigning group was misleading as the campaign had lobbied for the

prosecution and attempted to prosecute Mr Ali privately, as well as judicially review the decision not to prosecute.

5. The complainant also said it was inaccurate to characterise a quote as being given by a “campaigner against antisemitism” as the person who gave the quote was controversial and a columnist for the newspaper.

6. The complainant said that the quote from Imam Muhammed al-Asi was misleading as it wasn’t reproduced within its full context. It said that the full speech discussed the rights of Jews including Zionists to settle in and stay in the Holy Land, and his comments about “war criminals” were very specific and related to self-defence.

7. The complainant said that the article had failed to give them an opportunity to reply to their claims in breach of Clause 1.

8. The complainant also said that the article was discriminatory in breach of Clause 12 as it felt that the complainant as a corporate body, and also Nazim Ali and Imam al-Asi, who they were representing, were discriminated against by the article. It said that their religious affiliation and the ethnic affiliations of some of its members had been highlighted pejoratively. It said the use of the words “extreme” and “violence” were pejorative.

9. During IPSO’s investigation the publication failed to respond within IPSO’s time frame. The delay was reported to IPSO’s Standards Department, and when the publication still failed to respond within the time limit set by IPSO the matter was proceeded to the Complaints Committee without the benefit of the publication’s full response.

10. The publication did not accept a breach of the Code. The publication failed to supply any articles where the JC had previously reported on “calls for extreme violence against Israel”. It said Hezbollah flags had been raised and chants of “death to Israel” had been heard, but provided no evidence of this. It did supply a video, which it said showed the head of the complainant’s organisation calling for “Jihad in Palestine like in Syria” and members of the crowd cheering this. The video supplied by the publication did not contain this quote. It started part way through the head of the complainant’s organisation’s speech and showed him saying that people from around the world who had left “to go and do Jihad in Syria. What about Jihad in Palestine?”. It also stated that in 2012 the head of the complainant’s organisation had been filmed calling to the crowd: “Let’s get rid of the greatest oppressors in the region, the Zionists, then all our other problems will be resolved, one by one.” It did not provide the video of this. The publication also said that an Iranian State television interview the head of the complainant had said “it is” when asked if resistance was the message of the Al-Quds Day march. It did not provide the video of this.

11. The publication said that the publication of information relating to the police investigation of Nazim Ali's comments regarding the Grenfell Towers tragedy and the omission of referring to the campaigning group was not a breach of the Code.

12. The publication said that the person described as a "campaigner against antisemitism" had investigated concerns about antisemitism in his blog, and therefore it was not inaccurate to describe him as a "campaigner against antisemitism". It also said the person had wrote three or four articles for the publication, and that they were entitled to use his comments without having to declare this. It described the man as an expert and that he was an appropriate source.

13. The publication said that Imam Muhammed al-Asi's quotations had not been published selectively or in a way that was misleading. It also said that the complainant had made similar comments, such as in an article he wrote for another website and during two speeches at an American university. It said that clips of these speeches had been published by a project which investigated racism.

14. The publication said that it had approached the government lawyer referred to in the headline and the Government Legal Department for comment.

15. The complainant said that the quotes provided by the publication were either cropped to the point of distorting their meaning, or in many cases did not exist. It said that the video supplied by the publication had clearly been edited and cropped mid-sentence. It supplied a full version of the speech which included the full quote "You know, people are rushing in large numbers from Britain, from Europe, from all around the world, from Arab countries, to go and do jihad in Syria. What about jihad in Palestine? [Cheers from crowd]. What even not a single one of them gone to fight for Palestine?" The complainant said this speech was criticising those who went to Syria to fight and to call out their hypocrisy, and not to say that there should be Jihad in Palestine.

16. It provided a video of the head of the complainant's organisation's speech from 2012 and said the quote provided by the publication did not appear in it. It did acknowledge that in his speech of 2013 he said "We want people to stand up for the oppressed, and stand up for what is just. Let us get rid of the racist oppressors in the region, the Zionists, then all our other problems will be solved one by one." The complainant said that this was not a call for extreme violence against Israel, but a condemnation of those who were fighting in Syria as hypocrites. It also said it did not know what interview the publication was referring to as it had provided no evidence or even named the program. The complainant said that the project the publication had got the video clips of Imam Muhammed al-Asi speaking to universities in America came from a discredited study which had been criticised as being inaccurate, libellous, and inciting Islamophobia and racism.

Relevant Code Provisions

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 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

17. The Committee was very concerned that the publication had failed in its obligations to respond to IPSO within its set timelines. However, the publication had supplied a video of a past Al-Quds Day march in which a speaker had stated that people went “to go and do jihad in Syria” and then asked: “what about jihad in Palestine?” followed by cheers from the crowd. The video showed the same speaker saying: “what even not a single one of them gone to fight for Palestine?”. Whilst the Committee acknowledged that “jihad” has a multitude of meanings, the reference to “jihad” in the speech referred to travellers going to two locations that have been the site of armed conflict, Syria and Palestine. In this context, the Committee found that the publication was entitled to characterise this as “calls for extreme violence against Israel” in the article, which focused on the 2020 event. There was no breach of Clause 1 on this point.

18. The Committee noted that whether information is of relevance to the article in general does not fall under Clause 1 unless the inclusion of the information is misleading. In this case, reporting that Nazim Ali had been investigated by the police was not misleading. The omission of the campaigning group was also not misleading when reporting the facts that a police investigation took place. There was no breach of Clause 1 on these points.

19. The person who had been described as a “campaigner against antisemitism” had multiple public campaigns against antisemitism, and therefore it was not misleading to characterise him in this way. In addition, when quoting from him, it was not a breach of Clause 1 to omit to mention that he was a controversial figure and that he had previously written for the publication. There was no breach of Clause 1 on this point.

20. The article had quoted a large portion of a speech by Imam Muhammed al-Asi. The complainant had not disputed the accuracy of the quote, and where a large portion of the quote was included in full this was not misleading.

21. The right to reply is not a standalone requirement of the Code, but failing to contact a person or organisation for comment can lead to a failure to take care under Clause 1(i) where there are allegations in the article. In this case, the article did not contain unproven allegations against the Islamic Human Rights Centre directly and did not require a standalone correction.

22. The Code makes clear that the protections of Clause 12 only apply to individuals, and therefore the Clause was not engaged with regards to the Islamic Human Rights Commission. With respect to the individual complainants, the Committee did not consider that an allegation of advocacy for “extreme violence” constituted a pejorative or prejudicial reference to either man’s race or religion. There was no breach of Clause 12

Conclusions

23. The complaint was not upheld.

Remedial Action Required

24. N/A

Date complaint received: 15/07/2021

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 16/06/2021

Appendix E

Paper No.	File Number	Name v Publication
1897	08138-19/08755-19	Allison/North Ayrshire Council v irvinetimes.com
1989	09479-20	Nulty v Daily Express
1984	11372-20	Various v Telegraph.co.uk
1991	02581-20	Tarman v mirror.co.uk
1993	00996-20	Gibson v thesun.co.uk
2006		Request for review
2016		Request for review
1994	00236-20	Sharp v Take a Break
2003	08775-20	Bromley v The Spectator
2032		Request for review
2022	06731-20	Gilbert v The Northern Echo
2037		Request for review
2013	05094-20	Gething v The Sun
2033	08136-20	Mitchison v express.co.uk
2042		Request for review
1985	02672-20	Parker v Mail Online
1999	09788-20	Parker v liverpoolecho.co.uk
2021	01257-20	Islamic Human Rights Commission v The Jewish Chronicle
2051		Request for review
2026	12131-20	Emmett v Daily Mirror
2034	11861-20	Commuter Club Ltd v The Sunday Times
2035	09798-20	Taylor v Sunday Mirror
2036	12103-20	Smith v Mail Online
2039	10490-20	Devlin v dailyrecord.co.uk
2055		Request for review
2028	11860-20	Bunglawala v express.co.uk
2019	04851-20	Taylor v Sunday Life
2062	12355-20	Coleman v The Spectator
2078	12114-20	British Fur Trade Association v Daily Mirror
2082	28442-20	Glenwright v dailyrecord.co.uk
2090		Request for review
1973	01721-20	Waine v Galloway News
2041	09166-20	MacGregor v The Scotsman
2085	28194-20/28470-20/28471-20	Alfa Travel v walesonline.co.uk/South Wales Echo/Western Mail

2091	26642-20	Talbot v The Sunday Telegraph
2093		Request for review
2060	15682-20	Bride v Milton Keynes Citizen
2064	11845-20	Whitehead v Telegraph.co.uk
2086	27701-20	Singh v Birmingham Mail
2089	28437-20	Wimborne-Idrissi v thejc.com
2094	25169-20	Mote Medical Practice v kentonline.co.uk
2098		Request for review
2111		Request for review
2056	11011-20	Raja v thesun.co.uk
2088	28014-20	Findlay v The Scottish Sun
2100	27885-20	Sunderland v Daily Record
2108	28636-20	Enright v The Times
2116		Request for review