

Reach PLC

Annual Statement to the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO)¹

For the period

1 January to 31 December 2019

¹Pursuant to Regulation 43 and Annex A of the IPSO Regulations (The Regulations: <https://www.ipso.co.uk/media/1240/regulations.pdf>) and Clause 3.3.7 of the Scheme Membership Agreement (SMA: <https://www.ipso.co.uk/media/1292/ipso-scheme-membership-agreement-2016-for-website.pdf>)

Contents

1.	Foreword.....	2
2.	Overview.....	2
3.	Responsible Person.....	2
4.	Reach PLC.....	3
4.1	Editorial Standards.....	3
4.2	Complaints Handling Process	8
4.3	Training Process.....	11
4.4	Reach PLC's Record On Compliance.....	12
5.	Schedule.....	21

1. Foreword

The reporting period covers 1 January to 31 December 2019 (“the Relevant Period”).

2. Overview

Reach PLC is the largest news publisher in the UK.

Formerly known as Trinity Mirror PLC, the company changed its name following the acquisition of publishing assets of Northern & Shell Media Group Limited in May 2018.

Trinity Mirror was formed in 1999 by the merger of Trinity PLC and Mirror Group PLC. In November 2015, Trinity Mirror acquired Local World Ltd. Local World had been incorporated on 7 January 2013 following the merger between Northcliffe Media and Iliffe News and Media.

The company integrated its editorial complaints handling, compliance and training protocols for its newly acquired Northern and Shell titles from January 1 2019. As many procedures and policies inherited from Trinity Mirror PLC are unchanged, much of the 2018 report repeats the content of previous reports.

2.1 Publications & Editorial Content

During the Relevant Period, Reach plc published 11 National Newspapers, 172 Regional Newspapers (with associated magazines, apps and supplements as applicable) and 56 websites. Some websites were consolidated into the “Live” brand during this period. A full list of Reach plc’s publications for the Relevant Period is attached to this document².

3. Responsible Person³

Reach plc’s Responsible Person is Paul Mottram.

² See 5.1 Annex A

³ Pursuant to Clause 3.3.9 of the SMA

(<https://www.ipso.co.uk/media/1292/ipso-scheme-membership-agreement-2016-for-website.pdf>)

4. Reach plc

4.1 Editorial Standards⁴

The maintenance of high editorial standards is at the core of Reach PLC's business. All editorial staff are contractually bound to adhere to the Editors' Code of Practice ("the Code") by the terms of their employment. Furthermore, all agencies and freelancers, who supply us with editorial material are required to comply with the Code.

As a mark of its commitment to the maintenance of such standards and to acknowledge and address the difficulties that are presented in the everyday course of fast-paced current events journalism, Reach PLC's (then Trinity Mirror's) Board issued the following Risk Appetite Statement to senior management in April 2015:

[Reach plc] has no appetite for behaviours, past or present, that constitute a breach of IPSO's Editors' Code of Practice.

Reach plc has no appetite for behaviours or decisions that knowingly lead to the publication of inaccurate, misleading or distorted information.

We are committed to doing business in accordance with IPSO's Editors' Code of Practice. The Group recognises that protecting the rights of the individual consistently comes into conflict with the public's right to know and acknowledge that, as a consequence, we will have to make difficult judgements which are impossible to get right all of the time.

Reach plc has little appetite for errors or misjudgements in the normal course of business, but as stated above, the Group recognises that the business of publishing information – particularly when it is done quickly in the digital environment - brings with it a level of risk that mistakes will occur. However, the Group will continually seek improvements to its behaviours, processes and systems in order to ensure that the risk of errors is mitigated and that the correct judgements are made in balancing the rights of the individual and the rights of the public to know.

⁴ Pursuant to Clause 3.3.1 to 3.3.3 of the SMA
(<https://www.ipso.co.uk/media/1292/ipso-scheme-membership-agreement-2016-for-website.pdf>)

Pre-publication Guidance from IPSO

We have had occasion to consult with IPSO and, historically, the PCC over pre-publication guidance, primarily with “borderline” judgments involving the privacy of photographs etc. We have also consulted over issues such as the updating of stories with new information when there is an outstanding IPSO complaint.

IPSO Notices

Notices and warnings received from IPSO are distributed to the relevant editorial staff as soon as possible together with legally privileged guidance, if appropriate.

Verification of Stories

Reach plc expects its staff to use their best endeavours to verify the stories that are put forward for publication. Stories involving potentially contentious issues are reviewed by the newsdesk and then legal/Code compliance advice is generally sought from the legal department before publication. Code compliance issues are also considered on our regional titles by Managing Editors if serious allegations are being made. Furthermore, journalists are encouraged to seek comment from the subjects of stories where appropriate.

Reach plc’s policy on provenance is as follows:

Provenance

Editorial executives on all our titles are reminded that it is their responsibility to understand the provenance of material, both words and pictures, and to satisfy themselves that it has been appropriately obtained.

Journalists have an obligation under IPSO’s Editors’ Code of Practice to protect their sources, but we also have a duty to establish that the sources we use are reliable. Protecting our journalists’ sources and insisting on knowing who our sources are, are not mutually exclusive.

Although they can delegate the authority where necessary, story provenance is ultimately the responsibility of the Editor.

In this area the Company relies on its integrity, experience and professionalism.

If there is an anonymous source, whether received internally or via an agency, the Editor must take this into account when making their judgement on whether to publish and in doing so must ask pertinent questions and seek legal advice if necessary.

Although there may, in certain circumstances, be good reasons why the actual identity of a source is not known to the Editor, uncertainty as to provenance should in itself be a reason to question whether a story should be published.

It is usual journalistic practice to approach the subject matter of a story for comment before publication if serious allegations are being made by a third party. Further guidance is provided as stories are filtered through Content Editors, and if appropriate, legal advice is sought and taken.

Trust Project

25 of Reach plc's news websites were founder members of the Trust Project [thetrustproject.org], which was launched in November 2017 as an international initiative, having been set up from Santa Clara University. The project is supported by Google, Facebook and Twitter, and has brought media organisations across Europe and the Americas together to help readers make informed decisions about whether a news story is credible, quality journalism they can trust. Its three main commitments are "social responsibility, transparency and integrity". Fellow launch partners include the Washington Post, the Economist, the Globe and Mail, and La Stampa. Each participating website carries the Trust Project Logo next to IPSO's logo and includes:

- a letter from the editor explaining each site's coverage priorities, campaigning record and editorial ethos.
- an extended "About Us" page setting out journalistic values, key editors, ownership, funding, feedback and corrections and complaints mechanisms
- more information about Reach plc's writers, both on articles and on writer profile pages, reached by clicking on names shown in red at the top of stories.

A Reach representative continues to work closely with the Trust Project team to discuss and help agree international standards and frameworks as the project continues to expand.

An example of the “Letter from the Editor” is set out below:

Letter from the Editor

When BelfastLive was launched in February 2015, our vision was to be the beating heart and a new voice for a vibrant, exciting city which has left the shackles of the past behind.

We intend to provide in-depth news and information about Belfast, for the people of this new Belfast.

We cover stories as they break with an energy and enthusiasm which focuses on the real issues which matter to the people of the city. We are as local as our readers and that's why we also care about the issues which they care about.

The people of Belfast were, we felt, ready for a new voice, one that chats with them rather than talking at them.

That's what BelfastLive aimed to be and, I believe, has been.

We are delighted to be a launch partner of The Trust Project as we endeavour to make it simpler for readers of all ages and from all around the world to discover more about who we are and what we believe in.

Ethics policy

The maintenance of high editorial standards is at the core of BelfastLive's business philosophy.

Reach PLC, BelfastLive's parent company, is a member of and is regulated by IPSO, the Independent Press Standards Organisation.

Our journalists work according to The Editors' Code of Practice, which sets the benchmark for ethical standards in journalism and is enforced by IPSO. On joining BelfastLive, all editorial staff complete a training course in the Code and legal refresher training.

At BelfastLive, we recognise that protecting the rights of the individual consistently comes into conflict with the public's right to know. This means we have to make difficult judgements, sometimes quickly, which are impossible to get right all of the time. Regular bulletins and seminars give staff the best opportunity to learn from mistakes, whether our own or those of other parts of the media industry.

We are a launch partner of The Trust Project, an international initiative to make it easier for readers to find out more about the organisations and the people providing them with news, and to support quality journalism.

Verification and fact checking

We expect our staff to use their best endeavours to verify the stories being put forward for publication.

Unnamed sources

Journalists have an obligation under IPSO's Editors' Code of Practice to protect their sources, but we also have a duty to establish that the sources we use are reliable and that material has been appropriately obtained. Story provenance is ultimately the responsibility of the Editor.

When using unnamed sources, the company relies on the integrity, experience and professionalism of its staff.

Our awards and successes

At BelfastLive we've been delighted and honoured to have picked up a number of awards – some within six months of launching. We won Website Of The Year at the DANI Awards in 2015 and were commended in the Social Media category at the same ceremony.

We also won Website Of The Year at the prestigious Ulster Tatler awards in 2016 and Trinity Mirror's Digital Excellence Award.

Our most recent success came at the Publicity Association Northern Ireland awards 2017 when we won Gold and Silver in the Media Owner Initiative categories for our Belfast Loves campaign.

Corrections Policy

If you believe a story we have published is inaccurate, please contact the editorial team. You can:

Email:

Phone:

Write to Complaints, Belfast Live

Once verified, we will correct the story on the website as soon as possible. Where appropriate, the fact a correction has been made will be noted on the story and/or on the corrections and clarifications page.

If you have an issue about how BelfastLive has written about you personally or has treated you and wish to make a formal complaint over a potential breach of the Editors' Code of Practice, please see Reach PLC's Complaints Policy and Procedure.

You can also contact IPSO for advice.

4.2 Complaints Handling Process⁵

Reach plc seeks to resolve complaints as quickly and amicably as possible when a mistake has been recognised, but will also defend its journalism when it believes that there has been no breach of the Code. In any event, Reach plc strives to reply to all complainants in a timely and courteous manner, regardless of the merits of the complaint.

Reach plc receives complaints from the public through several avenues: indirectly via IPSO referrals, directly via its Complaints Form (in accordance with its Formal Internal Complaints Process), and informally by telephone and/or email and from solicitors writing "letters before claim" in advance of legal proceedings.

4.2.1 Formal Internal Complaints Process

4.2.1.1 Print

Every Reach plc printed news publication sets out details about its Complaints Process on page 2⁶ of each edition in a column entitled "Corrections & Complaints". The column includes a link to Reach plc's "How To Make A Complaint" process, which is hosted on Reach plc's website, www.reachplc.com. The website also hosts our Complaints Policy, the Code and our online Complaints Form.

⁵ Pursuant to Clause 3.3.4 of the SMA
(<https://www.ipso.co.uk/media/1292/ipso-scheme-membership-agreement-2016-for-website.pdf>)

⁶ (or as close to page 2 as possible if this is not possible for layout-related reasons, e.g. if there is a full page advertisement on page 2)

The column also informs readers of Reach plc's IPSO membership, together with IPSO's contact details for advice, if required. Those complainants who do not have internet access are provided with an address to send off for a "Complaints Pack", which includes a copy of our Complaints Policy, the Code and our Complaints Form.

Readers who wish to bring a factual error to our attention are directed to either the Editor or Readers' Editor, who will arrange prompt corrections of admitted inaccuracies. In the overwhelming majority of cases, corrections, clarifications and/or apologies will appear either in the Corrections & Complaints column or elsewhere on Page 2.⁶

4.2.1.2 Online

Every Reach plc website carries a link on its home page, which sets out not only a link to Reach plc's Complaints Process, but also directs readers to email addresses where they can address issues about both simple, online factual errors and non-editorial matters. Each homepage also links to a "Corrections and Clarifications" section. Some corrections or amendments may however, in certain circumstances, be published underneath the original online article as a footnote clarification.

4.2.2 Process

Once a Complaints Form is received, the matter is handled by the Legal Department. The complaint is assessed to determine whether the Code has been engaged, whether there has been a misinterpretation of the Code and/or whether the complaint is vexatious.

Examples of complaints that would not engage the Code could be the non-delivery of a newspaper or an issue arising from a reader offer or competition. In any event, this kind of complaint would be directed to the appropriate department and a response issued.

An example of misinterpretation of the Code could be a complaint made under Clause 4 (intrusion into grief or shock) from a reader concerned about a general report (with which the complainant has no personal connection) about, for instance, a natural disaster. Another example could be a complaint made under Clause 12 from a reader objecting to the portrayal of a football

team, i.e. these would be complaints about editorial matters that purport to engage the Code but upon analysis, do not.

Vexatious complainants include those who use insulting language or who do not set out the nature of their complaint under the Code.

In any event, if a correct contact address is provided, Reach plc endeavours to reply to all complainants within seven days.

If a complaint engages the Code, the matter is investigated internally and a response is sent. The response will either reject the complaint, if Reach plc is satisfied that there has been no breach of the Code, or, if there is a matter that does need addressing, discussions will then be held with the complainant in an attempt to resolve the matter.

If the matter cannot be resolved between the parties, the complainant is offered the option to refer the matter to IPSO to investigate.

4.2.3 Referrals From IPSO

The receipt of new complaints referred to Reach plc publications by IPSO engages Clause 13 of The Regulations. As part of its internal Complaints Procedure, Reach plc corresponds directly with the complainant to address the issues at hand as set out above. If no resolution can be reached, the matter is referred back to IPSO for its consideration.

4.2.4 Informal Complaints

Many complaints are dealt with directly by the Editor or a senior journalist following telephone calls or emails. In the vast majority of cases, this is the most appropriate, expedient and amicable way of resolving complaints.

4.2.5 Legal Complaints

All legal complaints (classified as complaints which are accompanied by a demand for a financial remedy and refer to a cause of action) are handled by the Legal Department separately.

4.2.6 Recording Of Complaints

Complaints that are received by Reach plc either through its Complaints Form or from IPSO are recorded and assessed with regard to whether the Code has been engaged and which clauses have been addressed. Although complaints received on an informal basis throughout the regions are generally logged, given the minor nature of many issues and the disparate way these complaints are received and dealt with (orally, by telephone, letter, email etc.), it would be disproportionate for these types of complaints to be formally assessed in terms of the Code. The most important factor is that complaints are addressed, and if possible, resolved as quickly as possible.

4.3 Training Process

From autumn 2014, Reach plc consulted with the Press Association (PA) and training company Eliesha over the creation of an online learning course with the purpose of making sure that all Reach plc journalists have a full understanding of the Code and the changes introduced by IPSO. The course contains ten animated and narrated modules. After viewing each module, editorial staff must complete a multiple choice assessment. Participants must score 100% in the assessment before they can move on to the next module and the course is only completed after the 100% pass mark has been achieved in all ten modules.

This compulsory course was rolled out and completed by all Reach plc editorial staff (from Editors and Executives to trainees) across the company in February and March 2015. All new editorial employees must also complete this training programme as part of their induction.

Following the acquisition of the Northern and Shell titles, Reach has reviewed this part of our training programme and a new online course has been drafted and, at the time of writing, is being prepared for distribution. The course will run on a similar format to the Eliesha course and is planned to be rolled out during 2020.

To supplement the online course, since 2015, Paul Mottram has been delivering seminars to executives and journalists throughout Reach plc at both regional centres and at Canary Wharf for the National Titles. These seminars examine each clause of the Code in turn, focussing upon the everyday practical application of the Code and examples of where Code breaches have occurred with a discussion on how similar issues could be avoided in the future. Upheld adjudications are also addressed. Last year, Paul Mottram returned to former Trinity Mirror regional hubs to deliver seminars.

Additionally, Daily Star and Express print and digital journalists attended compulsory seminars during the summer of 2019.

Further, as part of continuing legal and regulatory education for journalists and to provide legal advice, since March 2017 the Legal Department has issued a series of regular Legal Bulletins to all staff, including Northern and Shell titles from January 2019 . These legally privileged Bulletins detail any substantial compliance, legal or Code issues that have arisen during the previous weeks both within the company and from the industry generally, so that journalists can be made aware of, look out for and deal with similar issues that may arise in the future.

4.4 Our Record On Compliance

During the Relevant Period, Reach plc published over 850,000 articles online, and over 600,000 articles in National and Regional print titles.

In 2019, Reach plc received a total of 112 direct complaints through its online Complaints form. 49 of those complaints were resolved, and 51 were rejected outright as a non breach of the Code. 12 of these complaints were misinterpretations of the Code. Settlement of a complaint does not necessarily indicate an admitted breach of the Code. Many of these resolved direct complaints did not represent a breach of the Code, however were resolved by offering a gesture of goodwill, for example the removal of information or the article.

Furthermore, Reach plc received a total of 158 new complaints that were either referred to IPSO (i.e. following a direct complaint through our complaints form that was not resolved), or were received directly from IPSO. This report covers all upheld IPSO adjudications published in the Relevant Period.

There were 4 upheld adjudications within the Relevant Period, where there was a requirement to publish the adjudication or correction, and 8 upheld adjudications where the Complaints Committee ruled that sufficient remedial action had been offered by the publication. 26 complaints were not upheld by the Committee, 94 were settled, 25 were abandoned by the complainant and the rest were still under investigation/pending at the end of the Relevant Period.

4.4.1 Remedial Action

When adjudication is upheld with a requirement to publish the adjudication, if appropriate, the matter is mentioned in the privileged and confidential monthly legal bulletin with advice on what went wrong (if any wrongdoing is identified). Furthermore, such as those set out below, the Editor, Content Editor, and the journalist are informed of the outcome and the journalist is spoken to about the issue that had been identified. Details of upheld adjudications, published and adjudicated upon in the Relevant Period, are set out below:

4.4.1 Upheld Complaints With A Requirement To Publish The Adjudication

04186-19 Mmono v Manchester Evening News

The article of 15 January 2019 reported that the complainant, Dr Xavier Mmono, had been struck from the medical register for suggesting that a patient pay for surgery with sex via a “friends with benefits” arrangement following a tribunal in 2016 and that the complainant was suspended for 4 months for inappropriate conduct relating to texts he sent to a patient. The article was headlined: “Gynaecologist who suggested ‘designer vagina’ patient become ‘friends with benefits’ rather than pay for surgery struck off”. The article explained that after this 4 month suspension, the complainant was suspended again in 2018 for 12 months after carrying out intimate examinations without a chaperone present. The article reported that after a judge agreed with the General Medical Council that the second punishment in 2018 was too lenient, the complainant had now been struck from the medical register. The complainant said that he was not struck off the medical register for suggesting to a patient that she pay for surgery with a “friends with benefits” arrangement, nor was this the reason for his previous suspensions. He said that the reason he was struck off was that a judge found the second suspension in 2018 to be too lenient, and that his suspension had been imposed because he had carried out intimate examinations without a chaperone. Upon receipt of the complaint, the publication offered to amend the online headline to: “Gynaecologist struck off after inappropriate conduct with patient”, and publish a correction in print, and as an online footnote to the online article.

The Committee found that as both tribunals were online, where the correct information was freely available online, the headline and statements within the article represented a failure to take care not to publish inaccurate information, and the article’s claim that the complainant was

struck off for suggesting the a patient pay for surgery with sex was not only a significantly misleading report of the reasons why the complainant was struck from the medical register, but also a serious and damaging claim as to the complainant's professional conduct. The complaint was upheld on and the publication was required to publish the adjudication.

Date decision issued: 09/08/2019

Further comment: The issue of misleading headlines has been addressed in the Legal Bulletins.

07056-18 A woman v www.mirror.co.uk

The article of 22 October 2018 reported that the complainant had denied speculation, reported in other publications, that she was in a relationship with Adam Johnson. The article identified the complainant by name, included her photograph, and said that according to other reports, she had visited Mr Johnson in prison on "at least three occasions".

The complainant complained under clause 9 that the disclosure of her association with Adam Johnson was intrusive: the fact of her visits were only known to prison staff; she was not involved in Mr Johnson's previous court case, nor had she publicly commented on it.

The publication argued that the purpose of clause 9 is to ensure that individuals are not unjustifiably tainted by their association with persons accused or convicted of crimes, and said that the story was not about Mr Johnson and his crimes, nor was it about someone who had once associated with him. Rather, the story was about someone who has been visiting him in prison and speculation about their relationship. The Committee found that conjecture on the existence of a possible relationship with a person convicted of crime is not enough to show relevance, and was therefore upheld with the requirement to publish the adjudication.

Date decision issued: 15/02/2019

Further comment: Reach PLC vehemently disagreed with the decision making process behind this adjudication and the Complaints Committee's interpretation of the Code Of Practice. As a consequence, it is difficult to advise journalists as to how to avoid an upheld adjudication in this manner as this would result in a blanket ban on all stories that referred to people who associate with criminals. This has a "chilling effect" on freedom of speech.

01029-19 A Woman v Airdrie & Coatbridge Advertiser

The article was published on the front page on 22 January 2019 and reported that an individual had received a custodial sentence after being convicted of sexual offences against two children. It included a number of details from the case; specifically witness evidence heard in court regarding the location in which the offences took place. It disclosed both the complainant's and the defendant's association with that location. The article set out the period of time over which these offences had occurred, the age of the victims during that time, and their ages now.

The complainant said that details within the article had identified her as a victim of sexual assault, and that she had been identified as such within her local community. The publication was satisfied that they took care to remove any excessive information that was heard in court which might be likely to lead to identification and argued that it was entitled to report court proceedings held in public, in the public interest. However, the publication removed the online article as a gesture of goodwill, and offered a correction in print relating to an accuracy complaint the complainant had also made.

The Committee found that the inclusion of the location in which the offences had taken place, and the defendant and the complainant's association with that location, in combination with the period of time when the offences had occurred, and the ages of the victims, represented information which would be known to the complainant's community, particularly those who knew the defendant and the complainant, and was likely to lead to her identification as a victim in the case. The complaint was upheld and the publication was required to publish the full adjudication.

Date decision issued: 09/05/2019

Further comment: This was a very difficult and sensitive case with which to engage because of the upset caused to those involved. The publication took steps to avoid any potential identification of the victim by removing material from the article pre-publication. Identifying features that had been pointed out by the Committee could not reasonably have been anticipated.

Nevertheless advice was given after publication. Although Reach deeply regrets any upset caused, Reach was disappointed that the change in Clause 11 of the Code of Practice, designed to bring the test in line with the law on this issue, was not effective in this instance.

07925-18 Tim Partlett v www.express.co.uk

The original article of 12 August 2018 was headlined: 'Britain will be BETTER OFF after Brexit: Poll shows businesses BRIMMING with confidence', and claimed that a poll, commissioned by a group that represents businesses in the maritime industry, found that most of its members "feel Britain would become stronger after Brexit". The article reported that the 507 business leaders had been interviewed, and that 63% of those surveyed had reported that they'd experienced an export boost since the Brexit referendum, and 59% said that they had not experienced any difficulties recruiting skilled workers over the last 12 Months. The complainant said that it was inaccurate in breach of clause 1 (Accuracy) to state that the poll had found that the participating businesses believed that Britain would become stronger after Brexit; the poll had asked no such question of the respondents, and nothing in the poll indicated this belief. The publication denied any breach of the Code, and therefore did not make any offer of resolution. The Committee found that the headline, sub-headline, and first line of the article had made categorical claims of fact about the findings of the poll, which were not presented as conjecture or as the interpretation of the body which had carried out the poll. The complaint was upheld and the publication was required to publish the adjudication.

Date decision issued: 09/05/2019

Further comment: The distinction between comment conjecture and fact is a regular feature in Legal Bulletins and the issue of correctly interpreting poll results was specifically addressed in Seminars and the Legal Bulletin with this case in mind.

4.4.2 Upheld Adjudications Where Sufficient Remedial Action Had Been Offered

04097-19 Various v www.express.co.uk

IPSO received approximately 225 complaints for the article headlined “Scottish nationalists CLASH with pro-Union activists at independence march in Glasgow” which reported on a march by Scottish National Party (SNP) supporters. The complainants denied that there was a ‘clash’ as reported, and complained that the article implied that there were violent or physical altercations and disturbances between the two groups. The publication accepted that there was no suggestion that any form of violent confrontation took place during the SNP demonstration, and removed the article. The publication also offered to publish a standalone correction, which would appear on the homepage of express.co.uk. The Committee found that the publication had offered to publish a correction both promptly and prominently on the re-instated online article, and promptly offered to publish a correction on its homepage. The Committee found that this was sufficient to meet the requirements of Clause 1 (ii).

Date decision issued: 26/06/2019

Further comment: Both the journalist and the assistant News Editor were spoken to as to why the word ‘clash’ was not justified.

07959-18 UWE Bristol v Bristol Post

The University of Bristol complained about a number of articles, which formed part of wider coverage into concerns over the rate of deaths by suicide amongst the student population of the University of the West of England. The first article claimed that the University was withholding information on records of suicides amongst its students, based on the University’s response to a Freedom of Information request (FoI) submitted by its own students, and reported that the University had records of this information held in a ‘central database’. The complainant disputed this and complained that they did not have a ‘central database’. The publication offered to publish a correction clarifying this point, as a gesture of goodwill. The correction was sufficient to meet the terms of Clause 1(ii).

Date decision issued: 16/05/2019

Further comment: Reach did not agree with this decision and was disappointed that this complaint was upheld under semantics. No further action was taken.

04123-19 Philips v www.dailyrecord.co.uk

The article headlined “Carstairs staff suspended after 'encouraging violent patient to punch vulnerable man’” reported on the complainant’s suspension, and ultimate dismissal, from his employment as a nurse at a psychiatric hospital, and included quotes from a source. The complainant denied that he had been “assaulted” by a patient and in retaliation, had then “encouraged” another patient to “punch” them. The publication offered to remove both articles from online and publish a correction on Page 2 of the Daily Record, as well as a standalone correction on the website. The correction was offered with sufficient promptness and prominence to meet the terms of Clause 1(ii).

Date decision issued: 21/08/2019

Further comment: The issues that arose regarding information provided by a source, and the distinction between comment, conjecture and fact is a regular feature in Legal Bulletins.

03333-19 Coombes v Daily Post

The article headlined “Pensioner who reported neighbour’s plum tree felling breached order” reported that the complainant had been convicted of breaching a restraining order after reporting a named neighbour to Denbighshire County Council over the cutting down of a plum tree, and that he should pay his fine within 14 days, or face six months in prison. The complainant said that the article was inaccurate, as the judge had given him 6 months to pay his fine, and if this was not paid, he would be jailed for 14 days for each of his convictions. The publication amended the online article and added a footnote clarification, and published the correction on Page 2. The Committee found that this was sufficient to avoid a breach of Clause 1(ii), and no further remedial action was required.

Date decision issued: 18/06/2019

Further comment: This was a mistake by the journalist. No further action was taken.

00952-19 Richardson v www.express.co.uk

An article headlined “‘RIOTS ON STREETS!’ – Theresa May warns of DANGEROUS results of second Brexit referendum” and reported that the Prime Minister had “warned of a threat to democracy” in the event of a second Brexit referendum. The complainant said it was misleading to report that the Prime Minister had warned of “riots on [the] streets”, when she had not. The publication removed the words “Riots on streets” from the headline, and added a footnote correction to the article, however the complainant did not accept that it was sufficient. During IPSO’s investigation, the publication also published a standalone correction. The Committee found that this further action was sufficient, and no further action was required.

Date decision issued: 20/03/2019

Further comment: The article was written by a member of the overnight team. The overnight journalist, overnight Editor and the morning Editor were spoken to.

07026-18 Tindal v Sevenoaks Chronicle

An article headlined “Company must pay £2,500 for selling underweight food” reported on how the complainant’s company had been fined for selling underweight tins of apricots, and that the spokesperson for the company was contacted for comment, but did not wish to add any comment. The complainant complained that in fact, the publication had not contacted him for comment, therefore it was misleading to report that the company had been contacted and declined to comment on the story. The complainant also noted that the company had given an extensive comment to a different sister publication on the same topic. The publication offered to publish the company’s position, as published by the sister company, on Page 2. The Committee found that the correction was offered with sufficient promptness and prominence to meet the terms of Clause 1(ii).

Date decision issued: 07/03/2019

Further comment: There was internal miscommunication between the sister publications and was addressed by both parties.

06939-18 Thorne v www.express.co.uk

The article headlined “What border problems? MP tweets photo of Swiss border with just ONE sign” and reported that the MP had tweeted an image of a town on the Switzerland-France border “with just a single camera separating the two European nations”, saying that “there is no such border in sight”. The complainant disputed the accuracy of the article, as the road shown in the tweet which the article referred to was not a road leading to any border crossing, but rather to an airport. The publication accepted that the article was inaccurate, removed the online article, and published a standalone correction. The Committee found that this was sufficient to meet the terms of Clause 1(ii).

Date decision issued: 23/01/2019

Further comment: The relevant teams were spoken to, and issues regarding the distinction between fact and claims were addressed in the legal bulletin.

06720-18 Johnson v www.express.co.uk

The article headlined “Corbyn accused of wanting to ‘brainwash school kids into hating UK’ with colonial history” and reported that “In 2008, Mr Corbyn backed Saddam Hussain [sic] against British troops saying: ‘Socialists should unconditionally stand with the oppressed against the oppressor, even if the people who run the oppressed country are undemocratic and persecute minorities, like Saddam Hussein.’” The complainant advised that the quote was inaccurately attributed to Mr Corbyn. The publication promptly offered to amend the article to remove the reference to the quotation, and offered to add a footnote clarification. Although the complainant did not accept that this would resolve the complaint, the Committee found that this action was sufficient.

Date decision issued: 23/01/2019

Further comment: The relevant journalist was spoken to regarding the details of the complaint.

5. Schedule

5.1 Annex A: List Of Reach plc Titles/Websites

5.1.1 Print

National

Daily Mirror

Sunday Mirror

Sunday People

Daily Record

Sunday Mail

OK!

new! Magazine

Daily Express

Sunday Express

Daily Star

Daily Star Sunday

Regional

Accrington Observer

Airdrie & Coatbridge Advertiser

Ashbourne News Telegraph

Ashford Herald

Atherstone & Colehill Herald (Tamworth Herald Series)

Ayrshire Post

Bangor Mail

Bath Chronicle

Birmingham Mail
Birmingham Post
Black Country Bugle Annual
Black Country Bugle Sports Annual
Blackmore Vale Magazine
Blairgowrie Advertiser
Boston Target

Brentwood Gazette
Bristol Post
Burry Port & Pembrey Star (Llanelli Star Series)
Burton Mail
Bygones (Scunthorpe & Grimsby)
Caernarfon & Denbigh Herald (Arfon)
Caernarfon & Denbigh Herald (South)
Cambridge News
Carmarthen Journal
Central Somerset Gazette (Mid Somerset Series)
Cheddar Valley Gazette (Mid Somerset Series)
Chester Chronicle (Frodsham & Helsby)
Chester Chronicle (Country)
Chester Chronicle (Flintshire)
Chester Chronicle (Sandbach & Middlewich)
Chronicle & Informer
City Guide (Staffordshire)
Cornish Guardian
Cornishman
Coventry Telegraph
Crewe Chronicle
Croydon Advertiser (Croydon Advertiser Series)
Cynon Valley Leader
Daily Mirror Northern Ireland
Daily Post
Derby Telegraph

Dorking Advertiser
Dover Express
Dumfries & Galloway Standard
Ealing Gazette
East Coast & Wolds Target
East Grinstead Courier
East Kilbride News
East Riding Mail
Essex Chronicle
Exeter Express & Echo
Flashback (Hull)
Folkestone Herald
Frome Standard (Mid Somerset Series)
Fulham Gazette
Gainsborough Echo
Galloway News
Glamorgan Gazette
Gloucester Citizen
Gloucestershire Echo
Greater Manchester Business Week Magazine
Grimsby Telegraph
Gwendraeth Valley Star (Llanelli Star Series)
Gwent Gazette
Hamilton Advertiser
Herald Express
Hertfordshire Mercury
Heywood Advertiser
Hinckley Times
Holyhead & Bangor Mail
Hounslow Chronicle & Informer
Huddersfield Daily Examiner
Hull Daily Mail
Irvine Herald
Isle of Thanet Gazette

Journal (Grimsby & Scunthorpe)
Journal (Hull)
Kent & Sussex Courier
Kilmarnock Standard
Leatherhead Advertiser
Leek Post & Times
Leicester Mercury
Lennox Herald
Lichfield Mercury
Lincolnshire Echo
Liverpool Echo
Liverpool Sunday Echo
Llanelli Star (Llanelli Star Series)
Loughborough Echo
Macclesfield Express
Manchester Evening News
Manchester Weekly News (Salford Edition)
Manchester Weekly News (Sale & Altrincham)
Manchester Weekly News (Stretford Urmston)
Manchester Weekly News (Stockport East)
Manchester Weekly News (Stockport West)
Manchester Weekly News (South Manchester)
Manchester Weekly News (Wilmslow)
Manchester Weekly News (Tameside)
Merthyr Express
Middleton Guardian
Midweek Visiter
Mid Devon Gazette
Nantwich Chronicle
Newcastle Chronicle
Newcastle Journal
News & Mail Series (Aldershot)
News & Mail Series (Camberley & Sandhurst)
News & Mail Series (Farnborough)

News & Mail Series (Fleet & Yateley)
North Devon Journal
North Wales Weekly News
North Wales Weekly News (Conwy Valley & Dyffryn
Conwy)
North Wales Weekly News (Colwyn Bay & Abergele)
Nottingham Post
Nuneaton News
Ormskirk Advertiser
Paisley Daily Express
Perthshire Advertiser
Plymouth Herald
Pontypridd & Llantrisant Observer
Remember When
Retford Gainsborough & Worksop Times
Rhondda Leader
Rhymney Valley Express
Rochdale Observer
Rossendale Free Press
Runcorn & Widnes Weekly News
Rutherglen Reformer
Scunthorpe Telegraph
Seven Oakes Chronicle
Shepton Mallet Journal (Mid Somerset Series)
Skelmersdale Advertiser
Sleaford Target
Somerset Standard & Guardian
South Cheshire Chronicle
South Wales Echo
South Wales Evening Post
Southport Visitor
Staffordshire Newsletter
Staines Chronicle & Informer
Stirling Observer

Stockport Express
Strathearn Herald
Sunday Echo
Sunday Mercury
Sunday Sun
Surrey Advertiser
Surrey Mirror
Sutton Coldfield Observer
Swansea Lie
Tamworth Herald (Tamworth Herald Series)
The Gazette (North East, Middlesbrough & Teesside)
The Stoke Sentinel
The Way We Were
The West Briton
The Wharf
Uxbridge Gazette
Wales On Sunday
Wells Journal (Mid Somerset Series)
West Lothian Courier
Western Daily Press
Western Gazette (Yeovil)
Western Gazette (Sherborne)
Western Gazette (Crewkerne, Chard and Ilminster)
Western Gazette (Somerton and Langport)
Western Gazette (Wincanton, Castle Cary, Bruton and Gillingham)
Western Mail
Western Morning News
Widnes Weekly News
Wishaw Press

5.1.2 Websites

www.accringtonobserver.co.uk⁷
www.belfastlive.co.uk
www.birminghammail.co.uk
www.birminghampost.co.uk
www.bristolpost.co.uk
www.business-live.co.uk⁸
www.cambridge-news.co.uk
www.cheshire-live.co.uk
www.cheshire-live.co.uk
www.chroniclelive.co.uk
www.cornwalllive.com
www.coventrytelegraph.net
www.dailyexpress.co.uk
www.dailypost.co.uk
www.dailyrecord.co.uk
www.dailystar.co.uk
www.derbytelegraph.co.uk
www.devonlive.com
www.edinburghlive.co.uk
www.essexlive.news
www.examinerlive.co.uk
www.football.london
www.footballscotland.co.uk⁹
www.gazettelive.co.uk
www.getreading.co.uk¹⁰
www.getsurrey.co.uk
www.glasgowlive.co.uk
www.gloucestershirelive.co.uk
www.grimsbytelegraph.co.uk

⁷ Merged to www.lancs.live Feb 2019

⁸ New publication launched June 2019

⁹ New publication launched Jan 2019

¹⁰ Rebranded to Berkshire Live Feb 2019

www.hertfordshiremercury.co.uk
www.hulldailymail.co.uk
www.humberbusiness.com
www.insider.co.uk
www.inyourarea.co.uk/news
www.kentlive.news
www.lancs.live¹¹
www.leeds-live.co.uk
www.leicestermercury.co.uk
www.lincolnshirelive.co.uk
www.liverpool.com¹²
www.liverpoolecho.co.uk
www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk
www.mirror.co.uk
www.mylondon.news
www.nearlythereyet.co.uk
www.new-magazine.co.uk
www.nottinghampost.com
www.ok.co.uk
www.plymouthherald.co.uk
www.rossendalefreepress.co.uk¹³
www.scunthorpetelegraph.co.uk
www.somersetlive.co.uk
www.southwestbusiness.co.uk
www.staffordshire-live.co.uk
www.stokesentinel.co.uk
www.walesonline.co.uk

¹¹ New publication launched Feb 2019

¹² New publication launched July 2019

¹³ Merged to www.lancs.live Feb 2019