
MINUTES of the COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday 31 January 2018 at 10.30 am
Gate House, 1 Farringdon Street, London EC4M 7LG

Present Alan Moses (Chairman)
Richard Best
Nazir Afzal
Janette Harkess
David Jessel
Andrew Pettie
Neil Watts
Peter Wright
Nina Wrightson

In attendance: Charlotte Dewar, Director of Operations
Michelle Kuhler, PA and minute taker
Bianca Strohmman, Head of Complaints
Matt Tee, Chief Executive Officer

Also present: Members of the Executive:

John Buckingham
Vikki Julian
Madeline Palacz
Holly Pick
Lauren Sloan
Charlotte Urwin
Hugo Wallis

Observers: Jonathan Grun, Editors' Code of Practice Committee
Sir Hayden Philips, IPSO Appointments Panel

1. Apologies for Absence

Were received from Miranda Winram and Gill Hudson.
Sir Hayden Philips and Jonathan Grun were welcomed to the meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest

Andrew Pettie declared an interest in items 6 and 7. He left the meeting for these items.
Janette Harkess declared an interest in item 9. She left the meeting for this item.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 20 December.

4. Update by the Chairman – oral

The Chairman congratulated Madeline Palacz on her promotion to Complaints and Arbitration Officer.

He mentioned the House of Lords vote in favour of amendments to the Data Protection Bill incorporating Section 40.

5. Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

6. Complaint 17325-17 The Royal Albert Hall v The Times

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

7. Complaint 17326-17 The Royal Albert Hall v The Sunday Times

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should **not be upheld**. A copy of its ruling appears in **Appendix B**.

8. Complaint 20298-17 A woman v Thurrock Independent

The Committee discussed the complaint. Its ruling has not been finalised as the complaint will be discussed at a future meeting. A copy of the ruling will appear in the minutes of a future meeting.

9. Complaint 19719-17 Thomson v Sunday Post

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

10. Complaints not adjudicated at a Complaints Committee meeting

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

11. Any other business

There was no other business.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as **Wednesday 21st March 2018**.

The meeting ended at 12.20pm

Appendix A

Decision of the Complaints Committee 17325-17 The Royal Albert Hall v The Times

Summary of Complaint

1. The governing Council of the Royal Albert Hall complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that The Times breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in the following articles:
 - "Anger over the resale of Royal Albert Hall tickets", published in print and online on 9 January 2017;
 - "Disgrace" of Albert Hall members who resell tickets", published in print and online on 19 January 2017;
 - "Albert Hall defiant in ticket resale row", published in print and online on 21 January 2017;
 - "The Proms should stop this ticket scandal- or leave the Albert Hall", published in print and online on 1 September 2017;
 - "Unmask seat owners, Albert Hall told", published in print and online on 14 September.

The articles under complaint

2. The series of articles reported on a long running debate about the practice of Members of the Hall, which is a charity, selling tickets for seats they own at the Hall for "inflated prices".
3. The first article reported that a "fresh row" had erupted over the issue, claiming that the complainant had "allowed debenture holders to circumvent a ban on the resale of tickets" for a series of concerts in 2015. It said that the complainant had "failed to enforce rules" which had been drawn up by the promoter of these concerts, which had the intention of "limiting the number of tickets being made available for sale on the secondary market". The first article also contained a statement from the complainant's spokesperson: "Members seats are their own private property with their rights enshrined in the hall's royal charter and acts of parliament; neither the hall nor the promoter has the ability to impose restrictions on how [they] choose to use or dispose of their tickets".
4. The second article reported on criticism of the complainant from the Hall's former President. It said that that [the Hall's] leaders had been described as "presiding over a 'national disgrace'" by one of its former Presidents, who had also accused Members of "ignoring the hall's official system for passing on unwanted tickets and choosing to maximise their profits by using ticket resale websites".
5. The online version of the second article was amended to remove the words "presiding over" from the first paragraph, so that the article claimed that "the leaders of the Royal Albert Hall have been described as a 'national disgrace' by a former president in a row over members reselling tickets".
6. The former President also criticised the members of the Council who own seats at the Hall and were therefore in a position to sell their tickets. The article included his

“demand” that “trustees of the hall...declare any revenue that they make from selling tickets”. He had claimed: “members of the hall’s council own 145 seats worth conservatively £145 million. This interest is largely undeclared and as trustees of the charity, their position of privilege and the advantages afforded by the hall’s charitable status puts them in a position to profit personally. For this to have been unregulated, despite being in the public domain for so long, is a national disgrace”.

7. The third article reported that the complainant “will defy demands” by the Charity Commission to “overhaul its ruling council which is dominated by owners of debenture seats and boxes”. It said that the Commission had “threatened to open a statutory inquiry into the trust that runs the hall after concerns of an ‘inherent unresolvable conflict of interest’ caused by the majority of its ruling council owning seats”.
8. The third article continued by reporting that the head of an internal review into the trust’s constitution had told the newspaper that it would “recommend reducing the number of seat owners on the council while ensuring that they remain a majority”. This decision, the article claimed, had “infuriated the regulator”. The article also reported a statement from the Charity Commission’s spokesperson: “The commission has made clear that the issue of conflicts of interest and the independence of the council from the seat owners should be dealt with as part of [the internal] review.”
9. The third article also reported a statement made by the Chairman of the Charity Commission: “the “scale of commercialisation in private sales of seats raises questions about whether the charity is in fact operating in the public interest”. The newspaper had obtained this quote from an interview which he had given to another publication, in which the Chairman had continued by saying: “The trustees should consider whether such arrangements risk damaging public confidence in their charity. This is a matter of great concern to the Commission and we expect the trustees to resolve the issue swiftly and openly”.
10. The third article also reported a further statement from the former President of the Hall, whose criticism had formed the basis of the second article. It reported that he had “accused the hall of breaching charity law by failing to reveal the value of the seats owned by the council members and the income received from the sale of tickets”.
11. The fourth article was an opinion piece, which detailed the columnist’s concern at the difficulty in obtaining tickets for the Last Night of the Proms, an event held annually at the Hall. The columnist said that it was “extremely hard” to obtain tickets for the event by going through “official channels” but it was “very easy if you have a few thousand quid to spare and go to a ticket resale website”. The reason “why it’s so easy”, the columnist had claimed, was because “1,275 of the Royal Albert Hall’s seats are owned by members of the grandly named Corporation of the Hall of Arts and Sciences”. The columnist suggested that the BBC, the organisation which runs the Last Night of the Proms, were in a position to “stop this ticket scandal” by threatening to transfer the Last Night to another venue.
12. The fifth article claimed that a former director of the BBC Proms had “called for people who own seats at the Royal Albert Hall to be named to curb the practice of them selling allocations of tickets at inflated prices”. It said that the Charity Commission had “previously expressed concern about the issue” and had “recently requested that the attorney-general refer the matter to the Charity Tribunal for clarification”.

The complainant's position

13. The complainant said that the newspaper had, over many months, given its readers an inaccurate and misleading impression of the Hall, its governance and the status of Members' seats. It said that the newspaper had denied them a proper right of reply or any opportunity to comment on the articles' serious claims.
14. The complainant said that it had no control over how Members use or dispose of their tickets: this was their proprietary right.
15. The complainant explained that individuals who had contributed financially to the construction of the Royal Albert Hall had been granted property rights over seats, for a period of 999 years, by virtue of the terms of the 1867 Royal Charter. The terms of the Charter allowed the seat owner unfettered access to their seats, and their tickets, and did not contain a provision which would prevent them from licensing the use of their seats to others.
16. The complaint said that as the Charter was an Act of Parliament, only Parliament had the power to change its terms. It explained that amendments to the Charter could only be made by passing a resolution by a 75% majority of Members. It said that even if Members volunteered by that majority, to relinquish their property rights and empower the Hall to make such an application, Parliament would be required to agree that this would be proportionate. It said that this was unlikely given that the outcome of this process may result in the confiscation of Members' private property rights.
17. The complainant said that it was therefore inaccurate for the articles to suggest that it "allows" its Members to sell on their tickets for profit, or that it was "presiding over" the practice. It said that the restrictions put in place by the promoter of the 2015 concerts had not applied to members' tickets, and so it was inaccurate to state that Members had "circumvented" a ban on resales.
18. The complainant denied that Members' tickets were being "re-sold": members were selling their tickets so as to provide access to their private property and not, as suggested, in a manner akin to the industry-wide issue of secondary ticket sales. The characterisation of Members as "debenture holders" was also misleading as it suggested that the terms of the Charter had conferred a temporary agreement between a lender and a borrower, rather than granting permanent seat ownership.
19. While the complainant maintained that it had no control over Members' private property and the way they use or dispose of their tickets, it noted that it had encouraged members to sell unwanted tickets through a voluntary Ticket Return Scheme, where 60% of all Members' tickets are returned.
20. The complainant said that the articles had misrepresented its interactions with the Charity Commission; the Commission was not concerned about Members selling their tickets in general and it had not threatened to open a statutory inquiry into the trust that runs the Hall. The complainant said that the inclusion of the allegations made by its former President, rendered the third article significantly misleading, as it suggested that it had breached charity law by failing to reveal the value of the seats owned by Council members and the income received from the sale of tickets. The complainant

acknowledged that the Charity Commission was seeking consent from the Attorney General to refer questions to the Charity Tribunal under s.325 of the Charities Act 2011; however it said that the Commission's concern was not about tickets per se, or their "resales".

21. The complainant acknowledged that the Commission had previously "expressed a preference" that the Hall's council move to a minority of seat holding Members. The complainant said that it had commenced a constitutional review which the Commission were being regularly updated on- this did not amount to "defying" the Charity Commission's "demands". The complainant said that inclusion of the statement from the Charity Commission's spokesperson in the third article was therefore misleading, as it suggested that the issue of conflicts of interest and independence of the Council from seat owners was not being dealt with as part of its internal review.
22. The complainant said that the second article had distorted a quotation from its former President. It said that his concern related to the lack of regulation regarding the "issue" of members selling their tickets; he had not claimed that the Hall's governing body were a "national disgrace". The complainant was concerned at the amendment which had then been made to the online article, so as to accuse its trustees of being a "national disgrace". It said that this was not a claim made by its former President, and was far more damaging.
23. The complainant said that the fourth article had suggested that the issue of high prices for the Last Night of the Proms, and the alleged difficulties for members of the public in obtaining tickets, was primarily due to Members selling their tickets. It said that this practice did not contradict its commitment to prevent the secondary marketing of tickets. The complainant also said that the article had given the inaccurate impression that the Hall's conduct was in breach of charity law by suggesting that the organisers of the Proms should withdraw from the Hall in order to force it to reform.

The newspaper's position:

24. The newspaper did not accept a breach of the Code. It said that it was accurate to report that the complainant was allowing members to sell the tickets they receive by virtue of their seat ownership, and that it was "presiding over" this practice; the complainant provided Members with tickets, and did not prevent them from selling them. It said that the meaning of "allow" was dependent on context: the articles had been clear that the complainant was not stopping the practice, despite the Charity Commission putting it under pressure to deal with the conflict which this practice creates. It was this inaction, the newspaper said, which amounted to the complainant "allowing" the practice to continue.
25. The newspaper did not accept the complainant's position that it did not have a mandate to intervene in Members selling their tickets and noted the Ticket Return Scheme which had been set up by the complainant. The newspaper suggested that the complainant could refuse entry to the Hall in certain circumstances, including if tickets have been bought from secondary resale sites. It suggested that while it may be a cumbersome process, the complainant could seek to prevent the sales via an Act of Parliament. It noted that the complainant had previously sought to take such steps, when it wished to make a different amendment to its constitution.

26. The newspaper said that it was accurate to report that the complainant had “allowed” members to circumvent the 2015 ban. It said that the article did not suggest that the complainant had failed to enforce certain rules set out by the promoter or that the ban had applied to Members’ tickets. The article had made clear that the source of the promoter’s concern was the complainant’s policy of allowing Members to sell tickets, when he had sought to limit the number of resales.
27. The newspaper did not accept that referring to the arrangements of sale as “resales”, or referring to Members as “debenture holders” was significantly inaccurate, and noted that Members had been described as “debentures” previously, without complaint. The newspaper noted that the first article had reported the statement from the complainant’s spokesperson, which had set out the private, proprietary nature of members’ interests in their seats.
28. The newspaper said that it had reported the Commission’s concerns accurately. It was erroneous to suggest that the Commission was not concerned with Members selling their tickets as it was such selling that created the conflict in the complainant’s council. It was not possible to separate the issue of ticket sales from the issue of control of the charity, as the complainant was seeking to do. In support of this, the newspaper provided a statement which it had received from the Charity Commission, issued in September 2017:

“Under the Royal Charter that was created when the Hall was built in 1860s, individuals who helped finance its construction were rewarded with seats which could be handed down generations or sold permanently, like property. They can also be sold, very profitably, for individual nights of entertainment. The problem is that the seat holders are a majority of the council that runs the charity- 19 out of 25- which raises an inherent unresolvable conflict of interest in its governance.

The question is whether these arrangements enable the Council to be perceived as furthering the purposes of the charity for the public benefit. We have been engaged with the Hall for some time and, while progress has been made in some areas, the central issue of how to deal with the conflicts of interest, and suggested private benefit, remain unresolved and the Hall has shown minimal appetite to address these.

The charity had sought to address these issues by spending charitable funds to bring parliamentary proceedings to alter its constitution, by changing the Act of Parliament on which it was founded. However, the Commission has declined to authorise the charity to spend charitable funds on preparing or promoting a parliamentary Bill to implement its governance review. The Commission has concluded that it is not in the best interests of the charity to do so.

The Commission has statutory powers to establish schemes where it is necessary to alter an Act of Parliament which establishes or regulates a charity, and we believe this is the appropriate route for the outcome of a governance review requiring such constitutional changes to be made.

Due to the complex nature of these matters, we have taken the unprecedented step of seeking the consent of the Attorney General to refer a number of questions to the Charity Tribunal, under s.325 of the Charities Act 2011, concerning issues relating to the charity and the exercise of the Commission's regulatory powers by way of a scheme, to finally address this issue".

29. The newspaper said that the third article did not, as the complainant had suggested, refer to an ultimatum made by the Charity Commission. It simply reflected the long-running dispute between the complainant and the Commission. Nor had the third article stated that the complainant had breached charity law; it had contained an accusation made by the complainant's former President.
30. The newspaper said that another publication had reported an interview with the chair of the Charity Commission, who had said that "The Royal Albert Hall has now been given until May to put its house in order or face a formal inquiry by the Commission". Following this, a journalist had contacted the Commission for comment, who had said "The Royal Albert Hall is currently undertaking a governance review. The Commission has made clear that the issue of conflicts of interest and the independence of the Council from the seat owners should be dealt with as part of this review. The Commission will not pre-judge the outcome of this review and will assess its regulatory options once this has been presented".
31. The newspaper said that it was entitled to report the opinion of the complainant's former President, and said that there was no meaningful inaccuracy in the second article, caused by the original misquoting of his words. The suggestion that the trustees "preside over" over the "national disgrace" of Members selling their tickets, or that the trustees are a disgrace themselves for presiding over this practice, were substantively similar and would not lead to any misunderstanding of his views.
32. The newspaper said that the moment the complainant had raised concern regarding the original version of the online second article, it had apologised. It had explained that the omission of the words "presiding over" had occurred inadvertently and offered to reinsert the words. While it did not accept that the amendment to the online article had resulted in a breach of the Code, it reinserted the words "presiding over" into the first paragraph and added the following footnote on to the online article:

"This article was amended on [date] to correct an error introduced in the editing process, for which we apologise, which resulted in the article stating that a former president of the Royal Albert Hall had said that its leaders were a "national disgrace", when in fact what he said was that they were presiding over a "national disgrace". This is strongly denied by the Corporation that runs the Albert Hall"

33. The newspaper said that it had attempted to contact the complainant for comment, prior to the publication of the first article. The journalist had called the urgent out of hours number for press enquiries and left a message but no one returned his call. It said that the journalist had also used the complainant's online contact form, but received no response.

34. The newspaper said it had attempted to mediate a resolution to the complaint and had suggested a number of formulations for a clarification, all of which had been rejected by the complainant. While it did not accept a breach of the Code, it offered to publish the following wording in its Corrections & Clarifications column, in addition to the footnote on the second online article:

"In a number of recent articles, we said that the Royal Albert Hall allowed members who own Hall seats to resell their tickets for events and, on one occasion, to circumvent a ban on them doing so. The seats are privately owned, non-charitable property and the sales are not "resales". The trustees point out that the ban did not apply to members' seats, members are free to sell their tickets, and the Hall cannot control these sales. They deny they are presiding over a "national disgrace" and also say they are committed to working with the BBC to help them fight secondary sales of Proms tickets by non members. We are happy to clarify that the Charity Commission has not issued them with an ultimatum or threatened a statutory inquiry and that there has been no breach of charity law for not revealing the value of the seats owned by the council members and the income received from ticket sales. We apologise for any inaccuracies".

35. The newspaper changed all references to "reselling" in all the online articles to "selling". It also offered to consider a letter for publication from the complainant, subject to the right to edit it- as with all letters submitted for publication. It also offered to circulate a note to all of its news executives alerting them to the complainant's concerns and, assuming a resolution was reached, drawing their attention to the wording to be published and asking them to bear these points in mind when publishing material about the Royal Albert Hall in the future.

Further comments from the complainant:

36. In response to a request by IPSO to explain why it was not possible for it to refuse entry to members of the public who had bought Members' tickets on the open market, the complainant said that it was not able to dictate to Members how to dispose of their tickets. It also noted that such entrance restrictions would pose practical problems as staff checking such tickets upon persons entering an event would have no way of knowing whether the ticket in question had been donated, had been transferred as part of a charity auction, or indeed, sold at a discount.
37. The complainant said it had no record of the newspaper seeking comment from them prior to the first article, or at all. It did not accept the newspaper's offer of resolution, nor its previous formulations; the newspaper had continued to offer wording which was unsatisfactory and which it had made clear that it would not accept. The complainant said that it sought a fair right of reply, having been denied that in the articles.

Relevant Code provisions

38. 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.

Findings of the Committee

39. The articles under complaint contained criticism of the complainant from a number of sources, including in one instance, a columnist from the newspaper. At the core of this criticism was the allegation that the complainant “allows” its Members to sell their tickets. The complainant and the publication attributed different meanings to this claim. The complainant said that it had no standing to allow or disallow how Members use or dispose of their tickets. The newspaper did not dispute that Members had a proprietary right over their seats, but argued that it was not misleading to report that it “allows” these individuals to sell their tickets for inflated prices, where the complainant had failed to take any action to address the issue.
40. The question of whether the use of “allow” was misleading in breach of Clause 1 depended on the context in which it was placed. The first article had made the distinct claim that the complainant had “allowed” its members to “circumvent a ban” on the resale of tickets. It was not in dispute that the terms of sale imposed by the promoter did not apply to Members tickets; reporting that Members had “circumvented” a ban, and the complainant had allowed them to do so, misrepresented the terms of sale. This represented failure to take care over the accuracy of the article. The use of the term “allow”, in that context, was significantly inaccurate, as it suggested that the complainant had failed to comply with an obligation to which it was subject, and required correction under the terms of 1(ii).
41. The newspaper was entitled to take the view that the complainant had not taken sufficient steps to publicly condemn or discourage the practice of Members selling their tickets for high prices, despite public statements made by the Chairman of the Charity Commission who had expressed concern about whether the charity was acting in the public interest given the scale of commercialism in private seat sales by council members. This was the basis for the newspaper’s position that the complainant “allowed” Members to sell their tickets for high prices. In circumstances where all of the articles under complaint made clear the current legal status of Members’ property, so that readers were able to evaluate the meaning of the term, this characterisation was not misleading. The use of the term “allow”, or the allegation that the leaders of the Hall were “presiding over” over Members selling their tickets, did not represent a breach of Clause 1.
42. The articles also reported on the complainant’s long running engagement with the Charity Commission; the complainant said that the articles had misrepresented the nature of the Commission’s concerns.

43. In considering the care taken over the reporting of the complainant's interactions with its regulator, the Committee had regard to the statement from the Commission's Chairman which had been published in the third article that the "scale of commercialism in the private sales of seats raises questions about whether the charity is in fact operating in the public interest " and the statement which had been issued by the Charity Commission in September 2017.
44. The complainants' interactions with the Charity Commission were referred to in the third and fifth article. The third article had referred explicitly to the Commission's concern about a conflict of interest caused by "the majority of [the complainant's] ruling council owning seats". The statement of the Charity Commission had set out that seats held by Members could be sold profitably; it had identified a "problem" with this arrangement which was that seat holders were a majority of the council and had said that this "raised an inherent unresolvable conflict of interest in its governance". It was not in dispute that trustees on the complainant's council were in a position to sell tickets by virtue of their seat ownership. In the context of the vociferous concerns expressed publicly by the Commission's Chairman, it was not misleading to present the public statements from the Commission as expressions of concern that council Members were selling their tickets. There was no failure to take care over the presentation of the complainant's interactions with the Commission on these points, or the basis for the reference which was being made to the Charity Tribunal. The third article had not misrepresented the Charity Commission's publicly expressed concerns. Further, it did not state as fact that the Hall had breached charity law, it had distinguished this as a claim made by a former President of the Hall. There was no breach of Clause 1 in relation to the third article.
45. The fifth article had referred to the practice of members selling "allocations of tickets at inflated prices", and had gone on to report that the Charity Commission had "previously expressed concern about the issue". The Commission's publicly expressed concern did not relate to the practice of selling of seats more generally, but to members of the council doing so. The fifth article had not made this distinction clear. This represented a failure to take care over the accuracy of the article, in breach of Clause 1 (i). The misrepresentation of the Commission's concerns and further, the basis for the reference which was being made to the Charity Tribunal, was a significant inaccuracy, requiring correction to avoid a breach of 1 (ii).
46. The complainant had argued that the third article had given the misleading impression that it was not addressing the concerns raised by the Charity Commission. However, the head of the complainant's internal review was not advocating for a move to a minority of seat-holding Members on its Council. This proposed recommendation was in spite of the "great concern" expressed publicly by the Chairman of the Commission regarding the current arrangements on the complainant's Council. It was also in spite of the statement from the Commission which had been reported in the third article, which had made clear that this issue "should" be addressed. The complainant did not appear to be acting in accordance with the Commission's recommendations; it was not misleading to report that the complainant was "defying" its "demands".
47. The newspaper had sought comment from the Commission who had said that it would "assess its regulatory options" following the outcome of the complainant's internal review. It was accepted that a statutory inquiry into the trust that runs the Hall was an

option open to the Commission, should they choose to take it. Given the significant concern set out by the Commission, and its clear preference that Members should be a minority on the Council, it was not significantly misleading to characterise the possible imposition of one regulatory option as a “threat”. This aspect of the complaint did not breach Clause 1.

48. The second article had included the full statement from the Hall’s former President, setting out his concern that the fact that the lack of regulation governing Members’ selling their tickets was a “national disgrace”. The claim that “leaders” of the Hall had been described as a “national disgrace” was not a misleading characterisation of his concerns, in circumstances where his full quote, setting out his concern about trustees’ conduct, was included in the article.
49. The Committee did not establish any significant inaccuracies in the fourth article’s discussion of ticket sales for the Last Night of the Proms. The columnist was entitled to focus on the specific issue of Members selling their tickets at high prices in order to illustrate the difficulty in accessing tickets for the night. In the context of an opinion piece, the columnist’s decision to focus on one reason why access was difficult for the event did not suggest that the public were being prevented from accessing the Last Night of the Proms primarily due to Members’ actions.
50. The complainant argued that reference to tickets “resales” suggested that Members were selling their tickets in a manner akin to the industry-wide issue of secondary ticket sales. The Committee disagreed. The articles had made clear that Members were obtaining a financial benefit from selling their tickets which they receive by virtue of their seat ownership. The term “resell” did not mischaracterise this arrangement and both “resell” and “sell” made clear the complainant’s position that Members were able to control the sale of their tickets. In these circumstances, while it was accurate to report that Members were “selling” their tickets, the Committee did not establish that reporting that tickets were being “re-sold” in the first instance was significant. While the Committee did not establish a breach of the Code on this point, it welcomed the newspaper’s decision to remove references to “re-selling” in the online articles.
51. The Committee noted the complainant’s position that the term “debenture holders” suggested that Members owned a lease over their seats. The use of the term “debenture holders” drew a distinction between individuals who owned seats privately, and seats owned by the charity. Where the articles had been clear that Members own their seats, the Committee did not consider that referring to them “debenture holders” was significantly misleading such as to require correction.
52. In response to the complainant’s request that it be given a fair opportunity to reply, the newspaper had offered an opportunity for the complainant to submit a letter for publication. The Committee considered that such an opportunity was fair, given the significant inaccuracy which it has established above. There was no breach of Clause 1 (iii).

Conclusion

53. The complaint was upheld.

Remedial Action Required

54. Having upheld a breach of Clause 1, the Committee considered what remedial action should be required.
55. The newspaper had promptly offered a correction, prior to the complainant contacting IPSO, which had made reference to the 2015 ban and had set out that members are free to sell their tickets. It had also subsequently offered a correction which had made clear that the Charity Commission was concerned with the number of seat holders on the Board, not the issue of ticket resales. The correction which the newspaper had offered in final settlement of the complaint, and set out above, had made clear that the "ban" did not apply to members' seats.
56. The correction which the newspaper had offered in final settlement of the complaint, referred to material which the Committee did not consider to be in breach of the Code. However, the Committee welcomed the fact that this wording provided clarification on the complainant's position.
57. It was unfortunate that the complainant had not accepted the previous wording which had been offered by the newspaper earlier, so that the misleading impression contained in the first and fifth articles could have been corrected. The newspaper had offered a number of corrections during the course of the complaint. These corrections had addressed all the points which the Committee had found to be in breach of the Code. The Committee suggested that the following wording should be published, which drew on the wording of the corrections which had previously been offered by the newspaper:

"In a number of recent articles, we said that the Royal Albert Hall allowed members who own Hall seats to resell their tickets for events and, on one occasion, to circumvent a ban on them doing so. The seats are privately owned, non-charitable property and the sales are not "resales". The trustees point out that the ban did not apply to members' seats, members are free to sell their tickets, and the Hall cannot control these sales. We also said that the Charity Commission is concerned about people who own seats at the Royal Albert Hall selling their tickets at inflated prices, and had referred this matter to the Charity Tribunal. In fact, the Commission is not concerned about the issue of ticket resales by Members generally; it is concerned with the number of seat holders on the Board.

We are happy to clarify that the Charity Commission has not issued the Hall with an ultimatum or threatened a statutory inquiry and that there has been no breach of charity law for not revealing the value of the seats owned by the council members and the income received from ticket sales. The trustees deny they are presiding over a "national disgrace" and also say they are committed to working with the BBC to help them fight secondary sales of Proms tickets by non members. We apologise for any inaccuracies".

58. In order to avoid a breach of Clause 1(ii) this wording should now be published. The print correction should be published in the newspaper's corrections and clarifications column. The online correction should be published as a footnote to the articles.

Appendix B

Decision of the Complaints Committee 17326-17 Royal Albert Hall v The Sunday Times

Summary of Complaint

1. The governing Council of the Royal Albert Hall complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that The Sunday Times breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "Going for a song: tycoon's £2.7m Albert Hall box", published on 28 May 2017.
2. The article reported that ten seats in a box at the Royal Albert Hall had been sold for £2.7 million. It reported that the "record breaking price will increase the market value of the other 1,265 seats owned by individuals and companies- about a quarter of the concert hall, which has charitable status".
3. The article explained that the other 1,265 seats, included 145 seats owned by the Royal Albert Hall's trustees and related parties. The article contained a brief reference to the complainant's engagement with the Charity Commission; it reported that: "the Charity Commission said it had 'serious concerns' about the management of the charity and would act because perceptions 'that trustees are in a position to benefit financially from their role can be very damaging'". The article also reported a statement from the complainant: "seat holders [take] no benefit from the charity and voluntarily benefited it by £5m a year".
4. The article appeared in substantively the same form online, under the headline: "Billionaire Jim Ratcliffe buys box at Royal Albert Hall for £2.7m".
5. The complainant said that the article had inaccurately implied that the Charity Commission had made an allegation of wrongdoing and had issued it with an ultimatum. It further said that the article had failed to make clear that the 1,265 seats owned by its Members were entirely separate from the seats owned by the Hall, which have "charitable status". The complainant said that it had provided a statement for publication, but key aspects of it had been omitted from the article.
6. The newspaper said that the article did not contain the implications suggested by the complainant. The article did not suggest that an "ultimatum" had been issued by the Charity Commission and it was accurate to report that the Commission had serious concerns about the management of the charity.
7. The newspaper said that the Commission had been concerned about the issue of the perceived conflict of interest in charity trustees, who were in a position to benefit from the sale of tickets which had been issued to them by virtue of their permanent seat ownership. The newspaper said that the Commission had made clear that it expected the complainant to deal with the issue during an internal review into the trust's constitution, by ensuring that a minority of trustees are seat holders.
8. The newspaper said that the article had made clear that the 1275 seats were privately owned. The article concerned the private sale of a box from a named individual, and the only reference

to a charity was in relation to the Hall itself: no reader would think that the seats that were being traded were anything other than privately owned, as set out in the article.

Relevant Code provisions

9. 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.

Findings of the Committee

10. It was not in dispute that the Charity Commission had expressed concern regarding the perceived conflict of interest in the complainant's trustees, who were in a position to benefit from the sale of tickets which had been issued to them by virtue of their permanent seat ownership. It was accurate for the article to report that the Commission had raised "serious concerns" about the management of the charity, and the article did not contain a suggestion that it had issued the complainant with an ultimatum. The article reported accurately that the 1,265 seats which were privately owned, were separate from the seats which formed part of the Hall's charitable assets. There was no breach of Clause 1.

Appendix C

Decision of the Complaints Committee 19719-17 Thomson v Sunday Post

Summary of Complaint

1. Joanne Thomson complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that the Sunday Post breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined, "I was very uncomfortable about doing it but scared not to. Then the directors, both well-known in the industry, told me not to tell anyone. I was so terrified I said yes" published on 15 October 2017. The article was also trailed on the front page with the headline, "I never met any men like Harvey Weinstein when I was in Hollywood. I met plenty in Scotland though."
2. The article was an interview with the complainant, which reported on her experience of the so-called "casting couch culture" while working as an actor in both Scotland and the United States of America. The article was trailed on the front page with a picture of the complainant and the quotation "I never met any men like Harvey Weinstein when I was in Hollywood. I met plenty in Scotland though." The strapline that appeared at the top of the article said, "Actress speaks out in wake of casting couch scandal and says sexism and harassment in Scotland is as bad as Hollywood". The opening paragraph stated that the complainant had claimed "women are routinely harassed and hounded by powerful men in the Scottish screen industry," and went on to report that the complainant had said "a casting couch culture still exists in Scotland" and that many actors, including her, had endured sexual harassment at the hands of "powerful men" within the industry. The article ended with comments from other industry figures, about allegedly "predatory" behaviour.
3. The article quoted the complainant as having said "there's this idea that if you don't sleep with men in the business then you won't get on," and went on to report that the complainant and other female actors had an "unofficial self-help group" where they shared details of "male directors, producers and actors" who they believed were responsible for sexual harassment. The article also reported that while the complainant had said that it was unlikely that the scale of allegations that had emerged in the United States would ever be seen in Scotland, as she believed there was "no one figure" who was that powerful in the Scottish screen industry, women working in the entertainment industry in Scotland still "had to be careful". It quoted her as saying, in relation to her experiences in the US, that, "all I know is that I did not experience the problems there that I have done here."
4. The article included an account of an experience the complainant had had as a drama student. She said that two "well-known" directors had asked her to dress in lingerie and be filmed in sexual positions with two male actors. She had felt uncomfortable but had been afraid to say no. The directors had told her not to tell anyone about the request, and she had said yes. She had later changed her mind, and said no.
5. The article also appeared online, headlined, "'I was very uncomfortable about doing it but was scared not to': Actress Joanne Thomson describes an audition in Glasgow," and was substantially the same as the print article.
6. The complainant said that the article had misreported the interview she had given. She said that the newspaper had attributed comments to her that she had not made, and omitted a number of points that she had made, in order to misrepresent the views she had expressed. She said that the views expressed in the article were those of the male reporter,

not her own. She said that it was ironic that in an article about her own experiences of sexism, she believed her voice had been silenced by a man. The complainant had recorded the interview, and provided a transcript of the recording to IPSO.

7. The complainant said that the article gave the impression that she believed that the so-called "casting couch culture" was worse in Scotland than in the United States. This was not the case. She had explained that she had had positive experiences while working in Hollywood, but that her experience of the industry in the United States was limited. She denied that she had said that "all I know is that I did not experience the problems there that I have done here," as reported in the article. The complainant said that the front page strapline did not accurately reflect her views. She said that the journalist had called her prior to publication to check this line, and she had approved it only because she knew that he was facing time pressures.
8. The complainant said that she had told the journalist that there was "no one figure" in the Scottish industry with the power of Hollywood producers, and had made clear that the so-called "casting couch culture" was not rife in the Scottish entertainment industry. In response to the reporter's statement that the "casting couch culture" seemed to be "alive and well" in Scotland, she had responded, "of course that's a really interesting story if that's true, but it's just, it's not, it's not as alive and well as Hollywood... The culture is alive in our society here- absolutely." She said that she had discussed problems of sexual assault and harassment, but in the context of society more generally, rather than the film industry in Scotland. She accepted that female actors did message each other to warn of the potentially predatory behaviour of men in the industry, but this was in relation to young actors the women may be working alongside, not "male directors, producers and actors" as reported in the article.
9. The complainant denied that she had said that "there's this idea that if you don't sleep with men in the business then you won't get on." She said that this implied that she believed that women needed to use sex to achieve success, which was not the case. The complainant accepted that she had once told a fellow actor to "be careful" when working with a particular man, but denied that she had said that women need to be careful more generally. She said that this suggested that she believed that women should take responsibility for sexual harassment or assault.
10. The newspaper apologised for any frustration or upset the publication of the article had caused the complainant, but did not accept that it had breached the Code. It said that the article formed part of its wider coverage of sexual harassment in Scotland, which was a matter of public interest and said that the complainant's interview had been endorsed by others in the screen industry. The newspaper considered that it had substantially reported the complainant's comments accurately and did not believe the article misrepresented her views.
11. The newspaper said that the use of the term "casting couch culture" referred not only to the idea that in order to get a certain role in the entertainment industry, the actor had to perform sexual favours for the person in control of casting, such as the director or producer, but also covered more general instances in the industry of men of power abusing their influence in relation to women. It provided screenshots of the conversation between the journalist and the complainant before the interview, where the journalist had made clear that he wished to speak to her specifically about the "casting couch culture" in Scotland. It said that in these circumstances, it was reasonable for the journalist to assume

that the experiences the complainant had described in the interview had taken place in the Scottish screen industry.

12. The newspaper accepted that the recording and transcript provided by the complainant were an accurate representation of the 50 minute interview between the complainant and the journalist. However, it said that the journalist had spent almost two hours with the complainant, and had continued to ask questions and take notes throughout. The newspaper considered that the comments made by the complainant after the recorded interview were more personal and relevant for the purposes of the article. It provided a copy of the journalist's notebook and a transcript of his notes. It said these notes represented the interview in its entirety, and had been written by the journalist either at the time of the interview, or within 15 minutes of leaving the complainant.
13. In relation to the direct quotations the complainant believed to be inaccurate, the newspaper highlighted a section of the reporter's notes which stated "there's this idea that women sleep with men to get ahead. It's crazy" which it said supported the quotation that "there's the idea that if you don't sleep with men in the business then you won't get on." It said that this quotation had come from the part of the interview that was not recorded, and had been written down by the reporter within 15 minutes of leaving the complainant. The newspaper maintained that this quotation accurately reflected what the complainant had said, and denied that this quotation suggested that women regularly sleep with men to progress their career in the screen industry.
14. The newspaper did not have a note of the complainant stating "All I know is that I did not experience the problems there that I have done here"; however, it maintained that the article had been written by the journalist immediately after the interview, and was an accurate reflection of what the complainant had said, as it had an identical meaning to the front page quotation the complainant had approved. It also said that the reporter had recorded the complainant as referring to a need for women to "be careful" three times during the interview, which it said was accurately reported in the article.
15. It said that the article did not suggest that the scale of sexual harassment within the film industry in Scotland was comparable to that that had been exposed in the Hollywood. It pointed out that Scotland does not have a single film studio and that the article had stated several times in the article that the problem was not on the same scale in the Scottish screen industry. Rather, it wished to make the point, as the complainant did in her interview, that the problem is not limited to Hollywood, and that men abuse their power in Scotland as well. It said that the front page strapline was a distillation of this broader point. Due to the personal nature of the article, it had taken the unusual step of contacting the complainant prior to publication, to ask her to approve this quote, which she had done.
16. Nevertheless, as soon as the complainant contacted the editor to express her concern, the newspaper apologised that the article had caused her frustration, offered to remove or edit the online article and offered to publish an opinion piece penned by the complainant on the subject. The newspaper also offered to publish a number of clarifications in print, and suggested the following wording:

"After an interview published on 15 October, actor Joanne Thomson complained that she made none of the statements attributed to her. She would like to make clear that she does not believe sexual harassment is as widespread in the Scottish screen industry as it is in Hollywood; does not believe it is a woman's responsibility to be careful in casting couch

situations; and does not believe women in the Scottish screen industry need to sleep with men to get ahead. We are happy to make her position clear."

17. The complainant did not accept these offers of resolution, as she believed a printed apology was appropriate.

Relevant Code Provisions

18. Clause 1 (Accuracy)

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

Findings of the Committee

19. In considering the accuracy of the article, the Committee had regard for the reporter's notes and the recording and transcript of the interview provided by the complainant. The Committee acknowledged that it was important for women's experiences of sexual harassment to be accurately reported and gave serious consideration to the complainant's concern that her voice had been silenced by the reporter. In these circumstances it was particularly helpful for the Committee to be able to consider the recording and transcript she had supplied. However, the Committee was required to consider, independently, whether the article had inaccurately reported the complainant's comments.
20. The reporter had taken a large number of notes, which were a useful contemporaneous account of what had been said during the interview. Notes are often sufficient to show the care taken by a newspaper over the accuracy of an article. The Committee also welcomed the efforts made by the reporter, prior to publication, to ensure that the complainant's views were accurately reported, by calling her to obtain her confirmation that the front page strapline accurately represented her experiences. While there was some variation between the transcript which the complainant had provided, and the reporter's notes, the newspaper's obligation to take care over the presentation of direct quotations does not require it to reproduce an interviewee's comments word for word. In such circumstances, the question is whether the quotations had been reported in such a way as to change the meaning of what the complainant had said.
21. The newspaper had contacted the complainant to specifically discuss the "casting couch culture" and her experiences both in the UK and the United States. The term "casting couch culture" is a broad term and relates not only to female actors being expected to perform sexual favours in return for professional roles, but also encompasses the general culture of powerful men implicitly abusing their influence in the industry to make women feel objectified and harassed. Reporting on this issue is a matter of considerable public interest.
22. The complainant had recounted her experience, while at drama school, of being placed in an uncomfortable situation by experienced members of the industry. The Committee noted her position that, by telling this story, she intended to show the sexism in the types of roles available for young female actors. However, the newspaper had accurately reported her account, and was entitled to present it as support for the suggestion that some powerful individuals in the industry were taking advantage of young women. Given the complainant's comments, it was not inaccurate for the article to report that the complainant

- was concerned about the actions of some powerful men in the industry. There was no breach of the Code in relation to the presentation of this wider point.
23. The newspaper had taken the unusual step of asking the complainant to approve the front page strapline. While the Committee noted the complainant's position that she had approved the quotation because she believed the reporter was facing time pressures, she had not raised any concerns about its accuracy, and so the newspaper was entitled to publish it as an accurate summary of the interview. However, the situation in relation to the strapline published inside the article was different. The complainant had made clear, throughout the conversation, that she did not believe that the situation in Scotland was comparable to that in Hollywood, noting that figures in the Scottish industry did not have the same level of power, and that her experiences in the United States were limited; indeed, the article had included her comment that "the problem in Scotland...may not be as bad as it is in Hollywood". The inside strapline claimed that the complainant had said that sexism and harassment was as bad in Scotland as in Hollywood which represented a failure to take care to present the complainant's position on this point accurately. This was a breach of Clause 1 (i).
 24. The complainant had not made the claim which was attributed to her in the inside strapline, which was an inaccurate representation of her views, and was not supported by the text. Reporting this, in the context of widely reported allegations about various figures in Hollywood, misrepresented the comparison the complainant had made between the two industries, and suggested that the allegations she had made were more serious than those included in the article. This represented a significant inaccuracy, requiring correction under the terms of Clause 1(ii).
 25. Neither the reporter's notes, nor the transcript, included the complainant saying "all I know is that I did not experience the problems there that I have done here," as reported in the article. The reporter said he had noted this down when writing the article, shortly after the interview had finished. However, the Committee observed that there was no note of the comment, and it seemed to contradict the complainant's position in the recorded section of the interview, and in the reporter's notes. In these circumstances, the Committee considered that the newspaper had failed to demonstrate that it had taken care over the accuracy of the report of this comment, in breach of 1(i). The inclusion of this quotation added to the significantly misleading impression created by the inside strapline, in breach of Clause 1 (ii).
 26. The reporter's notes recorded that the complainant had said "there's this idea that women sleep with men to get ahead. It's crazy" and it was the newspaper's position that this comment had been made after the formal section of the interview had concluded, and when the complainant was no longer recording the conversation. By producing the reporter's contemporaneous notes, the newspaper had demonstrated that it had taken care so as to report this comment accurately. Paraphrasing this comment as "there's this idea that if you don't sleep with men in the business then you won't get on," did not suggest, as the complainant contended, that she believed that women could not be successful if they did not sleep with men. Nor did reporting that she had said "you have to be careful", where the recording and transcript showed that she had given this advice to one woman facing these issues, suggest that she believed women were responsible for sexual harassment. There was no breach of the Code on these points.
 27. While it was accepted by the Committee that the complainant had not said that all women need to be careful, she had made clear that she believed sexual harassment was

widespread in society, and could potentially affect any woman. The Committee found that the reported claim that women still needed to be careful was a reference to the complainant's view that sexual harassment was prevalent in all sections of society, and did not suggest that she believed it was women's responsibility to ensure sexual harassment did not occur. There was no breach of 1 (i) on this point.

Conclusion

28. The complaint was upheld.

Remedial Action Required

29. Having upheld a breach of Clause 1, the Committee considered what remedial action should be required.

30. The newspaper had published a significantly misleading inside strapline, not supported by the text of the article, which was compounded by an inaccurate quotation reported in the article. The newspaper had offered to publish a correction, setting out the complainant's position. However, the misattribution of quotes given as part of an interview, was a serious failure to take care, and so the appropriate remedy was the publication of an upheld adjudication.

31. The print article had been trailed on the front page and appeared in full on pages 4 and 5. Where the Committee upheld the complaint in relation to information that appeared on pages 4 and 5 only, the Committee decided that adjudication should be published on page 4 or further forward. The Committee noted that the misleading strapline had not appeared on the online article; however, it had still carried the inaccurate quotation in the body of the article. In these circumstances, the adjudication should also be published online, with a link appearing on the homepage for 24 hours; it should then be archived in the usual way. The headline of the adjudication must make clear that IPSO has upheld the complaint against the Sunday Post, and refer to its subject matter. It must be agreed with IPSO in advance.

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

Joanne Thomson complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that the Sunday Post breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined, "I was very uncomfortable about doing it but scared not to. Then the directors, both well-known in the industry, told me not to tell anyone. I was so terrified I said yes" published on 15 October 2017. The article was also trailed on the front page with the headline, "I never met any men like Harvey Weinstein when I was in Hollywood. I met plenty in Scotland though." The article was an interview with the complainant, which reported on her experience of the so-called "casting couch culture" while working as an actor in both Scotland and the United States of America. The strapline of the article said, "Actress speaks out in wake of casting couch scandal and says sexism and harassment in Scotland is as bad as Hollywood," and the article went on to report Ms Thomson as stating, "All I know is that I did not experience the problems there that I have done here."

The complainant said that the article had misreported the interview, and had given the impression that she believed that the so-called "casting couch culture" was worse in Scotland than in the United States. This was not the case. She also denied that she had said that "all I know is that I did not experience the problems there that I have done here," as reported in the article. The complainant provided a recording, and transcript of the interview.

The newspaper apologised for any upset the article caused but did not accept it had breached the code. It denied the article suggested the scale of sexual harassment within the film industry in Scotland was as bad as in America only that when it happened it was as bad as in America. It pointed out that Scotland does not have a single film studio. In addition, Ms Thomson was repeatedly quoted in the article saying the scale of the problem in Scotland was not the same.

The newspaper did not have a note of the quote "All I know is that I did not experience the problems there that I have done here" but claimed it was accurate. It also claimed the quote had an identical meaning to the front-page headline "I never met any men like Harvey Weinstein when I was in Hollywood. I met plenty in Scotland though." This was approved by the complainant before publication. The newspaper provided the reporter's notes of the interview and claimed that, when taken in context with the front-page headline, the size of Scotland's film industry, and the complainant's quotes, the meaning of the strapline was clear.

The complainant had made clear throughout the conversation that she did not believe that the situation in Scotland was comparable to that in Hollywood, noting that figures in the Scottish industry did not have the same level of power, and that her experiences in the United States were limited. The newspaper had failed to take care over the accuracy of the inside strapline claim that she had said that sexism and harassment was as bad in Scotland as in Hollywood. This was a breach of Clause 1 (i).

Reporting this, in the context of widely reported allegations about various figures in Hollywood, misrepresented the comparison the complainant had made between the two industries, and suggested that the allegations she had made were more serious than those included in the article. This represented a significant inaccuracy, requiring correction under the terms of 1(ii). Neither the reporter's notes, nor the transcript, recorded the complainant saying "all I know is that I did not experience the problems there that I have done here". While the reporter said he had written the article shortly after the interview, the Committee observed that there was no note of this, and it seemed to contradict the complainant's position in the recorded section of the interview, and the reporter's notes. In these circumstances, the Committee considered that the newspaper had failed to demonstrate that it had taken care over the accuracy of the report of this comment, in breach of 1(i). This quotation also added to the significantly misleading impression created by the inside strapline, in breach of Clause 1 (ii). The complaint under Clause 1 was upheld.

Appendix D

Paper No.	File Number	Name v Publication
1227	18520-17	Rowlands v The Daily Telegraph
1229	18812-17	Butt v mirror.co.uk
1232	19525-17	Sarwar v The National
1236	16907- 17/16908- 17	Delay Dossier - Ford v Halesowen News/Stourbridge News
1240	18680- 17/18894- 17	Johnston v Grimsby Telegraph/mirror.co.uk
1242		Request for review
1244	18875-17	Dickinson v Mail Online
1245	19858-17	Walker v mirror.co.uk
1247	19508-17	Savvov v The Times
1249		Request for review
1250	19319- 17/19320- 17	Warren v The Chronicle (Newcastle)/mirror.co.uk
1256	20808-17	Note to Committee – Alersawy v Mail Online
1257	19501-17	Ireland v Evening Telegraph
1258	20529-17	Strachan v Mail Online