

Reach

Reach PLC

Annual Statement to the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO)

For the period

1 January to 31 December 2023



020 7293 3000



www.reachplc.com



linkedin.com/company/reach-plc/

Contents

1.	Foreword.....	2
2.	Overview.....	2
3.	Responsible Person.....	2
4.	Editorial Standards.....	2
5.	Complaints Handling Process.....	3
6.	Training Process.....	5
7.	Our Record On Compliance.....	5
8.	Remedial Action.....	6
9.	Schedule.....	18

1. Foreword

The reporting period covers 1 January to 31 December 2023 (“the Relevant Period”).

2. Overview

Reach PLC (Reach) is the largest news publisher in the UK.

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

During the Relevant Period, Reach published 10 National Newspapers, 115 Regional Newspapers (with associated magazines, apps and supplements as applicable) and 47 websites. Some websites continued to merge into the “Live” brand during this period. A full list of Reach’s publications for the Relevant Period is attached to this document¹.

3. Responsible Person

Reach’s Responsible Person is Barbara Ludlow.

4. Editorial Standards

The maintenance of high editorial standards is at the core of Reach’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. There is an emphasis on staff training (see Section 6 below) and all editorial staff are given mandatory monthly legal and compliance briefings on lessons learned and/or changes to the Code by way of a confidential and privileged Legal Bulletin.

¹ See Annex A

5. Complaints Handling Process

Reach 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 strives to reply to all complainants in a timely and courteous manner, regardless of the merits of the complaint.

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

5.1 Formal Complaints Process

Print

Every Reach printed news publication sets out details about its Complaints Process on page 2 of each edition in a column entitled “Corrections & Complaints”. The column includes a web address to Reach’s “How To Make A Complaint” process, which is hosted on our website, www.reachplc.com. The website also hosts our Complaints Policy, the Code and our online Complaints Form.

The column also informs readers of Reach’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 the relevant 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.

Online

Every Reach website carries a link on its home page, which sets out not only a link to Reach’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 or correction.

5.2 Process

Once a Complaints Form is received, the matter is handled by the Complaints Team which is part of the Legal Department. The complaint is assessed by Reach's experienced Complaints Officer to determine whether the Code has been engaged, whether there has been a misinterpretation of the Code and/or whether the complaint is vexatious.

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

If a complaint engages the Code, the matter is investigated internally and a response sent. The response will either reject the complaint, if Reach 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.

5.3 Referrals From IPSO

The receipt of new complaints referred to Reach publications by IPSO engages Clause 13 of The Regulations. As part of its internal Complaints Procedure, Reach 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.

5.4 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. If the Editor believes that the complaint highlights a possible breach of the Code, it will be forwarded to the Complaints Team and dealt with in accordance with the internal Complaints procedure.

5.5 Recording Of Complaints

Complaints that are received by Reach 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, 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.

6. Training Process

Following the acquisition of the Northern and Shell titles, Reach reviewed its editorial legal and compliance training programme and a new in-house compulsory online course was created and introduced in December 2020 for completion by all editorial staff. The course contains nine animated and narrated modules covering all 16 Clauses of the Code. 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 modules. All new starters to the Editorial teams are required to complete this course.

This course also formed part of Reach's yearly compliance training in 2023, meaning that everyone working in an editorial role was required to watch the videos again and complete the assessment modules.

As part of continuing legal and regulatory education for journalists and to provide legal advice, since March 2017, a series of regular confidential Legal and IPSO Bulletins have been sent to all staff. These privileged and confidential 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. 11 such Bulletins were circulated in 2023.

Further, in 2022 Reach launched a Legal and editorial induction training programme. The programme, designed specifically for new joiners to editorial teams, is mandatory and covers the Code, the Complaints Policy and a legal refresher.

7. Our Record On Compliance

During the Relevant Period, Reach published over 2.5 million articles in its National and Regional print titles and online. It is common for most print articles to also be published online.

In 2023, Reach received a total of 483 direct complaints through its online Complaints Form. Of those complaints 237 were resolved and 236 were rejected outright as a non breach of the Code. The remaining complaints were either misinterpretations of the Code or not pursued. Resolution of a complaint does not necessarily indicate an admitted breach of the Code. Many of these resolved direct complaints did not represent a breach, but were resolved by offering a gesture of goodwill, for example, the removal of information or the article itself.

Furthermore, Reach received a total of 155 complaints that were referred by IPSO. During the Relevant Period, 65 complaints were resolved/settled during referral. Of those that escalated to the Committee, 30 were Upheld in the manner detailed below, and 49 were Not Upheld.

This report covers all upheld IPSO adjudications received within the Relevant Period.

The 30 Upheld complaints within the Relevant Period, are broken down as follows:

6	Upheld with a requirement to publish an adjudication
2	Upheld in Part with a requirement to publish an adjudication
5	Upheld with a requirement to publish a correction
4	Upheld in Part with a requirement to publish a correction
13	Upheld decisions where the Complaints Committee ruled that sufficient remedial action had been offered by the publication, with 4 of these decisions being Upheld in Part.

7.1 Regulation 40

Reach successfully defended 2 complaints pursuant to Regulation 40 during the relevant period. The complainants in these matters rejected the remedial measures offered by the publication and referred their complaints back to IPSO. The Complaints Committee was asked to consider them under Regulation 40, and it concluded that the remedial measures offered by the publication were a satisfactory resolution. The complaints were subsequently closed without investigation.

8. Remedial Action

If a complaint is Upheld and it is appropriate to do so, the matter is reported in the privileged and confidential monthly Legal Bulletin with further advice and an explanation of what went wrong (if any wrongdoing is identified). Readership of the Legal Bulletin is mandatory and compliance with the requirement to read the Bulletin within 21 days of issue is monitored.

The Editor or Audience Content Director responsible for the publication, Content Editor, journalist and all relevant team members are separately informed of the outcome and advice is given to the journalist about the issue that had been identified.

Details of all upheld adjudications, published and adjudicated upon in the Relevant Period, are set out below:

8.1 Upheld with requirement to publish the Adjudication

16894-23; 16898-23; 16769-23; 16498-23 Abbas v Sunday Mirror / liverpoolecho.co.uk / lancs.live / edinburghlive.co.uk

“I have lost my girl and now I don't know if I'll ever see my grandkids again”, “Children 'missing' after mum's mysterious death in Pakistan”, “Grandparents desperate for answers over the whereabouts of their grandchildren after mother took them to Pakistan” and “Devastated couple whose daughter died abroad don't know where grandchildren are” reported the account of a couple whose British daughter had died in Pakistan, after having flown there with her two children and husband. The grandparents complained that they had lost touch with their grandchildren and that the death of their daughter was suspicious. Her death had previously been widely reported, and had even been addressed by the Prime Minister. The names and the ages of the grandchildren were included in the article as were a photograph of them and it was reported that they had “*disappeared*”. The father of the children complained that the articles represented a breach of the children's privacy, and breached Clause 6 (Children). Given the grandparents did not have custody of the children, and where the publication had not obtained consent from the father, the Committee found that the article was in breach of Clause 2 and 6.

Date decision issued: 16/05/2023

This was frustrating as the whole point of the article was that the father had disappeared with the grandchildren and was uncontactable by the grandparents. Consent could not have been sought. The decision was included in the Legal Bulletin.

11888-22 A man v The Sentinel

“It's upsetting when they don't want help but we have to hope in the future they will engage” was a report on the services in place to help local homelessness. Reference was made to a homeless “male” living in a specific location and confirmed that he was seeking help for drug and alcohol abuse. IPSO found that the man was identifiable as he was notorious in the area, and therefore the reference to him seeking help for a drug addiction was a breach of his privacy. The publication was able to provide historical articles in which the man had previously been identified in relation to drug and burglary charges, however the Committee did not deem that this justified the intrusion in relation to his current engagement with drug services. Given that a breach of clause 2 was found, the adjudication was required.

Date decision issued: 18/05/2023

The publication did take precautions to ensure that the man was not identifiable, and the decision does seem harsh. However, because of the sensitivity of the information at risk of being made public, the publication was reminded to take care. The decision was included in the monthly bulletin.

17845-23 Knight-Brown v Sunday Mail

“Wife moves out to be near Rossi’s jail” - This article included two photographs of the complainant in the street, outside a building. The complainant had previously contacted IPSO following *“multiple approaches from journalists”* and advised that she did not wish to comment or to be photographed. IPSO circulated a Press Advisory Notice (PAN) on 3rd January 2023. The article under complaint was published on 2 April. The complainant said that the publication had breached the terms of Clause 2 (privacy) and 3 (harassment) by photographing her outside her home after she had requested that journalists not approach her or photograph her, and in circumstances where she had a reasonable expectation of privacy. The publication did not accept that the Code had been breached, and set out the events which led to the photographs being taken, including the fact that the complainant had participated in several interviews prior to the PAN being circulated. It also noted that the complainant did not know she had been photographed until the article was published. The complaint was Upheld under Clause 3 with a requirement to publish the full adjudication because the publication had not shown sufficient justification to go against the PAN.

Date decision issued: 03/08/2023

This was a very harsh decision. It shows that the IPSO is stricter when applying this part of the Editors’ Code than the courts when determining a legal harassment claim. The publication and Reach journalists generally were reminded of the need to keep a written record of their thought processes where publication is considered to be in the public interest.

8.2 Upheld in part with requirement to publish the Adjudication

09841-22 Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust v Sunday Mirror

“Patients left to die in Hospital Store Room” reported whistleblowers’ claims that end of life patients had been *“left to die”* in *“storage rooms”*. In fact, these were cohort areas, and the claim of *“storage rooms”* had not been put to the hospital before the article was published. There were a number of other inaccuracies in the article but the main criticism was that not all of the allegations had been put to the hospital before publication. Given the seriousness of the breach, the Committee required an adjudication to be published in print.

Date decision issued: 28/03/2023

The publication was reminded of the importance of putting all allegations to the subject of an article before publication and the decision was reported in the Legal Bulletin.

09339-22 A woman v cornwallive.co.uk

“Truro homeless attack suspects have bail extended” reported that six teenagers who had been arrested after an assault on a homeless man had their bail extended whilst they awaited a decision from the CPS as to whether or not they would be charged. The article was also posted on the publication’s Facebook page. The complainant was the mother of one of the teenagers that had been arrested. She complained that the article breached Clause 1, Clause 2, Clause 6, and Clause 9 by disclosing that her child had had his bail extended. The complaints pack also contained a screengrab of a Facebook post, which showed a comment from a member of the public identifying individuals as being five of the six teenagers. The complaint also made reference to another Facebook post, also containing a comment naming her son. The complainant said that her son had not been named by the police, and that allowing the sharing of his name had put her child in danger. She advised that her son was 14 years old and still in full-time education – though he did not attend school due to safety concerns. According to the complainant, the February comment had been posted a day or two after her son’s arrest. One of the Facebook posts had been removed as soon as this was flagged, however there was confusion over which article was under complaint and its counterpart Facebook post, which led to a delay of 19 days for the removal of the second Facebook post. The Committee found that this represented a breach of Clause 6 as it had caused “*unnecessary intrusion*” into the pupil’s freedom to complete their time at school. The Committee noted that the terms of Clause 6 (i) apply to children who are in full-time compulsory education, regardless of the educational setting; as in this case, given the child was not currently at school.

Date decision issued: 06/05/2023

The Committee initially also upheld this complaint under Clause 9. The publication requested a review as a breach was found because “*the publication had not been able to demonstrate that the child’s name was already in the public domain*”, despite the publication not being asked to. The Reviewer found that the process was flawed and the publication was given an opportunity to necessary provide evidence. Once these were provided to the Committee, there was no breach of Clause 9. Concerns were also raised with IPSO about multiple articles being referred to in one complaint, because that had caused the confusion and delay in this matter.

8.3 Upheld with a requirement to publish a Correction

09772-23 Peet v Sunday People

"We go without meals to keep our son alive", reported the difficulties faced by disabled people and their families during the cost-of-living crisis. The article included the story of a two-year-old who had a rare type of spina bifida. The article stated that he could not walk or talk and that the family was having to choose between buying food and paying to keep his vital machines going. In fact the child could talk, and the mother had told the publication, *"when it gets unmanageable we make sure the kids are fed [...] me and my partner often can survive on coffee or tea but they can't so we just make sure they're fed"*. The Committee found that the headline was significantly misleading and required a correction in print.

Date decision issued: 21/06/2023

The publication was reminded to take care when paraphrasing or summarising quotes, especially in sensitive stories.

12513-22 Muir v Paisley Daily Express

"Teacher convicted of abusing ex-girlfriend given community order" reported a domestic abuse case, and outlined the details of the charge. The complainant said that the details of the charge were incorrect. His solicitor suggested that the final charge had been amended to remove any reference to physical violence, and provided a copy of an amended charge sheet. The publication contacted the court officer, who confirmed that the details set out in the article were correct. Because the publication could not provide contemporaneous notes of the charge from the hearing, it could not demonstrate that it had taken care and the Committee found a breach of Clause 1. Although IPSO could not make a finding of fact in respect of the charge, the Committee required a correction to make clear that the charge was disputed.

Date decision issued: 22/06/2023

This was an odd decision, given that the court had confirmed that the details of the charge were correct. The charge had not been read out in court, but the reporter was shown it. Had he written it down in his notes, this complaint could not have been upheld.

17352-23 Smith v dailystar.co.uk

The headline, "Brit woman needing double hand transplant refuses hands of man and black female" resulted in a complaint because she had not in fact been offered a transplant. The *"offer"* formed part of a psychological assessment and was a hypothetical question to assess whether her body was more likely to reject the transplanted hand from a different sex or race. IPSO found that the headline was significantly misleading even though the text of the

article made clear the woman's full reasoning for answering "no". As the inaccuracy was in the headline, the Committee required a standalone correction.

Date decision issued: 21/07/2023

The publication was reminded that an accurate article cannot act as a correction to an inaccurate headline. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Here, the article contradicted the headline because it made clear that the woman had not actually been offered two pairs of donor hands.

17960-23 Aghios v mylondon.news

This article, headlined, "I've been living in fear of my flat burning down after the landlord below created HMO with 3 people cooking on camping stoves" reported a tenant's fear of her flat "burning down" as her landlord had "provided camping stoves" to residents living in a multi occupancy home below her. In fact, although this is what the tenant believed, the publication stated this as a fact and had no evidence that the landlord had "provided" the gas stoves.

Date decision issued: 25/07/2023

The publication did in fact offer a correction during the investigation period, but it was deemed to be too little too late. This decision highlights the importance of taking care when reporting claims vs facts. This issue was included in training sessions and featured in the legal bulletin.

22227-22 [REDACTED] % Hancock v Daily Mirror / mirror.co.uk

Print articles "DON'T CALL US" and "Matt's finished" and online articles "Matt Hancock's floundering showbiz career hits speed bump as he dumps agent search" and "Out-of-touch Tories forcing NHS staff towards industrial action amid strike chaos" each reported as fact that Matt Hancock had dropped his search for a celebrity agent as no one wanted to represent him. Although this information had been provided by a trusted source, the publication could not provide corroborating evidence of the claim so it should not have been reported as fact. The Committee required a correction to be published in respect of each article.

Date decision issued: 17/08/2023

It was explained to the publications that when there is a single source, it must be made very clear that the allegation is just that, and not a factual position.

8.4 Upheld in part with a requirement to publish a Correction

11319-22 MacLennan v dailyrecord.co.uk

“Scots Elvis impersonator took £5k Covid grant despite working full time as cop” reported that the complainant, a police officer, had received a £5,000 Covid support grant for his wedding business. The article implied that the complainant was not eligible for the grant as he had a full time job, but the grant had been applied for by a company of which the officer was the sole director. Upon receipt of the complaint, the publication contacted Police Scotland, the complainant’s employer, who confirmed that there was *“no evidence to substantiate any criminal conduct”*. The publication did not deem it necessary to add an update to the online article as it did not make any reference to a criminal investigation. The Committee held that it was inaccurate and required a correction to make it clear that the company that applied for the loan, did meet the necessary criteria for the funding.

Date decision issued: 01/03/2023

Action taken: This outcome could have possibly been avoided with the simple addition of a clarification/update to the online article and the publication was reminded of this.

01817-23 Cleary v South Wales Echo

“City property developer led double-life as a drug dealer” reported the criminal court case of Matthew Cleary who, with his accomplice, had *“profited from eight cannabis factories in and around Cardiff”* and *“was living in a ‘high-spec’ Llandaff home”*. The article reported the complainant’s address as being *“Clos Taf”*, and later reported that Cleary’s property had been searched by police who found cannabis. The complainant, the defendant’s mother, complained that the article was inaccurate as the Clos Taf address was in fact her property, and that this had not been searched by Police. Initially, the complainant emailed the publication directly, who checked with the court, which confirmed that although the Clos Taf address was listed as Cleary’s address on the court list, it had not been heard during court proceedings and was not the property that had been raided. The publication subsequently removed reference to the disputed address. Upon the complainant escalating her complaint to IPSO, the publication then offered a footnote correction, but explained that this would essentially amount to her address being republished. The complainant replied that she did not wish for it to *“reappear in the public domain”* and therefore no correction was published. The offer of a correction was reiterated by the publication during IPSO’s investigation. However, although the Committee found that the publication had taken care, they found that as the publication had not set out or offered specific wording for the correction, there was a breach of Clause 1 and a correction was required.

Date decision issued: 31/08/2023

The Committee's original decision suggested that there was a breach of Clause 1(ii) "*as no correction had been offered*". The publication requested a review as it had in fact offered a correction on two separate occasions, therefore the Reviewer found a flaw and the Committee amended its position, yet maintained there was a breach as the publication had not set out specific wording for the offered correction.

12574-22 Hibbert v birminghammail.co.uk

"Wolverhampton city councillor summoned to court over rent arrears", "Dexys star Kev backs Mish as a Wolverhampton parliamentary runner", "Local election results 2023 for Wolverhampton as Labour gets big majority" and "Wolverhampton local election 2022 full results with a very close race in Merry Hill" made reference a local Wolverhampton Councillor, with 3 of these articles resulting in partly upheld complaints under Clause 1 (Accuracy). One article incorrectly reported the number of votes the councillor received, and the other two articles reported how the councillor had been "*summoned to court over rent arrears*". After investigating the complaint, the Committee ordered the publication of a correction covering the number of votes received at the local election and that the complainant had attended court in respect of "*rent arrears*", when in fact she attended court in relation to a no-fault eviction.

Date decision issued: 06/09/2023

The publication was reminded to take care to report accurately.

19582-23 Understanding Animal Research v Daily Mirror

"BORN IN CAPTIVITY FOR LAB TEST HELL - This article reported that dogs "*bred for laboratory testing*" were being housed in "*small cages covered with excrement*". It also included a debate about the question, "*Should we experiment on animals?*". The commentator that was against animal testing stated that there was, "*an immense body of empirical evidence to support the position that animal models offer no predictive value for human response to drugs and disease*" and that "*recent developments in evolutionary and developmental biology and genetics*" have "*significantly increased our understanding of why animals have no predictive value for human response to drugs or the pathophysiology of human diseases*". The complainant, who was pro animal testing, took issue with almost all of the article, claiming it breached Clause 1 (Accuracy). The publication successfully defended most of the content but was not able to provide the immense body of evidence or the recent developments needed to support the opinion of the anti testing commentator.

Date decision issued: 08/11/2023

The publication was reminded of the importance of ensuring that experts do have evidence to support the statements of fact that they put forward, especially when

reporting on emotive subjects where it is more likely that those with opposing views will challenge the accuracy.

8.5 Upheld but Sufficient Remedial Action taken

10375-22 Jones v nottinghampost.com

“9 'criminal' plants that can lead to fines when grown in gardens” set out a list of “killer weeds” and the possible sanctions for knowingly letting them grow, for example, being fined. The article had reported as fact that it was “an offence by law to let any of the following plants grow outside in your garden” when in fact, this was not supported by the legislation upon which the article was based. The publication offered to publish a footnote including further explanation and clarity of the relevant legislation, which the Committee deemed sufficient.

Date decision issued: 22/02/2023

The publication acknowledged that summarising a topic, especially one involving multiple laws and sanctions, could result in the article being misleading.

11525-22 Mitchison v express.co.uk

“Brexit Britain urged not to 'hand EU £750m' to join scheme and launch own Five Eyes Plan”
The complainant raised a number of inaccuracies within this article including that the body of the article reported £750 “billion” rather than “million”, disputed the statement that “Britain is taking the EU to court”, and a video caption that described the Chief Executive of a European think tank as an “EU Chief”. All of these points were amended and a correction was added to the top of the article, which the Committee deemed sufficient.

Date decision issued: 16/01/2023

The promptness and prominence of the offered correction was acknowledged by the Committee.

1997-22; 11998-22; 11996-22 Higginson v manchestereveningnews.co.uk / cheshirelive.co.uk / liverpoolecho.co.uk

“Mum given overdose of paracetamol, while being in treated for sickness and pneumonia - she died two weeks later”, “Cheshire mum given overdose of paracetamol by hospital” and “Mum given paracetamol overdose while in hospital for pneumonia” reported the death of a mother just weeks after receiving an overdose of paracetamol from a hospital. The

subheading of each article reported that the “*CPS found the overdose did not contribute to her death*”. In fact, the CPS had not commented on this matter at all. The family complained, and the disputed statement was removed. A footnote correction was also published. During the investigation period, an apology was also added to published corrections on each article.

Date decision issued: 16/01/2023

Each publication acknowledged that although the CPS concluded that it could not bring charges for gross negligence manslaughter against the hospital trust, this did not mean that they had made a finding into the relation of the received overdose. The Committee also made a point in their decision that an apology was most definitely appropriate in this case, which was noted by each of the publications for future reference.

12068-22 Kelly v scottishdailyexpress.co.uk

“New poll sinks Nicola Sturgeon’s Scexit dream as majority of Scots back No” reported that “support for the union had INCREASED” with “49%” of respondents voting against Scottish independence, and that this marked “an increase of four per cent” from the organisation’s previous poll on the matter, conducted a few days prior. It also said that “46 per cent” would vote for independence – “an increase of one” from the previous poll. The complainant disputed these figures, which the publication accepted upon investigation, and offered a correction clarifying the correct percentages. The Committee deemed the published wording sufficient.

Date decision issued: 16/02/2023

The complainant did not accept the proposed wording for correction as it did not include an apology. However, the Committee found that as the complaint related to a general point of fact and did not personally affect a specific person or people, an apology was not appropriate. The correction was offered promptly which was recognised by the Committee.

15588-23 Palin v liverpoolecho.co.uk

“Cocaine kingpin brought down by Conor McGregor mural on wall”, “Conor McGregor. selfies and the fatal mistakes that landed EncroChat dealers in jail” and “Fallen cocaine kingpin tells court he has no money for lawyers” reported on the case and conviction of a “fallen cocaine kingpin”. The articles reported that the defendant was “found guilty of conspiracy to supply 700 kg of cocaine, 15 kg of heroin and 40 kg of amphetamine”. The complainant disputed the reference to heroin. Although it had been indicated that he had involvement with heroin, this did not form part of his conviction. The articles were amended accordingly and a footnote correction was added to each online article. Although the Committee found a breach of Clause 1, they considered that the action taken was sufficient.

Date decision issued: 06/07/2023

The article was also based on a police press release which did not include the reference to heroin, therefore this error could have been easily avoided with extra care taken and the publication was reminded of this.

17799-23 The Family of Steven Carrie v edinburghlive.co.uk

"Young West Lothian Dad collapsed and dies suddenly in family holiday tragedy" reported that a local man had died of a cardiac arrest whilst on holiday with his family. The headline inaccurately described the victim as a "Dad" but he did not have any children. The publication removed the online article and published a standalone correction and apology, and although the complainant did not accept it was sufficient, the Committee did.

Date decision issued: 25/08/2023

The publication acknowledged that extra care and caution should be taken on stories involving a sensitive matter.

16958-23; 16959-23 A man v mirror.co.uk / express.co.uk

"British backpacker 'lucky to be alive' after plunging down 130ft Thai waterfall" and "Brit tourist plummets 130ft from waterfall during terrifying hike with friends" reported that a British tourist had plummeted "130ft from waterfall" "narrowly avoiding death" during a hike with a friend. The articles named the victim and included screengrabs of a video showing the victim on a stretcher. The complainant, the victim's father, complained on his son's behalf under Clause 1 (Accuracy), Clause 2 (Privacy) and Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock). Under Clause 1, the complainant advised that although the waterfall was 130ft, the article was inaccurate as he had only fallen 10ft. The article also reported that the victim had "fractured his hip" which the complainant advised was also incorrect, as he had suffered an injury to his coccyx and his skull. The publication accepted the inaccuracies, and amended both articles accordingly and published a correction, but defended the alleged breach of Clause 2 and Clause 4. The publication was able to provide a screen-recording of the victim's Instagram account shortly after the incident, in which he openly discussed the accident and his injuries to his 50k+ followers, which had since been deleted by the victim. The publication was also able to provide the Thai coverage of the incident, in which video footage of the victim being carried down was broadcasted. The Committee took all of this into account and considered that the photograph did not represent a breach of Clause 2 or 4, and found that the remedial action taken under Clause 1 was sufficient.

Date decision issued: 26/10/2023

The importance of obtaining and retaining all relevant evidence (especially that from social media) of what is in the public domain at the time of the article was reiterated, as it ultimately saved the publication under Clause 2 and 4.

20112-23; 20114-23; 20116-23 Kayani v manchestereveningnews.co.uk / lancs.live / liverpoolecho.co.uk

“Man who pretended to be Greggs bakery swindled councils out of nearly £200,000”, *“Crook ‘pretended to be Greggs’ in bid to defraud £195k from Covid support grants”* and *“Fraudster got £35,000 from council by pretending to run a Greggs”* - The headline and opening paragraphs of all three articles reported that the complainant had “*swindled councils out of nearly £200,000*” by “*pretending to be Greggs bakery*”, and reported that he had scammed local authorities through a Covid-19 support scheme. The complainant said that the headline inaccurately suggested that he had personally made the unlawful application when in fact the frauds were perpetrated by unknown individuals. Although all of the requested payments had been transferred to the bank account of a company of which the complainant was the sole director, the publications accepted that the headline and opening paragraphs were inaccurate. The publication's initially offered a correction at the top of each article, however, as the error was in the headline, each publication subsequently offered to amend each article and publish a standalone correction which would appear on each of the publication's homepages. The Committee deemed this sufficient.

Date decision issued: 05/12/2023

Each publication was reminded that extra care and caution should be taken in respect of the accuracy of headlines.

9. Schedule

Annex A: List Of Reach Titles

Print

National

Daily Mirror

Sunday Mirror

Sunday People

Daily Record

Sunday Mail

OK!

Daily Express

Sunday Express

Daily Star

Daily Star Sunday

Regional

Accrington Observer

Airdrie & Coatbridge Advertiser

Ashbourne News Telegraph

Ayrshire Post

Bath Chronicle

Birmingham Mail

Birmingham Post

Black Country Bugle

Black Country Bugle Sports Annual

Blairgowrie Advertiser

Boston Target
Brentwood Gazette
Bristol Post
Burton Mail
Caernarfon Herald
Cambridge News
Carmarthen Journal
Central Somerset Gazette (Mid Somerset Series)
Cheddar Valley Gazette (Mid Somerset Series)
Chester Chronicle
Cornish Guardian
Cornishman
Coventry Telegraph
Crewe & Nantwich Chronicle
Croydon Advertiser
Cynon Valley Leader
Daily Mirror Northern Ireland
Daily Post
Derby Telegraph
Dorking & Leatherhead Advertiser
Dover Express
East Coast & Wolds Target
East Kilbride News
Essex Chronicle
Folkestone Herald
Frome Standard (Mid Somerset Series)
Gloucester Citizen
Gloucestershire Echo
Grimsby Telegraph
Gwendraeth Valley Star (Llanelli Star Series)
Gwent Gazette
Hamilton Advertiser
Herald Express
Hertfordshire Mercury

Heywood & Middleton Advertiser
Hinckley Times
Holyhead & Bangor Mail
Huddersfield Daily Examiner
Hull Daily Mail
Irvine Herald
Isle of Thanet Gazette
Journal (Grimsby & Scunthorpe)
Journal (Hull)
Kent & Sussex Courier
Kilmarnock Standard
Leek & Cheadie Post & Times
Leicester Mercury
Lennox Herald
Lincolnshire Echo
Liverpool Echo
Liverpool Sunday Echo
Llanelli Star
Loughborough Echo
Macclesfield Express
Manchester Evening News
Merthyr Express
Mid Devon Gazette
Newcastle Chronicle
Newcastle Journal
News & Mail Series (Aldershot)
North Devon Journal
North Wales Weekly News
Nottingham Post
Nuneaton News
Ormskirk Advertiser
Paisley Daily Express
Perthshire Advertiser
Plymouth Herald

Pontypridd Observer
Retford Times
Rhondda Leader
Rhymney Valley Express
Rochdale Observer
Rossendale Free Press
Runcorn & Widnes Weekly News
Rutherglen Reformer
Scunthorpe Telegraph
Sevenoaks Chronicle
Shepton Mallet Journal (Mid Somerset Series)
Sleaford Target
Somerset Standard & Guardian
South Wales Echo
South Wales Evening Post
Southport Visiter
Staffordshire Newsletter
Stirling Observer
Stockport Express
Strathearn Herald
Sunday Mercury
Sunday Sun
Surrey Advertiser
Surrey Mirror
Tamworth Herald (Tamworth Herald Series)
Gazette (North East, Middlesbrough & Teesside)
The Stoke Sentinel
The West Briton
Uxbridge Gazette
Wales On Sunday
Wells Journal (Mid Somerset Series)
West Lothian Courier
Western Daily Press
Western Gazette

Western Mail

Western Morning News

Wishaw Press

Websites

www.aberdeenlive.news

www.bedfordshirelive.co.uk²

www.belfastlive.co.uk

www.birminghammail.co.uk

www.bristolpost.co.uk

www.business-live.co.uk

www.buckinghamshirelive.com³

www.cambridge-news.co.uk

www.cheshire-live.co.uk

www.chroniclelive.co.uk

www.cornwalllive.com

www.coventrytelegraph.net

www.dailypost.co.uk

www.dailyrecord.co.uk

www.dailystar.co.uk

www.derbytelegraph.co.uk

www.devonlive.com

www.dorset.live⁴

www.edinburghlive.co.uk

www.essexlive.news

www.examinerlive.co.uk

www.express.co.uk

www.football.london

www.footballscotland.co.uk

www.galwaybeo.ie

www.gazettelive.co.uk

www.getreading.co.uk⁵

www.getsurrey.co.uk

² Merged with cambridge-news.co.uk

³ Merged with cambridge-news.co.uk

⁴ Merged with somersestlive.co.uk

⁵ Merged with getsurrey.co.uk

www.glasgowlive.co.uk
www.gloucestershirelive.co.uk
www.grimsbytelegraph.co.uk
www.hampshirelive.news⁶
www.hertfordshiremercury.co.uk⁷
www.hulldailymail.co.uk
www.insider.co.uk
www.inyourarea.co.uk/news
www.kentlive.news
www.lancs.live
www.leeds-live.co.uk
www.leicestermercury.co.uk
www.lincolnshirelive.co.uk
www.liverpool.com
www.liverpoolecho.co.uk
www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk
www.mirror.co.uk
www.mylondon.news
www.norfolklive.co.uk⁸
www.northantslive.news⁹
www.nottinghampost.com
www.ok.co.uk
www.oxfordshirelive.co.uk¹⁰
www.plymouthherald.co.uk
www.scottishdailyexpress.co.uk
www.somersetlive.co.uk
www.staffordshire-live.co.uk¹¹
www.stokesentinel.co.uk

⁶ Merged with getsurrey.co.uk

⁷ Merged with essexlive.news

⁸ Merged with cambridge-news.co.uk

⁹ Merged with leicestermercury.co.uk

¹⁰ Merged with gloucestershirelive.co.uk

¹¹ Merged with stokesentinel.co.uk

www.suffolklive.com¹²

www.sussexlive.co.uk¹³

www.walesonline.co.uk

www.wiltshirelive.co.uk¹⁴

¹² Merged with essexlive.news

¹³ Merged with kentlive.news

¹⁴ Merged with somersestlive.co.uk