

**Minutes of the Complaints Committee Meeting
Tuesday 2 September 2025 at 10:30am
10-12 Eastcheap, London, EC3M 1AJ**

Present Lord Edward Faulks – Chair
Bulbul Basu
Sarah Baxter
Manuela Grayson
Sarah Havlin
Lord Carwyn Jones
Alastair Machray
George McInnes
Asmita Naik
Allan Rennie
Harriet Wilson

In attendance: Charlotte Dewar, Chief Executive
Alice Gould, Head of Complaints
Emily Houlston-Jones, Head of Complaints
Michelle Kuhler, PA & minute taker (*remote*)

Also present: Members of the Executive:

Rosemary Douce
Paul McGarrity
Rebecca Munro
Marcus Pike (*remote*)
Elena Richards Coldicutt
Molly Richards
Hira Nafees Shah (*remote*)
Sophie Thomsett
Davina Wong

Observers: Jonathan Grun, Editors' Code Committee

1. Apologies for Absence and Welcomes

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received from Ted Young.

2. Declarations of Interest

Declarations were received from George McInnes for item seven, and George left the meeting for this item.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting that was held on 29 July 2025.

4. Matters arising

There were no matters arising.

5. Update by the Chair – oral

The Chairman gave the Committee an update on external affairs affecting IPSO. He updated the Committee on a small article that the government were not happy with.

He informed the Committee that Rebecca Munro will be leaving IPSO.

6. Complaints update by the Head of Complaints – oral

Emily Houlston-Jones, Head of Complaints, gave the Committee an update on complaints of note that are in the pipeline.

Emily updated the Committee on recruitment for a new Complaints Officer who will be joining IPSO in November.

7. Complaint O2131-25 Goodfellow v Mail Online

The Committee discussed the complaint and ruled that the complaint should be upheld in part, under Clauses 2 and 4. A copy of the ruling appears in Appendix A

8. Complaint O2912-25 Various v The Mail on Sunday

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

9. Complaints not adjudicated at a Complaints Committee meeting

The Committee confirmed its formal approval of the papers listed in Appendix C

12. Any other business

The Chief Executive gave the Committee members a general update on the new IPSO Chair recruitment process.

She asked the Committee for any feedback in terms of important aspects for the Chair role, which will be summarised and shared with the appointments panel.

APPENDIX A

02131-25 Goodfellow v dailymail.co.uk

Summary of Complaint

1. Julie Goodfellow complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that the conduct of a reporter acting on behalf of dailymail.co.uk breached Clause 2 (Privacy), Clause 3 (Harassment) and Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock) of the Editors' Code of Practice.

2. In April 2025, the complainant's son's partner had died in a sky-diving incident. In an article subsequently published by the publication – which was not, itself, under complaint – it reported that she was “feared to have taken her own life.”

3. On 2 May, 6 May and 7 May, following the death of the complainant's son's partner on 27 April, a reporter representing the publication made a series of approaches to the complainant's property. The complainant complained that the reporter's approaches intruded into her privacy and grief, and were harassing, in breach of Clause 2, Clause 3 and Clause 4.

4. The complainant said that, on 2 May, the reporter sat, in his car, outside her property for around three hours, and was “constantly in and out his car knocking on” her front door – she said she did not answer the door, and the reporter made no attempt to identify himself. She said that the reporter repeated the same behaviour on 6 May.

5. The complainant said that, on 7 May, the reporter “hid” round the side of the property and – when she went to approach her front door following a postman’s delivery – “sprang round” and started knocking and ringing on her external porch door. He then, she said, entered her porch, and began “banging” on the internal glass door; when she did not respond, she said he picked up and “look[ed] through” a number of letters which the postman had just delivered. She said that she then approached the internal door from within her house, took photographs of the reporter, and asked him “what are you doing?”. She said that she did not ask him who he was – however, he was fully aware that she was there, and did not identify himself or the publication he represented. The reporter then left the property.

6. Later, on the same day, the complainant found a note the reporter had left in the porch – the note included the reporter’s first name and phone number, and requested the complainant’s son contact the reporter, should he wish to provide a tribute for a story about his partner’s death.

7. The complainant said that, by sitting outside and repeatedly approaching her property, the reporter had harassed and pursued her, and invaded her privacy. She also considered his actions to be upsetting and highly insensitive, given her son’s partner had recently died.

8. She also complained that the reporter had failed to identify himself during any of the approaches. She said that, at the time of the approaches, as she did not know who the reporter was, she had been alarmed: he was an unidentified individual, who she believed had repeatedly attempted to gain access to her property.

9. The complainant expressed particular concern regarding the reporter's conduct on 7 May. She complained that, by entering her porch, the reporter had, without her consent, entered into her family home. She also complained that the reporter had looked through her post, which she considered to be intimidating and threatening.

10. The complainant supplied a number of photographs to IPSO as part of her complaint, which she said were taken during the final approach by the reporter. One photograph showed the reporter standing inside the complainant's porch.

11. The complainant also supplied a photograph of a number of letters on the floor of the porch, with someone standing next to them – though only the person's shoe was visible. She commented that the image showed the reporter's feet after he dropped the letters upon seeing her approach him.

12. The publication did not accept a breach of the Editors' Code. In support of its position, it supplied an account from the reporter.

13. Turning first to the approaches of 2 and 6 May, the reporter disputed that he had sat outside the complainant's property for three hours. He said he believed he was sat outside for a matter of minutes. He added that, as no-one answered the door, he believed no-one was at the property on either day. He had therefore driven to a number of other addresses, before returning, knocking, and leaving; on 2 May, he visited one other address before returning – on 6 May, he visited four other addresses before returning.

14. Turning to the approach made on 7 May, the reporter said that it was coincidental he had approached the property at the same time as a postman. He commented that, as cars were outside the property, he believed someone was home on this occasion, and he had therefore approached the property.

15. The reporter said that, upon entering the porch, he noticed there were letters scattered on the floor. He had moved them out of the way while knocking on the internal door to avoid standing on them. The reporter denied that he had “look[ed] through” the letters, and stated that, following this, the complainant came to the door but did not open it and allow him to introduce himself. Rather, she began filming or photographing him without speaking and so he left a note with his contact details.

16. The reporter later added that, because there was a door knocker on the internal door inside the porch, he considered that it was acceptable to enter the porch. He said he wished to provide the complainant’s son with the chance to comment on the publication’s upcoming article.

17. In light of the reporter’s account, the publication denied any breach of Clause 2. It stated that it was entirely reasonable for the reporter to approach the property multiple times – no-one had answered when the reporter had knocked, and so it was not clear if anyone was present.

18. Turning to the claim that the reporter looked through the complainant’s post, it denied that this had occurred. At any rate, it said that looking at the front of letters – which presumably only showed names and an address he was already familiar with – would be of no benefit to the reporter. The publication added that it did not see any material distinction between knocking on the external

front door and the internal front door, and that the complainant did not have any added expectation of privacy over this area of her property – there was an internal door knocker on the inside of the porch, and the porch was unlocked.

19. Similarly, it denied any breach of Clause 3. It said the complainant had not asked the reporter to stop approaching her, and that, while it was regrettable that any distress may have been caused by the approaches, the reporter's behaviour was not intimidating nor harassing. It also denied a breach of Clause 4.

20. In response, the complainant maintained that the reporter had sat outside her property for hours on 2 May and 6 May. She said that, owing to personal reasons, she had been confined to her property on the dates in question, and had been able to observe him while he was sat outside. She also commented that cars were outside the property on both 2 May and 6 May, and so the reporter's account – and his reason for approaching the property on 7 May – was inconsistent.

21. The complainant reiterated that, on 7 May, she was unaware of the reporter's identity. She therefore considered it reasonable for her to be on her guard. The complainant maintained that the reporter had looked through her letters, and said that it was her shock at seeing this that led to her approaching the reporter – it was her approaching the door, she said, that led to the reporter dropping the letters, which she considered was shown in the photograph she provided to IPSO.

22. The complainant also commented that, although her porch was unlocked, people other than family members would not enter it without permission. She said it was reasonable for her to expect that the reporter would use a

door knocker and doorbell attached to the external door of her property. She also questioned the reporter's intentions for entering the porch.

Relevant Clause Provisions

Clause 2 (Privacy)*

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

Clause 3 (Harassment)*

- i) Journalists must not engage in intimidation, harassment or persistent pursuit.
- ii) They must not persist in questioning, telephoning, pursuing or photographing individuals once asked to desist; nor remain on property when asked to leave and must not follow them. If requested, they must identify themselves and whom they represent.
- iii) Editors must ensure these principles are observed by those working for them and take care not to use non-compliant material from other sources.

Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock)

In cases involving personal grief or shock, enquiries and approaches must be made with sympathy and discretion

and publication handled sensitively. These provisions should not restrict the right to report legal proceedings.

Findings of the Committee

23. The Committee first wished to express its condolences for the complainant's loss.

24. The Committee recognised that the reporter had been attempting to contact the complainant's son to provide him with the opportunity to offer a tribute. Journalists are entitled to seek to people for comment, even in times of grief and shock. Approaching the complainant's property for this purpose did not breach the Editors' Code.

However, the approaches had to be handled in a manner compliant with the terms of the Editors' Code.

25. The Committee began with the approach of 7 May and, in particular, the decision to enter the complainant's porch. It first considered this under Clause 2.

26. Clause 2 states that everyone is entitled to respect for their private and family life, including their home, and that editors will be expected to justify intrusions into any individual's private life without consent. In the Committee's view, entering the complainant's porch through an external door clearly constituted intruding into a private area of her home: it could only be accessed through an external front door which had a doorbell to enable visitors to gain the attention of any residents without entering, and it contained items personal to the complainant, such as the post which had recently been delivered. Given that the reporter would have been able – through the use of doorbell – to fulfil his legitimate purpose of contacting the residents of the property to offer the complainant's son an opportunity to comment, this intrusion was not justified.

27. The external door was sufficient to alert anyone inside the property to the reporter's presence, and the fact of the door being unlocked did not, in the Committee's view, make the porch a public space.

28. On this basis, the reporter's entry through the complainant's front door and into the porch area represented an unjustified intrusion into the complainant's home and breached Clause 2.

29. Having established a breach of Clause 2, the Committee turned to Clause 4.

30. In the Committee's view, in light of the death of her son's partner, the Committee considered that the complainant was experiencing personal grief or shock. This was foreseeable to the reporter, who was seeking comment in relation to a death. Any approach to the property was therefore required to be handled with sympathy and discretion.

31. The Committee again recognised that the reporter's approach was a legitimate journalistic enquiry. However, the Committee did not consider that the decision to enter the complainant's porch constituted a sympathetic or discreet approach. The reporter's decision to open and enter the complainant's front door, and enter her complainant's porch, constituted a clear intrusion into her privacy, which foreseeably caused her distress at a time of grief and shock. There was a breach of Clause 4 on this point.

32. The Committee then considered the approach on 7 May, and the reporter's decision to enter the porch, under Clause 3.

33. The approach had, as covered above, been inappropriately handled. However, the Committee took into account that, while the reporter may have suspected the complainant, or another individual, was present in the home, it lacked evidence that he knew someone was at the property at the time, and therefore aware of the prior approach. It therefore did not necessarily follow that the decision to again approach the property, or enter the porch, represented the reporter persistently pursuing the complainant or acting in a way which amounted to harassment or intimidation.

34. Furthermore, the Committee noted that, once the reporter had been alerted to the complainant's presence, he had left a note providing his contact details before promptly leaving the premises. The Committee considered that this mitigated the impact of his actions in respect of Clause 3 – the reporter had not continued to interact with the complainant once it had clearly been communicated that the complainant did not wish to engage with him.

35. In light of these factors, the Committee did not find a further breach of Clause 3.

36. The Committee then turned to the allegation that, on the approach to the property on 7 May, the reporter had picked up and looked through the complainant's recently delivered mail.

37. The Committee acknowledged, firstly, the difficulties inherent in making a finding on this allegation – ultimately, only the two parties were present during the interaction, and the Committee noted that the image supplied by the complainant simply showed the letters on the floor; it did not show them in the reporter's possession.

38. The Committee noted that both parties were in agreement that the letters had been held by the reporter. The disagreement arose from the reason why he had picked them up: the complainant believed he was looking through them; the reporter said he wished to avoid standing on them. In these circumstances, and without clear evidence in support of the complainant's position, the Committee did not consider that a breach of the Code had been demonstrated on this point. There was no breach of Clause 2, Clause 3 or Clause 4 in respect of this allegation.

39. The complainant had also complained that the reporter's approaches on 2 May and 6 May represented a breach of Clause 2, Clause 3 and Clause 4.

40. While it was disputed how long the reporter had spent outside of the property on each occasion, and how many times he had approached and knocked on the complainant's door, the Committee noted that it was not in dispute that the reporter had not entered any area of the property on either day. The Committee did not consider that sitting in a car on a public road, or knocking on the complainant's front door, represented an intrusion into her private life or home. There was no breach of Clause 2 on this point.

41. Similarly, the Committee did not consider that sitting outside of the complainant's home, nor knocking on the door, represented harassing or intimidating conduct. While it took into account that it was not able to determine how long the reporter had sat outside of the property, it noted that, as referenced above, the reporter was entitled to seek the complainant's son's comment on the story. In any event, where no interaction had taken place on either date, and the reporter was seemingly unaware of whether the complainant was in the property at all, there were no

grounds to establish that this activity constituted harassment. There was no breach of Clause 3 on this point.

42. Finally, where no interaction had ultimately taken place on either date, irrespective of the number of times the reporter had sat outside the property, or knocked on the door, the Committee also did not consider that the approaches of 2 May and 6 May had been handled unsympathetically or indiscreetly. There was no breach of Clause 4.

43. The complainant had also complained that, across the three dates, the reporter had failed to identify himself. Clause 3 of the Editors' Code makes clear that reporters must identify themselves when asked to do so. The Committee noted that the two parties had not interacted until the final date – failing to identify himself on the first two dates did not, therefore, raise a breach of Clause 3.

44. Regarding the approach of 7 May, the Committee noted that, by the complainant's admission, she had not asked the reporter who he was – rather, she had asked him "what are you doing?". Further, the reporter had, following this, left a note providing his name and contact details. In the Committee's view, while it may have been preferable for the reporter to identify himself earlier, he had taken sufficient steps to make clear his identity to the complainant – especially given she had not, seemingly, explicitly asked for this information. There was no breach of Clause 3 on this point.

45. The Committee, finally, wished to express its concern regarding the reporter's decision to enter a private area without the complainant's consent, and where a less intrusive method of making his presence known was available. It recommended, in light of the breaches of the

Code identified, that the publication's news desk review its internal training procedures to avoid such incidents repeating in future.

Conclusions

46. The complaint was partly upheld under Clause 2 and Clause 4.

Remedial action required

47. Having partly upheld the complaint, the Committee considered what remedial action should be required. In circumstances where the Committee establishes a breach of the Editors' Code, it can require the publication of a correction and/or an adjudication; the nature, extent and placement of which is determined by IPSO.

48. As the complaint had been upheld under Clause 2 and Clause 4, it could not be remedied by way of a correction. The Committee therefore upheld the publishing of an adjudication.

49. The Committee considered the placement of this adjudication. The headline to the adjudication should make clear that IPSO has upheld the complaint, reference the title of the newspaper and refer to the complaint's subject matter. The headline must be agreed with IPSO in advance.

50. The adjudication should be published online, with a link to this adjudication (including the headline) being published on the top 50% of the publication's homepage for 24 hours; it should then be archived in the usual way.

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

Julie Goodfellow complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation that the conduct of a reporter acting on behalf of dailymail.co.uk breached Clause 2 (Privacy) and Clause 4 (Intrusion into grief or shock) of the Editors' Code of Practice.

The complaint was upheld, and IPSO required dailymail.co.uk to publish this adjudication to remedy the breach of the Code.

Following the death of the complainant's son's partner, a reporter representing the publication made an approach to the complainant's property in which he entered her porch. The complainant said this constituted entering her home without consent.

In IPSO's view, entering the complainant's porch through an external front door clearly constituted intruding into a private area of her home. IPSO considered that the reporter's entry through the complainant's front door and into the porch area represented an unjustified intrusion into the complainant's home. This was a breach of Clause 2.

Furthermore, IPSO did not consider that the decision to open and enter the complainant's front door, and enter her porch, constituted a sympathetic or discreet approach, as required at a time of grief and shock. This was a breach of Clause 4.

Date complaint received: 27/05/2025

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 02/10/2025

Independent Complaints Reviewer

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

APPENDIX B

O2912–25 Various v Mail on Sunday

Summary of Complaint

1. The Independent Press Standards Organisation received various complaints that Mail on Sunday breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice in an article headlined "NOW ARREST PUNK BAND WHO LED 'DEATH TO ISRAELIS' CHANTS AT GLASTONBURY", published on 26 June 2025.

2. IPSO received 123 complaints about the article. In light of the volume of complaints received, and where the specific input of a complainant was not necessary, IPSO summarised the complaints for the purpose of investigating the complaint.

3. The article, which appeared on the front page and continued on pages 4 and 5, reported on criticisms of the BBC and its coverage of Glastonbury festival. The full front-page headline was: "Tel Aviv blasts BBC for failing to cut hour-long live broadcast of vile outburst as police face demands... Now arrest punk band who led 'death to Israelis' chants at Glastonbury". The text of the article began on the front page: "The BBC and Glastonbury provoked outrage last night when a pro-Palestine punk act called for the death of Israeli soldiers during a live broadcast from the festival. In appalling scenes condemned by the British and Israeli governments, the lead singer of the duo Bob Vylan led a crowd of thousands in a vile chant of 'death, death to the IDF' – the Israel Defence Forces." Continuing on the front page, it reported "The singer, who keeps his identity secret, also led a chant of 'free, free Palestine', and declared 'from the river to the sea Palestine... will be free' – regarded by many in the Jewish community as a call for Israel's elimination."

4. Complainants said that the headline was inaccurate in breach of Clause 1 as it reported that the band "led 'death to Israelis'" chants at the festival. They said this was inaccurate and misleading, as the chant the band led was actually "death, death to the IDF".

5. Complainants also said that, as the words 'death to Israelis' were presented in single quotation marks in the headline, this gave readers the impression that it was a direct quote from the band.

Complainants said the headline was not supported by – and was in fact contradicted by – the text of the article, which set out the actual chant.

6. Complainants also said that “death to” was a figure of speech used in protest against organisations, rather than an incitement to harm individuals. They said that there was a material difference between calling for the ‘death’ of an institution, as opposed to people of a particular nationality. Some complainants said this was significantly inaccurate and misleading as it gave the impression that Bob Vylan’s chant had targeted Israelis in general, rather than the IDF as an institution.

7. The publication did not accept that the headline was inaccurate or misleading, or that the Code to be breached. It said the headline’s reference to the chant – “Death to Israelis” – was not a direct quote, but a summary of the chants and comments made by the band whilst on stage. It said this summary was supported by text of the article and the wider context behind the performance. It said it was entitled to use editorialised paraphrasing in headlines, and that this was not misleading.

8. The publication said that its headline summary accurately reflected the meaning of the chant “Death to the IDF”, and that the band had not disputed its interpretation of the meaning behind the chant. It noted that, one month prior to the Glastonbury performance reported, the band had said on stage “death to every single IDF soldier out there”. The publication said that, in light of this, the chant “Death to the IDF” could be understood as calling for the murder of individual Israeli citizens, rather than calling for the ‘death’ of the IDF as an institution – as contended by the complainants. The publication said the band’s chant should also be understood in the context of other comments, made by the singer, during the same performance: he had led chants of “from the River to the Sea”, which is widely condemned as advocating for the destruction of the Israeli state, and that he had spoken about “Zionist” control in the music industry and “genocide” perpetrated by the Israeli state.

9. The publication noted that Israel has compulsory conscription for 18-year-olds, and compulsory reserve duty for all Jewish citizens up to the age of 40. It said therefore any incitement aimed at Israel’s armed forces would logically extend to the vast majority of its adult Jewish population. It said it was for these reasons that the chant had been widely condemned as anti-Semitic hate speech and

prompted a police investigation. It said the article clearly supported the headline's characterisation of the chant as that this was how it was widely interpreted, including by sources quoted in the article as critical of the BBC and the band – such as Israel's deputy foreign minister, and the Leader of the Opposition.

10. The publication said that since the article had been published, it has become widely accepted that the chant was aimed at Israelis. It referenced comments made by the Culture Secretary in Parliament: *"There was something particularly pernicious about chanting, 'Death, death to the IDF'. Many colleagues will know that in Israel, there is a conscription model. Every young person is required to serve in the IDF, which means that chanting 'death to the IDF' is equivalent to calling for the death of every single Israeli Jew. That is one of the many reasons why we take this so seriously and why it cannot be argued that this did not cross a very dangerous line."*

11. It said this interpretation of the chant was also supported by the United Kingdom's Chief Rabbi, who said: *"Israel has a conscript army. Every 18-year-old is called to serve – Jews, Christians, Muslims – and serve they do. Because they know that the country faces enemies whose stated intention is to wipe out the Jewish state and all its inhabitants. Consequently, without such service by the population at large on behalf of the entire country, Israel would not exist. And so, calling for 'Death to the IDF' is a call to kill the vast majority of the population of Israel. It is effectively a call for the death of the world's only Jewish state. What could be more hateful to Jews than that?"*

Relevant Clause Provisions

Clause 1 (Accuracy)

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

Findings of the Committee

12. Single quotation marks in headlines can be used in different ways, including to present verbatim comments, and to reference a characterisation or summary of an individual's position. In this instance, the publication's position was that it had been using the single quotation marks to summarise chants and comments made by the band whilst on stage. The complainants did not accept this, interpreting the phrase "DEATH TO ISRAELIS" in the headline as implying that this was a direct quotation, when in fact this phrase had not been used.

13. Where quotation marks are used to signal paraphrasing, the words inside single quotation marks may differ somewhat from the exact words spoken, but providing that the coverage makes clear the words spoken; and that the summary contained within the quotation marks is not misleading or a distortion of what was said, this is not in and of itself inaccurate. The questions for the Committee in this case were therefore: first, whether the coverage taken as a whole, made clear what was said from the stage at Glastonbury; and second, whether the publication had failed to take care over accuracy in summarising the words spoken in the way that it had.

14. The Committee noted that the headline referred to plural "chants", and that the text of the article, on the front page, specified that Bob Vylan had led chants of "death, death to the IDF", "free, free Palestine", and "from the River to the sea Palestine... will be free", which it reported is "regarded by many in the Jewish community as a call for Israel's elimination." The Committee considered that the coverage had included a clear and prominent explanation of the precise words that had been spoken. The accuracy of this aspect of the report was not in dispute. The Committee found that the article was not misleading on this point.

15. The Committee next considered whether the publication had failed to take care over accuracy or published misleading or distorted information when it summarised the chants with the phrase "DEATH TO ISRAELIS".

16. The Committee acknowledged that this is a sensitive and controversial topic and emphasised that its remit was only to apply the terms of the Editors' Code rather than to adopt a position on these wider matters. However, the publication was entitled to hold

and express such a view. It had explained the basis of its position that “Death to Israelis” was an accurate summary, which included its understanding of the relationship between Israeli society and the IDF, and the meanings it attributed to the various chants heard at the concert. While recognising that these interpretations are heavily disputed, in circumstances where the full chants were included on the front page of the article, and recognising the publication’s entitlement to set out its own interpretation of the chants, the Committee considered that the publication had provided an adequate basis for this characterisation. It did not establish that the headline was inaccurate or misleading, or unsupported by the article’s text. There was no breach of Clause 1.

Conclusions

17. The complaint was not upheld under Clause 1.

Remedial action required

18. N/A

Date complaint received: 29/06/2025

Date complaint concluded by IPSO: 09/10/2025

APPENDIX C

Paper no.	File number	Name v publication
3285	05362-24	Pottinger v Sunday Mail
	00268-25,	Jones v cheshire-
3372	00269-25	live.co.uk/manchestereveningnews.co.uk Tiddlywinks Nursery School v
3363	06028-24	oldhamtimes.co.uk
	00989-	Szendro v edp24.co.uk/Norwich Evening
3395	25/01021-25	News
3423	05149-24	Rocha v Jewish Chronicle
3386	00668-25	Williams-Key v express.co.uk
3401	00962-25	Williams-Key v express.co.uk
3411	01939-25	A man and a woman v Leicester Mercury
3394	01672-25	Fisher v mirror.co.uk
3397	00910-25	Hilson v The Daily Telegraph