

New rulings on property identification; and on Priory intrusion

The PCC today publishes two adjudications.

The first concerns a complaint from Mr Badr Jafar, an associate of the model Naomi Campbell, that the Evening Standard website, in an article that reported an alleged disturbance outside his property, had intruded into his privacy by including sufficient information - when combined with details published in another newspaper that day - to identify his London home. The Commission acknowledged that a particularly determined individual might have been able to identify the exact location of the house by putting together the information in the two articles, although considered that it was unclear why anyone might wish to do so. It did not, in any case, follow that there was a breach of Clause 3 (Privacy) of the Code. The newspaper had published only minimal details about the complainant's home in circumstances where the police had put the name of the road and some details of the disturbance into the public domain. The Commission found no breach of the Code and did not uphold the complaint.

To read the full adjudication click [here](#)

The Commission has also ruled on a complaint from the Corporate Communications Manager of the Priory Group, who complained that a reporter from the Daily Mail had entered the private grounds of the Priory Hospital Roehampton in breach of Clause 8 (Hospitals) of the Code. The newspaper argued that the reporter had entered the grounds only in order to identify herself at the hospital reception, as there was no security presence at the gate. She did not write an article about her time in the hospital, or speak to (or take photographs of) any patient. The Commission did not consider that the welfare of any patient had been compromised as a result of the visit, and found no breach of the Code. However, it did acknowledge and sympathise with the hospital's concern that, in the interests of patients, journalists should not routinely be on hospital grounds. It welcomed the fact that, as the hospital had apparently amended its security procedures and the newspaper had noted for future reference that the preferred form of contact would be by telephone, a positive outcome of this complaint would be that a similar problem would not occur again.

To read the adjudication, click [here](#)

ENDS

For further information, call Stephen Abell on 020 7831 0022

14 November 2006