In a few weeks time a law could be passed that could lead to the closure of many local newspapers – including the South London Press. It will mean an end to 360 years of press freedom in this country – do you care enough to do something about it?

It’s all about Section 40 of the Criminal and Courts Act 2013 and how that story. Regionals, just in the public interest.

Established 1865

The consultation exhibitions begin todaiy – the press can be confident in the knowledge that even if they are now liable to pay exemplary costs, win or lose, for court restraints, overrules a robust complaints system, free to the user. A wholly independent appointments process was overseen by a former Head of the Supreme Court, Lord Justice Robert and set up as a regulator funded regulator, by the Royal Charter and interlocking and other voluntary

Almost any local council’s expenses, for example – we’ll do our best to get the public interested.

The industry accepted the need for a new and tougher system of self-regulation in response to the Press Complaints Commission and established the framework for a voluntary, independent system of press regulation which is believed to be the toughest in the western world.

The Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO) delivers on the Leveson principles, binding the industry to an enduring regulatory system and one which is of real benefit to the public.

But crucially this system is under-planned by contract law and not by Parliament. It allows the press to retain its fundamental democratic freedom to investigate, criticise politicians and others in positions of power, acting as the public’s watchdog and championing the rights to know. Almost any local newspaper wants to get it right and we don’t want to be sitting in a regional office with ever-declining budgets, would certainly think twice about doing that.

So even if the Leveson Inquiry holds to be bound by the Royal Charter’s terms as any consultation with the press or the public. It allows politicians to interfere in the regulation of the very voices which hold them and others in authority to account on behalf of their readers and investigate cases of corruption and wrongdoing.

Newspapers and magazines which wish to be bound by the Royal Charter now face the prospect of being punished in the courts for refusing to succumb to state press regulation. Under the Crime and Courts Act 2013, they are now liable to pay punitive (punitive) damages. If Section 40 were brought into force, they would be ordered to pay both sides costs, win or lose, for court action, actions for libel, breach of confidence, misuse of private information, harassment, malicious falsehood, or similar.

So even if the publisher won the court case, the court was satisfied the report was true, had been lawfully published, was in the public interest, and that publishers, editors and reporters had also acted lawfully, the publisher would still have to pay the losing claimant’s costs and its own costs.

Britain’s press is already subject to numerous criminal and civil laws which impact upon news gathering and reporting. There are statutes covering anything from defamation, harassment, contempt of court, court reporting restrictions, data protection, official secrets to phone hacking.

The regulator at IPSO is independent. It is not representative of the press. It is not independent.

It is not credible, being neither sponsored nor funded by any publisher nor is in membership of IMPRESS liable to pay the crippling costs of both sides of a court action, win or lose.

Future of local newspapers is at stake

Mothers unite to stop the killings

The State Sponsored Royal Charter and interlocking legislation in the Crime and Courts Act is the polar opposite of Leveson’s recommendation. There was no parliamentary scrutiny of the Royal Charter’s terms nor any consultation with the press or the public. It allows politicians to interfere in the regulation of the very voices which hold them and others in authority to account on behalf of their readers and investigate cases of corruption and wrongdoing.

Newspapers and magazines which wish to be bound by the Royal Charter now face the prospect of being punished in the courts for refusing to succumb to state press regulation. Under the Crime and Courts Act 2013, they are now liable to pay punitive (punitive) damages. If Section 40 were brought into force, they would be ordered to pay both sides costs, win or lose, for court action, actions for libel, breach of confidence, misuse of private information, harassment, malicious falsehood, or similar.

So even if the publisher won the court case, the court was satisfied the report was true, had been lawfully published, was in the public interest, and that publishers, editors and reporters had also acted lawfully, the publisher would still have to pay the losing claimant’s costs and its own costs.

Britain’s press is already subject to numerous criminal and civil laws which impact upon news gathering and reporting. There are statutes covering anything from defamation, harassment, contempt of court, court reporting restrictions, data protection, official secrets to phone hacking.

The industry accepted the need for a new and tougher system of self-regulation in response to the Press Complaints Commission and established the framework for a voluntary, independent system of press regulation which is believed to be the toughest in the western world.

The Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO) delivers on the Leveson principles, binding the industry to an enduring regulatory system and one which is of real benefit to the public.

But crucially this system is under-planned by contract law and not by Parliament. It allows the press to retain its fundamental democratic freedom to investigate, criticise politicians and others in positions of power, acting as the public’s watchdog and championing the rights to know.

The vast majority of UK national, regional and local newspapers and magazine publishers joined IPSO. It upholds the Editors’ Code of Practice, (governing accuracy and privacy and other voluntary

 standards mean it is incapable of being effective.

And on October 25, 2016, the Press Recognition Panel (PRP) approved IMPRESS’s application for recognition as a press regulator under the Royal Charter.

The new Culture Secretary Karen Bradley had been considering whether to bring the costs provisions into force and had been meeting all sectors interested in the Leveson review, including Hacked Off and IMPRESS.

The Culture Secretary and the Home Secretary launched a joint consultation on the Leveson Inquiry and its Implementation earlier this year.

The consultation closes at 5pm on January 10.

It asks whether section 40 should be repealed in its entirety now, as the industry believes it should on press freedom grounds, and whether the Leveson Inquiry should be terminated.

If, as a result of the consultation, the Government chose to bring section 40 into force, this would render any publisher not in membership of IMPRESS liable to pay the crippling costs of both sides of a court action, win or lose.

Future of local newspapers is at stake

Mothers unite to stop the killings

South London Press

NURSING IN CRISIS

You can respond to the proposals in three ways:

Online – at www.gov.uk/government/consultations:

Email – to presspolicy@culture.gsi.gov.uk:

By post – to Press Policy, Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 4th Floor, 100 Parliament Street, London SW1A 2BG.

Impress, the regulator funded by Max Mosley and set up as a vehicle to trigger the costs sanctions, list of fewer than 30 regulated titles which are primarily broadsheets, Sundays, microsites or small scale publications run by volunteers and therefore excluded from the Crime and Courts Act 2013 definition of ‘relevant publisher’. IMPRESS has been accredited recognition by the Press Recognition Panel even though:

It is not representative of the press.

It is not independent.

It is not credible, being neither sponsored nor funded by the press and lacking in code of standards.

Its lack of backing by the press and the absence of a code of


Deaths

MANN

NEIL DEREK NEVILLE

Died at home in Bournemouth on Sunday 27 November 2016, aged 75.

He was a well-known and respected osteopath with an established practice in Streatham, South London, for over forty years.

Beloved husband of Marisa and much loved father of Emily and Sylvia and grandfather of Ari, he will be much missed.

Funeral service at St Mark’s Church, Talbot Village, Bournemouth at 2.00pm on Thursday 15th December. All welcome. No flowers please. Donations if desired, to be made payable to ‘George Scott Funeral Service’ (for a charity to be chosen at a later date) and may be sent to George Scott Funeral Service, 1537 Winborne Road, Kinson, BH10 7BD. Tel: 01202 578079: