

Dear Sirs,

I understand you seek input on the current situation re press regulation and on the content of the report you will make to Parliament. Please consider the following input from me.

1. IMPRESS should not be recognised as meeting the requirements of Leveson's recommendations, as most significant publishers remain outside it.
2. In that Leveson's recommendations have not be fulfilled, Parliament should be reminded by the PRP what the Leveson Report said should happen in this case, namely that *"if some or all of the industry are not willing to participate in effective independent regulation, my own concluded view is to reject the notion that they should escape regulation altogether. I cannot, and will not, recommend another last chance saloon for the press. With some measure of regret, therefore, I am driven to conclude that the Government should be ready to consider the need for a statutory backstop regulator being established, to ensure, at the least, that the press are subject to regulation that would require the fullest compliance with the criminal and civil law, if not also to ensure consequences equivalent to those that would flow from an independent self-regulatory system."*
3. Regardless of the PRP's considered opinion of IMPRESS's compliance or otherwise with the Leveson recommendations, given that the Government is now also blocking the coming into effect of Section 40 of the Crime and Courts Act, passed by Parliament in 2013, that would guarantee access to justice for victims of libel and press intrusion, the PRP should strongly recommend to Parliament that this should be brought into effect, as Parliament intended, without further delay.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Bramhall