

From: Holly Perry [mailto:hperry@pressrecognitionpanel.org.uk]
Sent: 13 July 2015 08:46
To: colette metcalfe <colettemetcalfe@hotmail.com>
Cc: contact@pressrecognitionpanel.org.uk
Subject: RE: Recent meeting in Birmingham FAO David Wolfe, Chair

Dear Ms Metcalfe

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your letter and enclosures addressed to our Chair, David Wolfe QC. He has seen your letter and has asked me to respond on his behalf.

I thought it might be helpful to start by explaining a bit about our role. The Press Recognition Panel (PRP) is an independent body set up to ensure that any regulators of the press are independent, properly funded and able to protect the public. The PRP was created as a result of the Leveson Inquiry into press standards, which followed widespread concern about unlawful activities carried out by some sections of the media such as phone hacking.

The Panel's main role will be to consider applications made by press self-regulators who want to be 'recognised' as 'approved regulators'. This means ensuring that any press regulators who apply to us are independent, properly able to protect the public from unlawful (or excessively intrusive or misleading activities) carried out by the press, and provide prompt and proper redress where these are judged to have taken place. The Press Recognition Panel has no control over the press and cannot tell any press organisation, publisher or press self-regulator what to do. That is the job of the press regulators.

If you haven't done so already, you need to address your concerns to the Editor of the local paper, asking them to look into the facts. If you do not get an satisfactory response from the Editor, you will then need to find out who owns the paper to find out if you can refer your case to a regulator. In numerical terms the majority of traditional news publishers are regulated by the Independent Press Standards Organisation, and their website is: <https://www.ipso.co.uk/IPSO/index.html>

I hope this response is helpful – please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Yours sincerely

Holly Perry

Holly Perry
Head of Governance

Press Recognition Panel
10th Floor, 88 Wood Street
London
EC2V 7RS
T: 020 8528 1589
E: hperry@pressrecognitionpanel.org.uk

Weblink: [PRESS RECOGNITION PANEL](#)  @PRPanel

From: colette metcalfe [<mailto:colettemetcalfe@hotmail.com>]

Sent: 09 July 2015 19:38

To: contact@pressrecognitionpanel.org.uk

Subject: Recent meeting in Birmingham FAO David Wolfe, Chair

Dear Mr. Wolfe,

I have today, 9th July, received my local paper in which your letter appears inviting interested readers to attend the meeting held yesterday. Had I known about it I should certainly have attended.

My concern is with misleading reporting in the press of court proceedings. The attached letter and solicitor`s statement will give the context but briefly what happened was this:

My son was convicted of manslaughter, against all our expectations, on 18th March. The sentencing took place on 19th March.

What first caught the interest of the police in my daughter-in-law`s tragic accidental death from a fall down the stairs while my son slept was some hearsay evidence from **10 years earlier**, implicating my son in some sort of domestic violence. Despite the best efforts of the police over 15 months, they could find no other evidence, hearsay or otherwise, of incidents of violence in the relationship. The judge at the trial ruled that the hearsay evidence was irrelevant, dating from such a long time before, and it therefore played no part in the proceedings.

On the day of the sentencing the Prosecution was able to describe the “evidence” from 2004 to a jury who had already reached their verdict.

This allowed the press (our local papers and the Daily Mirror) to use the phrase “The court heard. . .” and then to go on to portray a relationship where violence and abuse were a common and ongoing occurrence and indeed to allow readers to infer that the jury had heard all about this during the trial.

I understand that these reports were based on a press statement from the police, whose aim was probably to convince the local community that my son is a violent thug - which is laughably far from the truth.

I wonder how many other defendants, convicted or acquitted, have their reputation blackened by this sort of reporting.

We have attempted to get the papers to publish our letter, but of course they will not as this would be tantamount to acknowledging misreporting. Whereas the Prosecution story gets wide coverage in the media, the Defence must do what they can by word of mouth or, in our case, by circulating the truth in letters and emails.

I attach:

a letter which we asked the press to publish

a statement from my son`s solicitor.

Press reports can be found by “googling” my son`s name, **Edward Metcalfe**.

Yours sincerely,

Colette Metcalfe

Sent from Windows Mail