

Juliet Shaw

I hope you will take special note of my response to this Consultation, as someone who has followed Leveson and the entire Royal Charter process in full [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1. Leveson called for remedies to be discussed with the complainant (K7.4). This should be a requirement for regulators – that they must discuss the proposed sanction with the complainant before issuing it (criterion 16). [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2. Subscribers must not be permitted to withhold any relevant information from a Regulator’s investigation. Subscribers should be bound to hand over any material requested, under non-disclosure contracts as required, by contract upon joining the regulator (criterion 18). [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

3. Regulators must have the power to direct the prominence and placement of apologies, corrections and adjudications (criterion 19). [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4. It should be made clear that membership of the arbitration scheme (criteria 22) must be compulsory for all subscribers, and that subscribers must not be able to “pick and choose” the cases they want to take to arbitration.

5. For arbitration (criteria 22) to work, caps on claimants’ costs and expenses must be set with regard to the need for “equality of arms” in each case, and the PRP must require the regulator to deliver that approach. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

With regard to the remainder of the issues in the consultation, I can direct you to Hacked Off's full response here <http://hackinginquiry.org/prp-consultation-response/>, which I support. This covers all issues in the consultation in detail.

Regards,

Juliet Shaw