

**Dear Sirs,**

I understand that ahead of your report to Parliament about the state of the the press regulatory system, that you are seeking views from the public.

I remain disgusted at the lack of progress in putting in place a proper independent regulatory framework as recommended by Leveson and agree with the comments made by Hacked Off. Namely;

1. Parliament should be reminded by the PRP what the Leveson Report said should happen if the industry tried to veto his recommendations and refused to comply. The Leveson Report says: "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."
2. In the meantime, regardless of whether IMPRESS is recognised by the PRP, the PRP should strongly recommend to Parliament that the key 'guaranteed access to justice incentive' (section 40 of the Crime and Courts Act) should be brought into effect as Parliament had intended.

I remember only too well the promises made by leading Politicians to the families of those who suffered serious abuse by the press. Some sections of the press are way too powerful and think they can get away with anything in order to get a headline and drive up circulation. This has to change.

Regards,

**Adrian Vincent**