

Index

- A v. B*, 142, 155
A v. Norway, 276–8, 288, 293
AAA v. Associated Newspapers, 107–8
Abrams v. United States, 58, 168–9
 actual malice standard
 assessment of, 74
 in *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 86–7, 171, 335
 Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD), 203–4
Ajinomoto Sweeteners v. ASDA Stores, 45–6
Aksu v. Turkey, 284
 ALRC. *See* Australian Law Reform Commission
 Ammori, Marvin, 63
 Amnesty International, 228
 Anderson, Pamela, 192
 anonymity orders, in privacy law, 181–2
 Aplin, Tanya, 14–15
 Appelbaum, Jacob, 225
Armoniene v. Lithuania, 191
Ashby v. White, 300
 Assange, Julian, 224–5, 241–4
 as fabulist, 243
 on Internet as facilitator of totalitarianism, 225, 228
 on mass data capture, 228–32, 239–40
Attorney-General v. Guardian Newspapers Ltd (No 2), 345, 349
Aubrey v. Editions Vice-Versa Inc, 195
 Australia
 damages awarded in, for privacy violations, 305–6
 data collection in, 236–9
 under Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979, 238–9
 under Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Amendment (Data Retention) Bill 2014, 236–7
 Defamation Act 1974 in, 37
 defamation cases involving media in, 24–5
 defamation in, public interest elements of, 316
 defamation law in, 1–2, 3–4, 82–4, 352
 reform of, 333, 340–4
 extension of qualified privilege in, 87–90
 free speech cases in, 64–5, 87–9
 implied rights in, 88
 journalism law in, 2–6
 New York Times v. Sullivan as legal influence in, 64–5
 privacy law in, 1–2, 80
 reasonable expectation of privacy in, 98–100
 reasonableness standard in, 37
Australian Broadcasting Corporation v. Lenah Game Meats, 98, 298, 349
Australian Capital Television v. Commonwealth, 87–9
 Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC), 1–2, 96–106
 Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979, 238–9
Author of a Blog case, 112–13, 114
 autonomy
 in commonwealth courts, 131–2
 defamation claims and, 318–20
 grief journalism as influence on, 131–5
 liberty and, 132
 through privacy, 131–5
 privacy claims and, 318–20
Axel Springer v. Germany, 146, 186–7
 privacy laws and, for celebrities, 188–90
 right of reputation in, 278–80, 286–90
Ballina Shire Council v. Ringland, 296
 Barbas, Samantha, 169
 Barendt, Eric, 3–4, 11–12, 270
 Barker, Kit, 301–2
Bartnicki v. Vopper, 164–5, 183–4
 Belfort, Jordan Ross, 259

374 *Index*

- Benn, Stanley, 126, 129
 Bernal, Paul, 34
 Bernstein, Carl, 73
 Bill of Rights Act 1990 (New Zealand), 15
Bin Mahouz v. Ehrenfeld, 347–8
 Blackstone, William, 295
 blogs
 journalistic standards for, 30–1
 public interest communication defence
 by, 24–5
Boehner v. McDermott, 184
 Bollinger, Lee, 171
Bonnard v. Perryman, 304, 314
Bonnick v. Morris, 43, 46
 Bosland, Jason, 14–15
 Brandeis, Louis, 166, 168–9, 248,
 338–9
 Brandis, George, 239
Brooker v. Police, 126–7
Broome v. Cassell, 297–8
 Brown, Sheila, 130
 Browne, John, 5
 Burns, John F., 243
 Burrows, John, 2–3

Campbell v. MGN, 96, 100, 131, 165, 177,
 180, 195, 305, 319, 349
 Canada. *See also Grant v. Torstar*
 defamation cases involving media
 in, 24–5
 defamation law in, 10, 82–4
 Supreme Court in, 18, 38–9
 Canadian Association of Journalists, 31
Cantwell v. Connecticut, 85
Carson v. John Fairfax & Sons, 295–6, 297
Cârstea v. Romania, 280–1
 Cash, William, 5
 celebrities, privacy laws for, 187–90
Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire, 85
 character, reputation compared with, 268
Charleston v. News Group Newspapers, 46
Chase v. News Group Newspapers, 44
Chauvy v. France, 273–4
 Cheer, Ursula, 2–3, 15
 children, reasonable expectation of privacy
 for, 108
 civil rights
 implied rights, 88
 role of juries in protection of, 60
 Civil Rights movement, 58–9
 CJEU. *See* Court of Justice of the European
 Union
Clague v. APN News and Media, 309
 claims, for defamation and privacy
 autonomy influenced by, 318–20
 complex damaging speech claims, 310
 constitutional models for, 327–9
 in EU, 317
 under Harmful Digital Communications
 Act, 15, 322–7
 merged of, 320–9
 under New Zealand Bill of Rights Act
 1990, 327–9
 purpose of, 318–20
 statutory model of, 322
 Clapper, James, 228–30
 Clarke, Anthony, 101, 109
 Clinton, Bill, 194
Closer, 246–7, 263
Coco v. AN Clark, 176–7
Cohen v. California, 79–80
Cohen v. Cowles Media, 184
Coleman v. MacLennan, 344, 350
Commentaries on the Laws of England
 (Blackstone), 295
 common law systems
 constitutional court limits and, 79–80
 defamation law under, 9–11, 84–5
 dignity as value in, 80
 extension of qualified privilege in, 87–90
 First Amendment and, 75–8
 free speech in, 3–4, 74–5
 New York Times v. Sullivan and, 67–73
 privacy law in, 9–11, 84–5
 US law influenced by, 85–7
 commonwealth courts, autonomy in,
 131–2
 Communications Decency Act, 63, 254
 complex damaging speech claims, 310
 conduct rule, 56
 Conradt, William, 260
Conradt v. NBC Universal, 260–1
 constitutionalism
 common law systems and, 79–80
 of defamation law, 9–11, 76–7
 human rights through, 61–2
 in UK, 197
 in US, 197
 Contostavlos, Tulisa, 194
Contostavlos v. Mendahum, 194
 Convention for the Protection of Human
 Rights and Fundamental
 Freedoms, 136
 Costejo González, Mario, 204
Costejo ruling. *See Google Spain SL, Google
 Inc v. Agencia Española de Protección
 de Datos (AEPD) and Mario Costejo
 González*
*Couderc and Hachette Filipacchi Associés v.
 France*, 187

- Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)
 DPD law and, 199, 204–17
 balance of rights and interests under, 214–16
 RTBF under, 212–14
 territorial scope of, 205–8
 Google and
 AEPD and, 203
 as data controller, 208–12
 RTBF requests for, 199–200
 SEOs and, 200, 202–3, 204–17
Google Spain SL, Google Inc v. Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD) and Mario Costeja González, 198, 199–223
 DPD law and, 199, 204–17
 gaps in ruling, 218–21
 Google interpretation of, 220–1
 legal implications of, 221–3
 RTBF and, 199–202
 legals issues before, 204–17
 balance of rights and interests, 214–16
 courts systems. *See also* Court of Justice of the European Union; European Court of Human Rights; US Supreme Court
 commonwealth, autonomy in, 131–2
 Cowen, Zelman, 5
Cox Broadcasting v. Cohn, 164–5, 337–8
 Craig, Larry, 252
Cream Holdings v. Banjeree, 181–2
 criticism. *See* right to criticise
CTB v. News Group Newspapers, 165
Cumpăna v. Romania, 273–4
Curtis Publishing v. Butts, 187
 cypherpunk philosophy, 244
Cyberpunks (Assange), 225, 228

Daboll v. DeMarco, 26, 28
 Dacre, Paul, 157, 161–2
 damages. *See* vindication, through damages
 data collection. *See also* Google
 Assange on, 228–32, 239–40
 in Australia, 236–9
 under Australian Security Intelligence Organisation Act 1979, 238–9
 under Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Amendment (Data Retention) Bill 2014, 236–7
 consent for, 242
 for defamation law, 6–8
 future of privacy rights with, 241–4
 Google as controller for, 208–12
 Manning on, 225–6, 239–40
 of metadata, 230, 235, 239
 under Patriot Act, 230
 amendments to, 233
 Snowden on, 226–7, 231, 239–40
 through surveillance, in US, 228–32
 under FISA, 228–30
 under Fourth Amendment, 234–6
 government responses to, 232–4
 under Patriot Act, 230, 233
 with PRISM program, 234–6
 search and seizures from, 234–6
 UK legal response to, 240
 data privacy law, 6–8, 13–14. *See also* privacy law
 Google and
 AEPD and, 203
 as data controller, 208–12
 RTBF requests for, 199–200
 SEOs and, 200, 202–3, 204–17
Google Spain SL, Google Inc v. Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD) and Mario Costeja González and, 198, 199–223
 CJEU and, 218–21
 DPD law and, 199, 204–17
 Google interpretation of, 220–1
 legal implications of, 221–3
 RTBF and, 199–202
 Data Protection Act (DPA), 111
 Data Protection Directive (DPD), 13–14, 199, 204–17
 balance of rights and interests under, 214–16
 RTBF under, 212–14
 territorial scope of, 205–8
 data removal, from Google, 203
 Davies, Nicola, 108
 De Cew, Judith Wagner, 125
 de Zwart, Melissa, 14
Debs v. United States, 60
 declaration of falsity, 52
 Defamation Act 1974 (Australia), 37
 Defamation Act 1992 (New Zealand), 316
 Defamation Act 2013 (UK), 10, 18, 40, 90
 declaration of falsity under, 52
 foundations of, 331
 free speech under, 66–7
 libel law reform under, 53
 new defamation provisions under, 348
 Reynolds v. Times Newspapers and, 90
 right to criticise under, 159
 defamation claims. *See* claims, for
 defamation and privacy

376 *Index*

- defamation law, 83–4, 95. *See also* claims, for defamation and privacy; reputation, as right; single meaning rule
- actual malice and, assessment of, 74
- in Australia, 1–2, 3–4, 82–4, 352
- public interest elements of, 316
- autonomy influenced by, 318–20
- in Canada, 10, 17–39, 82–4 (*See also Grant v. Torstar*)
- in common law systems, 9–11, 84–5
- comparative analysis for, 8–9
- comparative reform of, 9–11
- constitutionalism and, 9–11, 76–7
- in courts, 2–6
- data collection for, 6–8
- in democracies, 83–4, 95
- dignity influenced by, 318–20
- discursive remedies in, 52–4
- disputes, without juries, 50
- in England and Wales, 2, 51, 82–4
- in EU, 317
- evolution of, 82–3
- free speech under, 3–4, 41
- group, 269
- as human rights issue, 5
- in journalism law, 2–6
- journalistic standards and, 53
- legislative reform proposals in, 2–6
- media reporting influenced by
- in Australia, 24–5, 94
 - in Canada, 24–5
 - in UK, 24–5, 91–2, 94–5
 - in US, 24–5, 92–3
- negligence standards in, 33–4
- in New Zealand, 82–4, 309–30
- public interest elements of, 316–17
- privacy as distinct from, 292–3, 304–5, 310–12
- for purpose of legal remedies, 293–5
- privacy claims merged under, 320–9
- privacy law compared with, 14–16
- for public figures, 67–8, 83
- purpose of claims under, 318–20
- reasonable expectation of privacy and, 111–12
- reform of, 53
- in Australia, 333, 340–4
 - after *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 331–50
 - after *Reynolds v. Times Newspapers*, 345–50
 - in UK, 333, 344–50
 - in US, 334–9
- reporting technologies and, 6–8
- right to criticise under, 159
- severity of harm in, 34–5
- single meaning rule and, 51–7
- under Defamation Act 2013, 53
- under SPEECH Act, 347
- in UK, 310–12
- public interest elements of, 316–17
- in US, 2, 24–5, 33, 82–4, 85–7, 92–3
- reform movement for, 334–9
- Supreme Court cases, 79, 82, 85, 350
- under US Constitution, 85
- US states' determination of, 86–7
- vindication in, 295–9
- critique of, 298
- Delfi v. Estonia*, 198
- democracy
- defamation law development under, 83–4, 95
 - free speech and, 60–1
- Denton, Nick, 258
- Derbyshire County Council v. Times Newspapers*, 341–2, 344–6
- Derry v. Peek*, 68
- Descheemaeker, Eric, 19, 32
- dignity
- defamation claims and, 318–20
 - as justification for reputation as human right, 268–71
 - looking-glass self theory and, 269–71, 272
 - privacy claims and, 318–20
 - privacy law and, 256–63
 - self-esteem and, 269–71
 - for Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics, 260
 - as value, 80
- Dingle v. Associated Newspapers*, 295
- The Dirty, 255–6
- Domscheit-Berg, Daniel, 225–6, 243
- Donald v. Ntuli*, 182
- Douglas v. Hello*, 100, 305
- DPA. *See* Data Protection Act
- DPD. *See* Data Protection Directive
- Dun & Bradstreet v. Greenmoss Builders*, 67, 190–1
- ECHR. *See* European Convention on Human Rights
- Editions Plons v. France*, 185
- Ehrenfeld, Rachel, 347–8
- England and Wales
- constitutional framework in, 197
 - damages awarded in, for privacy violations, 305–6
 - defamation law in, 2, 51, 82–4
 - ECHR influence in, 196

- European Charter on Human Rights
 in, 66
 extension of qualified privilege in, 87–90
 free speech in, 176
de Libellis Famosis in, 83
New York Times v. Sullivan as legal
 influence in, 66–7
 privacy law in, 2, 4–5, 173–80
 Public Order Act 1986 in, 176
 Race Relations Act 1976 in, 176
 reasonable expectation of privacy in,
 100–3
 right to criticise in, 157–61
 Erdos, David, 340–1
 European Convention on Human Rights
 (ECHR), 5–6, 66
 Article 8
 doctrinal and conceptual tensions for,
 281–90
 protected interests in, reputation as,
 273–6
 reputation as human right under,
 265–7, 281–6
 seriousness threshold in, 276–8,
 286–90
 Article 10(2), 273–6
 English law influenced by, 196
 free speech and, 178–9
 privacy law and, 256
 privacy rights under, 165, 178–9
 for celebrities, 187–90
 for private individuals, 190–1
 reasonable expectation of privacy
 guidelines, 96, 103–4, 112
Von Hannover v. Germany (no 2), public
 interest elements in, 151–4
 European Court of Human Rights, 12–13
Axel Springer v. Germany, 146, 186–7
 celebrity privacy and, 187–90
 journalistic standards for, 37
 jurisprudence of, 180
 privacy rights and, 131–2, 136–7, 179–80
Von Hannover v. Germany (no 1), 179–80,
 188–90
Von Hannover v. Germany (no 2), 137,
 145–6, 179–80, 186–7
 privacy rights in, 179–80
 Falwell, Jerry, 77
Favell v. Queensland Newspapers, 298–9
Ferdinand v. MGN, 102, 109
 First Amendment, US Constitution
 in *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 85
 in *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*, 85
 Civil Rights movement and, 58–9
 common law rights and, 75–8
 cultural power of, 165
 free speech under, 3–4, 70, 86–7
 freedom of press and, 140–1
 Gawker's use of, 254–6
 historical context for, 167–8
 in *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 75–80,
 86–7, 170, 171
Patterson v. Colorado and, 168
 for private individuals, 190–1
Smith v. People of the State of California
 and, 85
 FISA. *See* Foreign Intelligence
 Surveillance Act
 Fleming, John, 298
Flood v. Times Newspapers, 90, 346–7
Florida Star v. BJJF, 164–5, 249–50
 Flynt, Larry, 77
 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act
 (FISA)
 data surveillance under, 228–32
 US Supreme Court and, 229–30
Foulidis v. Baker, 26–7
 Fourth Amendment, US Constitution,
 234–6
 France, privacy damages in, 305–6
 free speech. *See also* First Amendment, US
 Constitution; freedom of press;
Grant v. Torstar; *New York Times v.*
Sullivan; public speech
 in *Abrams v. United States*, 168–9
 in Australia, 64–5, 87–9
 Brandeis on, 166, 168–9
 in common law systems, 3–4, 74–5
 under Communications Decency Act, 63
 under Defamation Act 2013, 66–7
 under defamation law, 3–4, 41
 democracy and, 60–1
 in England and Wales, 176
 European Convention on Human Rights
 and, 136, 178–9
 European Court of Human Rights and,
 179–80
 under First Amendment, 3–4, 70, 86–7
 Holmes on, 168
 in *Jameel v. Wall Street Journal*
Europe, 66
 under *de Libellis Famosis*, 83
 Mill on, 157
 in *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 86,
 167, 249
 parody and, 77
 privacy rights balanced with, 177–80
 privacy-invading, benefits of, 141
 rationale for, 138–42

378 *Index*

- free speech (cont.)
 in *Reynolds v. Times Newspapers*, 66, 89–90
 in UK, 13, 173–80
 in US, 13, 166–73
 methodology for, 172–3
 in *Whitney v. California*, 168–9
- freedom of press
 economic survival argument for, 142–5
 First Amendment arguments for, 140–1
 in Germany, 145–50
 under Human Rights Act 1998, 139
 Impress Project and, 163
 judicial approach to, 141–2
 in *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 86, 167, 249
 public figure doctrine and, 145–50
 in *Axel Springer v. Germany*, 146
 in *Von Hannover v. Germany (no 2)*, 137, 145–6
 public interest arguments for, 137, 143
 expansion of, 151–4
 in *Von Hannover v. Germany (no 2)*, 151–4
 rationale for, 138–42
 right to criticise and
 under Defamation Act 2013, 159
 under defamation law, 159
 in England and Wales, 157–61
 on moral grounds, 161
 role model argument for, 154–7
 social value of, 139–40, 141
 in UK, 142–5, 150–1
 waiver argument for, 150–1
 for Yellow Press, 164
- Fressoz and Roire v. France*, 104
Funding Evil (Ehrenfeld), 347–8
- Gadja, Amy, 14
Garrison v. Louisiana, 86
 Gavison, Ruth, 160
 Gawker, 254–6, 258
 Gayet, Julie, 246–7, 256, 262, 263
 George, Patrick, 298–9
 Gerety, Tom, 125
 Germany. *See also Axel Springer v. Germany; Von Hannover v. Germany (no 1); Von Hannover v. Germany (no 2)*
 damages awarded in, for privacy violations, 305–6
 freedom of press in, 145–50
 privacy law in, for celebrities, 188–90
 public figure doctrine in, 145–50
- Gertz v. Robert Welch*, 33, 336–7
 Gigg, Ryan, 162, 165
 Goodwin, Fred, 158
Goodwin v. MGN, 174
 Google
 as data controller, 208–12
 data removal from, 203
 interpretation of *Costeja* ruling, 220–1
 RTBF requests for, 199–200
 SEOs and, 200, 202–3
 DPD application to, 204–17
 link removal on, 216–17
Google Spain SL, Google Inc v. Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD) and Mario Costeja González
 CJEU and, 198, 199–223
 DPD law and, 199, 204–17
 gaps in ruling, 218–21
 Google interpretation of, 220–1
 legal implications of, 221–3
 RTBF and, 199–202
 data privacy law in, 198, 199–223
 procedural history of, 203–4
 Googlebots, 202–3
 Gould, R. Douglas, 36–7
Grant defence. *See* public interest communication defence
Grant v. Torstar, 10
 elements of, 18–24
 public interest communication defence
 in, 18–24
 in applications besides journalism, 21–2
 in applications besides publications to the world at large, 22–3
 cost of risk avoidance analysis in, 35
 journalistic standards references in, 30–2
 jury questions in, 23–4
 pleading of, 24–5
 in practice, 24–9
 public interest element in, 19
 qualified privilege in, 22–3
 reasonableness standard in, 32–8
 responsible communication element in, 19–20
 scope of, 20–3, 29–38
 severity of harm aspect in, 34–5
 social benefits of, 35
- Greene v. Associated Newspapers*, 304
 Greenwald, Glenn, 139, 230, 239–40
 grief journalism, 12
 behavior of media in, 123, 125–31
 breaches of privacy and, 124–5
 components of, 119–20
 interviewed participants in, 120, 121
 justifications of, 120

- pack phenomenon in, 122
 physical presence of media and, 125–31
 in Pike River disaster, 116–35
 autonomy influenced by, 131–5
 avoidance of media and, 132–3
 behavior of media during, 123, 125–31
 breaches of privacy and, 124–5
 feelings of insecurity as result of, 128–31
 feelings of safety as result of, 128–31
 hiding of emotions as response to, 134–5
 lack of empathy in, 127–8
 personal dignity impacted by, 126–8
 physical intrusiveness of media, 125–31
 post-traumatic stress for interviewed persons, 121
 psychological response to, 122
 post-traumatic stress for interviewed persons, 121
 psychological response to, 122
 group defamation, 269
- Halford v. UK*, 103
Hansen v. R, 327–8
 Harmful Digital Communications Act (New Zealand), 15, 322–7
 Hogan, Hulk, 254–6, 258
 Hollande, François, 246–7
 Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 168
Hosking v. Runting, 97, 98–9, 131, 147, 315, 348–9
 Howarth, David, 268, 270–3
 Hughes, Kirsty, 13, 105, 110, 113, 136–7, 140–1
 human rights. *See also* civil rights; privacy, as a right; reputation, as right
 constitutional development of, 61–2
 defamation law and, 5
 implied rights, 88
 privacy law and, 5, 173–80
 Human Rights Act 1998 (UK), 139
 privacy law under, development of, 175
 privacy rights under, 165
Hunter v. Chandler, 28, 31
Hustler Magazine v. Falwell, 77
Hutcheson v. News Group Newspapers, 102
- implied rights, 88
 Impress Project, 163
 Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO), 157
 informational privacy, 124–5
 injunctions, in privacy law, 181–2
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 5
 Internet
 cyberpunk philosophy about, 244
 as facilitator of totalitarianism, 225
 IPSO. *See* Independent Press Standards Organisation
- Jameel v. Wall Street Journal Europe*, 7, 18, 66, 346–7
John Fairfax & Sons v. Carson, 298
 Johnson, Boris, 143
 journalism law, 2–6. *See also* grief
 journalism
 public speech and, 7–8
 journalistic standards. *See also* freedom of press
 assessment of malice in, 74
 for bloggers, 30–1
 for Canadian Association of Journalists, 31
 for courts compared with journalists, 36
 defamation law and, 53
 for European Court of Human Rights, 37
 in *Grant v. Torstar*, 30–2
 New York Times v. Sullivan and, historical context for, 73–4
 pushing the envelope of, 253–6
 Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics, 251–2
 Twitter and, 30
 journalists. *See also* freedom of press
 standards for, 36
 withholding of information by, 252–3
Julian Assange: The Unauthorised Biography (O'Hagan), 224–5
- juries
 civil rights and, 60
 in *Grant v. Torstar*, 23–4
 libel disputes without, 50
- K v. News Group Newspapers*, 137, 143
 Kahan, Dan, 71
 Kalven, Harry, 171
 Kant, Immanuel, 126
Karakó v. Hungary, 277–8, 286–90
Katz v. US, 99
Kaye v. Robertson, 173–4
 Kennedy, John F., 259
 Kenyon, Andrew, 37, 50, 62
Khashoggi v. IPC Magazines, 43–4
Kiam v. MGN, 298
 King, Martin Luther King, Jr., 170, 334. *See also* *New York Times v. Sullivan*
KU v. Finland, 191

380 *Index*

- Lait v. Evening Standard*, 46, 48
Lange v. Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 94, 316, 342–4
Lavric v. Romania, 280–1
 Leigh, David, 243
 Lewinsky, Monica, 194
 Lewis, Anthony, 339
 libel law. *See* defamation law
de Libellis Famosis, 83
 liberty, autonomy and, 132
 Lidsky, Lyriisa, 72
Lillo-Stenberg and Saether v. Norway, 153, 189
Lindon v. France, 274
 Lindsay, David, 13–14
 Lofgren, Zoe, 233
 looking-glass self theory, 269–71, 272, 284–5
Lucas-Box meaning, 44
Lucas-Box v. News Group Newspapers, 44
 Lyon, Alexander, 5
- MacAskill, Ewen, 230
 male gaze, 130
Mannai Investment v. Eagle Star Life, 47–8
 Manne, Robert, 243, 244
 Manning, Chelsea, 225–6, 239–40
 Mason, Anthony, 341
 Massie, Thomas, 233
 Maxwell, Robert, 92
McCartan Turkington Breen v. Times Newspapers, 139
 McClaren, Steve, 149
 McDonald, Barbara, 109
McGinty v. Western Australia, 342
McKennit v. Ash, 100–1, 113, 137, 312
McLaren v. News Group Newspapers, 102
 media. *See also* journalistic standards; journalists; Pike River disaster
 in defamation cases
 in Canada, 24–5, 94
 in UK, 24–5, 91–2
 in US, 24–5, 92–3
 grief journalism and, 12
 autonomy influenced by, 131–5
 avoidance of media in response to, 132–3
 behavior of media, 123, 125–31
 breaches of privacy and, 124–5
 feelings of insecurity as result of, 128–31
 feelings of safety and, 128–31
 hiding of emotions as response to, 134–5
 lack of empathy in, 127–8
 personal dignity impacted by, 126–8
 physical intrusiveness of media, 125–31
 post-traumatic stress for interviewed persons, 121
 psychological response to, 122
 after *Lange v. Australian Broadcasting Corporation*, 94
 after *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 24–5, 92–3
 pack phenomenon in, 122
 during Pike River Disaster, 117, 135
 after *Reynolds v. Times Newspapers*, 24–5, 91–2, 94–5
 Meiklejohn, Alexander, 336
Merivale v. Carson, 46
 Merkel, Angela, 231
 metadata, collection of, 230, 235, 239
Michaels v. Internet Entertainment Group, 192
Mikolajová v. Slovakia, 286, 288
 Mill, John Stuart, 157, 175, 336
 Milton, John, 74–5, 175, 336
 morality, right to criticise and, 161
 Moreham, Nicole, 12, 104–5, 106, 107, 109
Mosley v. News Group Newspapers, 102, 137, 157–61, 162, 165, 193–4, 256–8, 293–4, 299, 305
Mosley v. United Kingdom, 188
 Müller-Maguhn, Andy, 225
 Mullis, Alastair, 269–70, 272, 283–6
 Murchison, Brian, 351
Murray v. Express Newspapers, 96–106, 195
- Nagel, Thomas, 134–5
Nationwide News v. Wills, 87–9
 negligence standards
 for defamation, 33–4
 in defamation law, 33–4
 in *Gertz v. Robert Welch*, 33
New York Times v. Sullivan, 2, 10–11, 15–16
 actual malice standard in, 86–7, 171, 335
 Australian law influenced by, 64–5
 civil rights context for, 58–9
 common law doctrine and, 67–73
 defamation law reform influenced by, 331–50
 elements of, 59, 170
 English law influenced by, 66–7
 epistemological issues in, 68–73
 First Amendment and, 75–80, 86–7, 170, 171
 free speech issues in, 86, 167, 249

- freedom of press in, 86, 167, 249
 historical context for journalism
 and, 73–4
 isolation costs of, 67–8
 legal impact of, 59–61, 62
 media reporting after, 24–5, 92–3
 privacy law reform influenced by, 331–50
 privacy rights in, 167
 qualified privilege defence in, 64–5
 US Supreme Court and, 59–60, 86–7
 New Zealand. *See also* Pike River disaster
 Bill of Rights Act 1990 in, 15
 Defamation Act 1992 in, 316
 defamation in, 82–4
 parameters of, 310–12, 314–15
 public interest elements of, 316–17
 Harmful Digital Communications Act in,
 15, 322–7
 privacy law in, 147
 reasonable expectation of privacy in,
 98–100
 New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, 327–9
 Nixon, Richard, 253, 338–9
 Nordic Conference on the Right to
 Privacy, 6
 Northern Ireland, single meaning rule in, 57

OBG v. Allan, 349
 O’Hagan, Andrew, 224–5, 241–4
*Oklahoma Publishing v. Oklahoma County
 District Court*, 164–5
On Liberty (Mill), 336. *See also* Mill, John
 Stuart
OPO v. MLA, 197–8
*Oriental Daily Publisher v. Ming Pao
 Holdings*, 46–7

 parody, free speech and, 77
 Partlett, David, 10–11
Patterson v. Colorado, 168
Pauliukienė v. Lithuania, 280–1, 288
Pavesich v. New England Life Insurance,
 131–2
Pfeifer v. Austria, 274–5, 317
 Phillipson, Gavin, 12–13, 114
 photographs and video, under privacy laws,
 191–5
 Pike River disaster (New Zealand)
 breaches of privacy during, 124–5
 grief journalism in, 116–35
 autonomy influenced by, 131–5
 avoidance of media and, 132–3
 breaches of privacy and, 124–5
 feelings of insecurity as result of,
 128–31
 hiding of emotions as response to, 134–5
 lack of empathy in, 127–8
 personal dignity impacted by, 126–8
 physical intrusiveness of media,
 125–31
 post-traumatic stress for interviewed
 persons, 121
 psychological response to, 122
 safety issues with, 128–31
 media interest in, 117, 135
 study of, 117–22
 limitations of, 120–2
 methodology for, 119
 role of media presence in, 122–5
 strengths of, 119–20
 timeline of events, 116–17
Plato Films v. Speidel, 297–8
 Poitras, Laura, 230, 239–40
Polanco v. Spain, 286
*Popovski v. Former Yugoslav Republic of
 Macedonia*, 280–1
 presidents, US, privacy rights for, 247–53
Prince Albert v. Strange, 193
Prince of Wales v. Associated Newspapers, 107
Privacy (Prosser), 247
 privacy, as a right. *See also* claims, for
 defamation and privacy; freedom of
 press; privacy law; reasonable
 expectation of privacy
 autonomy and, 131–5
 in *Campbell v. MGN*, 96, 100, 131
 citizen’s right to, 80
 defamation as distinct from, 292–3,
 304–5, 310–12
 for purpose of legal remedies, 293–5
 under DPA, 111
 under ECHR, 136, 165, 178–9
 European Court of Human Rights and,
 131–2, 136–7, 179–80
 expansion of, 312–13
 free speech balanced with, 177–80
 future of, 241–4
 grief journalism and, 12, 124–5
 in *Hosking v. Runting*, 97, 98–9, 131
 under Human Rights Act 1998, 165
 informational, 124–5
 in journalism law, 2–6
 male gaze and, 130
 under *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 167
 under public figure doctrine, 145–50
 in UK, 177–80
 remedies for, 181–3
 in US, 166–73
 for presidents, 247–53
 remedies for, 181–3

382 *Index*

- privacy, as a right (cont.)
 for whistleblowers, 227, 239–41
Privacy and Media Freedom (Wacks), 97
 privacy claims. *See* claims, for defamation and privacy
 privacy law. *See also* claims, for defamation and privacy; data privacy law; freedom of press; privacy, as a right; public figures, doctrine for; public interest arguments; reasonable expectation of privacy
 anonymity orders in, 181–2
 in Australia, 1–2, 80
 in common law systems, 9–11, 84–5
 comparative analysis for, 8–9
 in courts, 2–6
 defamation claims merged with, 320–9
 defamation law compared with, 14–16
 dignity as part of, 256–63
 ECHR support of, 256
 in England and Wales, 2, 4–5, 173–80
 in EU, 317
 expectations of, 11–13
 in Germany, for celebrities, 188–90
 under Human Rights Act 1998, 175
 as human rights issue, 5, 173–80
 journalistic practices under, 13–14
 legal impact of, 11–13
 legislative proposals in, 2–6
 in New Zealand, 147
 purpose of claims under, 318–20
 rationale for, 11–13
 reform of, *New York Times v. Sullivan* as influence on, 331–50
 reporting technologies and, 6–8
 Restatement of Torts provisions in, 247, 248–9
 right to criticise under, 157–61
 super-injunctions in, 181–2
 in UK, 173–80
 approach to remedies for, 181–3
 for celebrities, 187–90
 compared with US law, 183–95
 for government officials, 183–7
 for heads of state, 183–7
 photographs and video in, 191–5
 for private individuals, 190–1
 in US, 2, 166–73
 antecedents for, 166–7
 approach to remedies for, 181–3
 for celebrities, 187–90
 compared with UK law, 183–95
 for government officials, 183–7
 for heads of state, 183–7, 247–53
 photographs and video in, 191–5
 for private individuals, 190–1
 vindication of, through damages, 305–7
 Von Hannover v. Germany (no 2) and, 179–80
 for celebrities, 188–90
 for photographs and video, 194–5
 privacy-invading expression, 141
 Prosser, William, 169–70, 247
 public figures, doctrine for
 in *Axel Springer v. Germany*, 146
 for celebrities, 187–90
 defamation law for, 67–8
 de Libellis Famosis and, 83
 expansion of concept, 148–9
 freedom of press and, 145–50
 for government officials, 183–7
 for heads of state, 183–7, 247–53
 in *Hosking v. Runting*, 97, 98–9, 131, 147
 loss of privacy for, factors in, 150
 reasonable expectation of privacy for, 145–50
 role model argument, 154–7
 in *Von Hannover v. Germany* (no 2), 137, 145–6
 public interest arguments
 in defamation cases, 316–17
 economic survival argument in, 142–5
 for freedom of press, 137, 143
 expansion of, 151–4
 judicial support in, 144
 right to criticise as, 157–61
 role model argument, 154–7
 in *Time v. Hill*, 337–8
 in UK law, 196–7
 in US law, 196–7
 in *Von Hannover v. Germany* (no 2), 151–4
 public interest communication defence (Canada). *See also Grant v. Torstar*
 application of, 25–9
 by bloggers, 24–5
 in *Daboll v. DeMarco*, 26, 28
 in *Foulidis v. Baker*, 26–7
 in *Grant v. Torstar*, 18–24
 in applications besides
 journalism, 21–2
 in applications besides publications to the world at large, 22–3
 cost of risk avoidance analysis in, 35
 journalistic standards references in, 30–2
 jury questions in, 23–4
 pleading of defence, 24–5
 in practice, 24–9
 public interest element in, 19

- qualified privilege in, 22–3
 reasonableness standard in, 32–8
 responsible communication element
 in, 19–20
 scope of defence, 20–3, 29–38
 severity of harm aspect in, 34–5
 social benefits of, 35
 in *Hunter v. Chandler*, 28, 31
 pleading of, 24–5
 in *Roshard v. Saint Denis*, 27–8
 in *Rubin v. Ross*, 27
 in *Shavluk v. Green Party of Canada*, 29
 success rate of, 25–6
 by traditional journalists, 24
 in *WIC Radio v. Simpson*, 18
 Public Order Act 1986, 176
 public speech, 7–8
 publications to the world at large, 22–3
Putistin v. Ukraine, 280–1
- qualified privilege, 22–3. *See also*
 Defamation Act 2013 (UK); *Grant v. Torstar*; *Lange v. Australian Broadcasting Corporation*; public interest communication defence (Canada); *Reynolds v. Times Newspapers*; *Theophanous v. Herald & Weekly Times*
 in Australia, 87–90
 in common law systems, 87–90
 in England and Wales, 87–90
 in *Lange v. Australian Broadcasting Corporation*, 87–9
 in *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 64–5
 in *Reynolds v. Times Newspapers*, 89–90, 346
- Quan v. Cusson*, 17
- R (Lumba) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department*, 303
- R v. Secretary of State for the Home Department ex parte Simms*, 175
- Race Relations Act 1976, 176
- Rachels, James, 124
- Radio France v. France*, 273
- reasonable expectation of privacy, 96–8
 abandonment of, 111–14
 ALRC and, 96–106
 in *Australian Broadcasting Corporation v. Lenah Game Meats*, 98
 in Australian cases, 98–100
 in *Author of a Blog* case, 112–13, 114
 in *Axel Springer v. Germany*, 146
 in *Campbell v. MGN*, 96, 100
 for children, 108
- defamation law and, 111–12
 ECHR guidelines for, 96, 103–4, 112
 in English cases, 100–3
 in grief journalism, 124–5
 in *Hosking v. Runting*, 97, 98–9
 Hughes on, 105, 110, 113
 in *Katz v. US*, 99
 Moreham on, 104–5, 106, 107, 109
 in *Murray v. Express Newspapers*, 96–106
 in New Zealand cases, 98–100
 origins of, 114
 under public figure doctrine, 145–50
 right of reputation and, 111–12
 test of, in case law, 97, 98–103
 arguments for, 104–7
 incoherence of, 107–10
 in *TSE v. News Group Newspapers*, 180
 in *Von Hannover v. Germany (no 2)*, 137, 145–6, 179–80
- reasonableness standard
 in Australia, 37
 in public interest communication
 defence, 32–8
- remedies. *See* vindication, through damages
- repetition rule, 56
- reputation, as right
 under Article 8, of ECHR, 265–7, 281–6
 doctrinal and conceptual tensions for, 281–90
 as protected interest, 273–6
 seriousness threshold in, 276–8, 286–90
 under Article 10(2), of ECHR, 273–6
 in *Axel Springer v. Germany*, 278–80
 character compared with, 268
 looking-glass self theory and, 269–71, 272, 284–5
 loss of, 271–2
 reasonable expectation of privacy and, 111–12
 self-esteem and, 269–71
 theoretical justifications for, 267–73
 for dignity, 268–71
 property conception in, 268
 sociality justification, 271–3
 vindication of, through damages, 296
- Restatement of Torts provisions, in privacy law, 247, 248–9
- Reynolds v. Times Newspapers*, 17, 18
 Defamation Act 2013 and, 90
 defamation law reform as result of, 345–50
 expansion of qualified privilege in, 89–90
 free speech in, 66, 89–90
 media reporting after, 24–5, 91–2, 94–5

384 *Index*

- Reynolds v. Times Newspapers (cont.)
 public interest communication defence
 in, 32–3, 346
 qualified privilege in, 89–90, 346
 vindication in, 297
- Richards, Neil, 13, 136–7, 140–1
- Richardson, Megan, 15–16
- Richie, Nik, 255–6
- Riegel v. Medtronic*, 79
- right to be forgotten (RTBF)
 under DPD law, 212–14
 Google requests for, 199–200
 in *Google Spain SL*, *Google Inc v. Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD) and Mario Costeja González*, 199–202
- right to criticise
 under Defamation Act 2013 (UK), 159
 under defamation law, 159
 in England and Wales, 157–61
 on moral grounds, 161
The Right to Speak Ill (Weaver et al.), 62
- rights. *See* civil rights; human rights;
 privacy, as a right; reputation, as
 right; right to be forgotten; right to
 criticise
- Roberts v. United Kingdom*, 287–8
- Rocknroll v. News Group Newspapers*, 137
- Rolph, David, 15, 319–21
- Rosenbloom v. Metromedia*, 336–7
- Roshard v. Saint Denis*, 27–8
- Ross, Donald Q. C., 5
- RTBF. *See* right to be forgotten
- Rubin v. Ross*, 27
- Ruusunen v. Finland*, 185–6
- San Diego v. Roe*, 192–3
- Sawer, Geoffrey, 2
- Schauer, Frederick, 68, 352
- Schwartz, Bernard, 339
- Scott, Andrew, 10, 269–70, 272, 281–6
- search engine operators (SEOs), 200,
 202–3
 DPD application to, 204–17
 link removal on, 216–17
- Securing the Protection of our Enduring
 and Established Constitutional
 Heritage (SPEECH) Act, 347
- self-esteem, 269–71
- Sensenbrenner, Jim, 233
- SEOs. *See* search engine operators
- severity of harm, 34–5
- Shavluk v. Green Party of Canada*, 29
- Shulman v. Group W Productions*,
 106, 259
- single meaning rule
 in *Ajinomoto Sweeteners v. ASDA
 Stores*, 45–6
 in *Bonnick v. Morris*, 43, 46
 in *Charleston v. News Group Newspapers*, 46
 critique of, 42–6
 determination of meaning in, 51
 explanation of, 42–6
 extant rule and, 49–50
 function of, 40–1
 in *Lait v. Evening Standard*, 46, 48
 legal costs of, 49
 legal justifications for, 46–50
 libel law and, 51–7
Lucas-Box meaning and, 44
 in *Manna Investment v. Eagle Star
 Life*, 47–8
 in *Merivale v. Carson*, 46
 in Northern Ireland, 57
 in *Oriental Daily Publisher v. Ming Pao
 Holdings*, 46–7
 reform of, 55–7
 role of language in, 43
 in *Slim v. Daily Telegraph*, 42, 45–6, 48
 in UK law, 41
 in US law, 41
Stipple v. Chronicle Publishing, 183–4, 251
Slim v. Daily Telegraph, 42, 45–6, 48
Smith v. Daily Mail Publishing, 164–5
Smith v. Maryland, 235
Smith v. People of the State of California, 85
 Snowden, Edward, 7, 14, 139, 197, 226–7,
 239–40
 on US data collection, 230–2
Snyder v. Phelps, 63, 173
 Society of Professional Journalists Code of
 Ethics, 251–2, 260
Someșan v. Romania, 280–1
 SPEECH Act. *See* Securing the Protection
 of our Enduring and Established
 Constitutional Heritage Act
- Spelman v. Express Newspapers*, 102
- Stephens v. Western Australian
 Newspapers*, 88
- Strasbourg court. *See* European Court of
 Human Rights
- super-injunctions, in privacy law,
 181–2
- surveillance, mass data collection through,
 in US, 228–32
 under FISA, 228–32
 under Fourth Amendment, 234–6
 government response to, 232–4
 government responses to, 232–4
 under Patriot Act, 230, 233

- with PRISM program, 234–6
- search and seizures of, 234–6
- Tee v. United Kingdom*, 273
- Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Amendment (Data Retention) Bill 2014, 236–7
- Terry v. Persons Unknown*, 304, 313
- Theakston v. MGN*, 193
- Theophanous v. Herald & Weekly Times*, 88, 341–2
- Time v. Hill*, 2, 171, 250, 337–9
- Times Newspapers v. United Kingdom (nos. 1 and 2)*, 215
- Tinsley, Yvette, 12
- tort law, vindication in, 299–303
- TSE v. News Group Newspapers*, 180
- TV3 Network Services v. Fahey*, 314
- Twitter, tweeting and
 - journalistic standards for, 30
 - severity of harm and, 34
- United Kingdom (UK). *See also* England and Wales; Northern Ireland; *Reynolds v. Times Newspapers*; single meaning rule
 - constitutional framework
 - throughout, 197
 - Defamation Act 2013 in, 10, 18, 40, 90
 - declaration of falsity under, 52
 - foundations of, 331
 - free speech under, 66–7
 - libel law reform under, 53
 - Reynolds v. Times Newspapers* and, 90
 - right to criticise under, 159
 - defamation cases involving media in, 24–5, 91–3, 94
 - defamation in, parameters of, 310–12
 - public interest elements of, 316–17
 - defamation law reform in, 333, 344–50
 - free speech in, 13, 173–80
 - remedies for, 181–3
 - freedom of press in, 142–5, 150–1
 - Human Rights Act 1998 in, 139, 165
 - privacy law in, 173–80
 - approach to remedies for, 181–3
 - for celebrities, 187–90
 - compared with US law, 183–98
 - for government officials, 183–7
 - for heads of state, 183–7
 - photographs and video in, 191–5
 - for private individuals, 190–1
 - privacy rights in, 177–80
 - public interest arguments in, 196–7
 - single meaning rule in, 41
- United States (US). *See also* US Constitution
 - Civil Rights movement in, 58–9
 - common law as influence in, 85–7
 - Communications Decency Act in, 63
 - constitutional framework in, 197
 - data collection in, through surveillance, 228–32
 - under FISA, 228–30
 - under Fourth Amendment, 234–6
 - government responses to, 232–4
 - under Patriot Act, 230, 233
 - with PRISM program, 234–6
 - search and seizures from, 234–6
 - UK legal response to, 240
 - defamation cases involving media in, 24–5, 92–3
 - defamation law in, 2, 24–5, 33, 82–4, 85–7, 92–3
 - reform movement for, 334–9
 - under US Constitution, 85
 - US Supreme Court and, 79, 82, 85
 - free speech in, 13, 166–73
 - methodology for, 172–3
 - remedies for, 181–3
 - Freedom Act in, 233
 - Patriot Act in, 230, 233
 - privacy law in, 2, 166–73
 - antecedents for, 166–7
 - approach to remedies for, 181–3
 - for celebrities, 187–90
 - compared with UK law, 183–98
 - for government officials, 183–7
 - for heads of state, 183–7, 247–53
 - photographs and video in, 191–5
 - for private individuals, 190–1
 - public interest arguments in, 196–7
 - single meaning rule in, 41
 - states rights in, for defamation law, 85
 - United States v. Jones*, 235
 - Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 5
 - Unpublished Opinions of the Warren Court* (Schwartz), 339
 - US Constitution
 - defamation law under, 85
 - First Amendment
 - in *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 85
 - in *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire*, 85
 - Civil Rights movement and, 58–9
 - common law rights and, 75–8
 - cultural power of, 165
 - free speech under, 3–4, 70, 86–7
 - freedom of press and, 140–1
 - Gawker's use of, 254–6

386 *Index*

- US Constitution (cont.)
 historical context for, 167–8
 in *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 75–80,
 86–7, 170, 171
Patterson v. Colorado and, 168
 for private individuals, 190–1
Smith v. People of the State of California
 and, 85
 Fourth Amendment, data collection
 under, 234–6
 US Freedom Act, 233
 US Patriot Act, 230, 233
 US Supreme Court. *See also* specific cases
 defamation law and, 79, 82, 85, 350
 FISA and, 229–30
New York Times v. Sullivan and,
 59–60, 86–7
- Varuhas, Jason, 302–3
Vidal-Hall v. Google, 306
Vigna v. Levant, 30–1
 vindication, through damages
 under Australian law, 305–6
 in defamation law, 295–9
 critique of, 298
 discursive, in libel law, 52–4
 under English law, 305–6
 under French law, 305–6
 under German law, 305–6
 in privacy law, 305–7
 for privacy rights, 181–3
 for public reputation, 296
 in *Reynolds v. Times Newspapers*, 297
 in tort law, 299–303
 Volokh, Eugene, 140–1
Von Hannover v. Germany (no 1), 179–80,
 188–90, 194–5
Von Hannover v. Germany (no 2), 137,
 145–6, 179–80, 186–7
 privacy law and, 179–80
 for celebrities, 188–90
 for photographs and video, 194–5
 public interest elements in, 151–4
- Wacks, Raymond, 5–6, 97
Wainwright v. Home Office, 174
 Walden, Brian, 5
 Waldron, Jeremy, 269
 Wales. *See* England and Wales
 Warren, Samuel, 166, 248, 338–9
 Weaver, Russell, 11, 67
Weller v. Associated Newspapers, 137,
 143, 195
 Westin, Alan, 7
 whistleblowers. *See also* Assange, Julian;
 Snowden, Edward; Wikileaks
 corporate accountability through, 241
 privacy rights for, 227, 239–41
 Whitman, James, 256
Whitney v. California, 168–9
 Whittall, Peter, 117
WIC Radio v. Simpson, 18
 Wikileaks, 14, 225, 226–7, 243. *See also*
 Assange, Julian
Wilkinson v. Downton, 77
Williams v. Reason, 43
Wood v. Commissioner of Police of the
Metropolis, 102–3
 Woodward, Bob, 73
 Wragg, Paul, 140–1, 153, 156–7
WXY v. Gewanter, 307
Wyeth v. Levine, 79
- X v. Iceland*, 284–5
- Yellow Press, 164
 Young, Hilary, 10
- Zimmerman, Dianne, 140–1, 337
 Zimmermann, Jérémie, 225