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
Barnicki v. Vopper, 164–5, 183–4
Belfort, Jordan Ross, 259

© in this web service Cambridge University Press
www.cambridge.org
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
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
Cárstev a. Romania, 280–1
Cash, William, 5
celebrities, privacy laws for, 187–90
Charlottesville 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
corporation rights, 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. Cоеles 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, 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
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. Mendahoun, 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
Index

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 Costejo González, 198, 199–223
DPD law and, 199, 204–17
Gaps in ruling, 218–21
Google interpretation of, 220–1
RTBF requests for, 199–200
Supreme Court
RTBF and, 199–202

Cowen, Zelman, 5
Cox Broadcasting v. Cohn, 164–5, 337–8
Craig, Larry, 252
Cypherpunk philosophy, 244
Cyperpunks (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 Costejo González and, 198, 199–223
CJEU and, 218–21
DPD law and, 199, 204–17
Google interpretation of, 220–1
RTBF requests for, 199–200
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
Deletion 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

© in this web service Cambridge University Press
www.cambridge.org
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, 37–39, 82–4 (See also Graw 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
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 Reynolds v. Times Newspapers, 348–50
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
Delf 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
Index

European Charter on Human Rights in, 66
extension of qualified privilege in, 87–90
free speech in, 176
de Libelli Famosi in, 83
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
Fawell v. Queensland Newspapers, 298–9
Ferdinand v. MGN, 102, 109
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
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. EJF, 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. Torstyn, New York Times v. Sullivan; public speech
in Abrams v. United States, 168–9
in Australia, 64–5, 87–9
Brandes 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 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 Libelli Famosi, 83
Mill on, 157
parody and, 77
privacy rights balanced with, 177–80
privacy-invading, benefits of, 141
rationale for, 138–42
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
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
Pressos and Roire v. France, 104
Funding Evil (Ehrenfeld), 347–8

Gadja, Amy
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, 145–50
privacy law in, for celebrities, 188–90
public figure doctrine in, 145–50
Gertz v. Robert Welch, 33, 336–7
Giggs, Ryan, 162, 165
Goodwin, Fred, 158
Goodstein v. MGN, 174
Google
as data controller, 208–12
data removal from, 203
interpretation of Costejo 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 Costejo 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
Googlebotts, 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
Index

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
Holland, François, 246–7
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 168
Hosking v. Routling, 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, 163
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
cypherpunk philosophy about, 244
as facilitator of totalitarianism, 225
IPSO. See Independent Press Standards Organisation
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
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, 57, 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
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, Lyrissa, 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
Manne 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
McCarran Turkington Breen v. Times Newspapers, 139
McClaren, Steve, 149
McDonald, Barbara, 109
McGinty v. Western Australia, 342
McKenzie 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 by, 126–8
post-traumatic stress for interviewed persons, 121
psychological response to, 122
after Lange v. Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 94
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
metadatam, 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. 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

© in this web service Cambridge University Press

www.cambridge.org
Index

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
Phillippou, 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
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. Running, 97, 98–9, 131
under Human Rights Act 1998, 165
informational, 124–5
in journalism law, 2–6
male gaze and, 130
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
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
defamation law for, 67–8
defamation law for, 196
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
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, 247–53
photographs and video in, 191–5
for private individuals, 190–1
vindications 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 Famosi 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. Running, 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
Index

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
Puttini v. Uhlraine, 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 *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
*Rhodes, James*, 125
*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. Runtting*, 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 replication rule, 56
reputation, as right
under Article 8, of ECHR, 265–7
seriousness threshold in, 276–8, 286–90
test of, in case law, 97, 98–103

saskatchewan expansion of qualified privilege in, 89–90
self-esteem and, 269–71
theoretical justifications for, 267–73
for dignity, 268–71
property conception in, 268
coupling of, 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

© in this web service Cambridge University Press

www.cambridge.org
Index

Reynolds v. Times Newspapers (cont.)
public interest communication defence in, 32–3, 346
qualified privilege in, 89–90, 346
vindicatio 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 Costejo 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 a
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
Scot, 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
Shaveluh 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
extend 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 Mammal Investment v. Eagle Star Life, 47–8
in Mertesv. 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
Sipple v. Chronicle Publishing, 183–4, 251
Slim v. Daily Telegraph, 42, 45–6, 48
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
Somegín 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
Index

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
government responses to, 232–4
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
civil rights movement and, 58–9
civil liberties movement under US Constitution, 85
compared with UK law, 183–98
defamation law under, 85
in Connecticut, 85
in New Hampshire, 85
civil liberties movement and, 59–8
common law rights and, 75–8
cultural power of, 165
free speech under, 3–4, 70, 86–7
government responses to, 232–4
human rights in, 5
privacy rights in, 177–80
private interest arguments in, 196–7
single meaning rule in, 41
United States (US). See also US Constitution
Civil Rights movement in, 58–9
civil liberties movement under US Constitution, 85
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
civil rights movement and, 58–9
civil liberties movement under US Constitution, 85
compared with UK law, 183–98
defamation law under, 85
in Connecticut, 85
in New Hampshire, 85
civil liberties movement and, 59–8
common law rights and, 75–8
cultural power of, 165
free speech under, 3–4, 70, 86–7
government responses to, 232–4
human rights in, 5
privacy rights in, 177–80
private interest arguments in, 196–7
single meaning rule in, 41

© in this web service Cambridge University Press
www.cambridge.org
US Constitution (cont.)
historical context for, 167–8
*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
*US Freedom Act*, 233
*US Supreme Court*. See also specific cases
defamation law and, 79, 82, 85, 350
FISA and, 229–30

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
*Wainright 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
*WJC 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. Geteanter*, 307
Wyeth v. Levine, 79
*X v. Iceland*, 284–5
Yellow Press, 164
Young, Hilary, 10
Zimmerman, Dianne, 140–1, 337
Zimmermann, Jérémie, 225