IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE OUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

1997 I No.139

Royal Courts of Justice
Monday, 28th February 2000

Before:

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND

BETWEEN:

- (1) INDEPENDENT TELEVISION NEWS LTD.
- (2) PENNY MARSHALL
- (3) IAN WILLIAMS

Claimants

- and -

- (1) INFORMINC (LM) LTD.
- (2) MICHAEL HUME
- (3) HELENE GULDBERG

Defendants

Transcribed by BEVERLEY F. NUNNERY & CO.
Official Shorthand Writers and Tape Transcribers
Quality House, Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1HP
Telephone: (0171) 831-5627

MR. T. SHIELDS Q.C. and MR. M. BARCA (instructed by Messrs. Biddle) appeared on behalf of the Claimants.

MR. G. MILLAR and MR. A. HUDSON (instructed by Messrs. Christian Fisher Solicitors) appeared on behalf of the Defendants.

PROCEEDINGS - DAY 1

INDEX

| | | Page No |
|---|--|---------|
| SUBMISSIONS (in the absence of the jury) re alterations to skeleton arguement/chronolgy/ jury selection | | |
| Mr. SHIELDS | | 1 |
| OPENING SPEECH by Mr. SHIELDS | | 5 |

MR. SHIELDS: There are a few matters, my Lord. Firstly, the transcript prepared of the hearing last Monday - has your Lordship been sent a copy of that?

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: It certainly has not reached me.

7 MR. SHIELDS: It only arrived late Friday night, so if I could hand up a full transcript of that.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. (Same handed).

MR. SHIELDS: As your Lordship will recall, you ordered me to lodge a skeleton argument of my opening speech.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes, I am grateful for that, and I have read it.

MR. SHIELDS: I am obliged. There are one or two alterations to that but nothing which I would regard as of significance which I need to draw your Lordship's attention.

9 21

Secondly, your Lordship will recall that we also prepared a chronology which we lodged with you.

25 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

MR. SHIELDS: Having seen my client and gone through some disclosed documents, it appears that I have actually got one or two dates wrong. They are minor dates but I think perhaps your Lordship should have a correct one.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. There will be copies for the jury of the correct one?

 MR. SHIELDS: Yes. If your Lordship wants them to be handed to the jury, there will be copies. I had the trip from Budapest to Belgrade being made two days before it was made. (Same handed). I do not think it is in any sense prejudicial to anyone that I got that wrong.

Thirdly, I thought it would be worth clarifying what directions you were going to make in terms of jury selection. Your Lordship will remember we had discussion on that.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

47 MR. SHIELDS: You will find it at p.2 of the transcript. I can
48 recall but I cannot now find it, and I apologise for that,
49 that we had a subsequent discussion between us as to whether
50 we could refine the criteria for exclusion.

52 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: I know there was some mention that it should 53 not be confined solely to the names in the list and the 54 various organisations but should also include close relations 55 or friends.

MR. SHIELDS: Your Lordship will find at p.2 the provisional 1 2 directions, para.C.

3 4

5

6

(After a pause): Dealing with A, any MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. comments on that? Exclude anyone who has ever been employed or worked for ITN Channel 3 or Channel 4 or who has a close relation or friend. B, any comment about that, Mr. Shields?

7 8 9

MR. SHIELDS: No, my Lord.

10 11

12

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: C? No. Now, D, do we want it more I have no objection to reading out the extensive than that? names of what are described as the key protagonists.

13 14 15

I am very happy for your Lordship to do that.

16 17

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. You would prefer that?

18

19 MR. MILLAR: Please.

20

21 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes, certainly. I will not mention the names of the translators, Misha, Mira and Nina because that 22 23 would be meaningless really. But other than that I will read all those names out. Anything else? 24

25 26

27

28

29 30 31

32 33

34

MR. SHIELDS: No, that is essentially it, if your Lordship is happy with the order in which I intend to take it. So I am going to show the Channel 4 rushes first -- the Channel 3 rushes first. If your Lordship is interested, I do have a timing of all those, how long it is going to take, and I think it works out, after I have shown the rushes, Channel 4, Channel 3, subsequently the broadcast on August 6th, I intend to show the whole broadcast, because other parts of the programme dealt with this so it is only right that the jury see the context.

35 36 37

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Certainly.

38 _∖39

40

41

42

43

MR. SHIELDS: And August 7th. I think they come to about three So looking at in the round, subject to your Lordship having any break today, I envisage I will take today hopefully and then Ian Williams will start first thing tomorrow. I would propose, if I finished at four o'clock, that he does not start until tomorrow.

44 45 46

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Certainly.

47

48 MR. SHIELDS: That would be more sensible for everyone.

49

50 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. Thank you.

51

52 My learned friend Mr. Barca helpfully says should we MR. SHIELDS: 53 also probably exclude people with Yugoslavian origin. may be the one that we did take up last time. 54

- 1 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: What do you say about that, Mr. Millar?
- MR. MILLAR: I think Mr. Barca's recollection is correct. It came up later on in the directions hearing. The thinking, I think, was that there would be such a risk that anybody from Yugoslavia would have some empathy with one side or another in the conflict that they should be ----
 - MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Well, do you want me to say anyone who was born in Yugoslavia or whose parents were born in Yugoslavia?
- 12 MR. MILLAR: Yes.

10 11

15

21

22

23

32

- 13
 14 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Would that satisfactory both of you? Yes.
- 16 MR. SHIELDS: One last matter, a small matter, which is this: on looking at Mr. Williams' statement and going through it with him, it appeared that a typographical error had occurred in that, as your Lordship recalls, at the end of his witness statement he goes through the article as numbered.
 - MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.
- MR. SHIELDS: As it happened, we have obviously numbered the
 article and picked out numbers of paragraphs. When it came to
 be typed up, someone then just typed the paragraphs
 sequentially, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. So we have
 actually corrected that. I have told my learned friend.
 I will hand your Lordship a copy of the corrected version.
- 30
 31 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Thank you very much. (Same handed).
- 33 MR. SHIELDS: It is a small matter but it just happened that way. 34 That is all I have to say to your Lordship. 35
- 36 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Thank you. 37
- 38 MR. SHIELDS: There is one matter that I want to mention at the end of proceedings today in accordance with your direction.
 - 41 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: At the end of today?
 - 43 MR. SHIELDS: Yes.
 - 44
 45 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: That is when the jury have gone home?
 - 46 47 MR. SHIELDS: When the jury have gone home. 48
 - 49 10.45 a.m.
 - 50
 51 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. Well, I apologise to people at the
 52 back of the court. They will temporarily have to leave court
 53 while 30 potential jurors come into court. Nobody will,
 54 I hope, steal your places, but if you would not mind leaving
 55 court. I think we need the two back rows, if you could be

 good enough to leave temporarily. (After a pause): Ladies and gentlemen, 12 of you are going to be selected at random to try a libel case. It is a case that concerns the conflict in Bosnia in 1992 and certain television news broadcasts in August 1992 and certain articles written about the news broadcasts a number of years later in 1997. It is of course important that nobody trying the case has any personal involvement with either any of the people concerned in the case or the problems that arose in Bosnia in 1992.

Now, I am first of all going to ask you if any of you by any chance have ever worked for or been employed by ITN, Channel 3 or Channel 4, or who have close relations or friends that have worked for or been employed by ITN, Channel 3 or Channel 4. If there is any such person could they be good enough to put their hands up. Thank you.

Now, by any chance have any of you been either born or have your parents been born in what was called Yugoslavia? No.

Have any of you visited Yugoslavia in the past 10 years? Would you mind giving your name to the jury usher? That includes anybody who has served in the Forces or in any relief organisation of course in Yugoslavia or has any close relation or friend who has done so.

The next question is, have any of you ever worked for or written for or been employed by a company called Informinc, LM Magazine or a magazine called Living Marxism, or have any of you worked for or worked with either Mr. Michael Hume who is a journalist and editor, or Miss Helene Guldberg, who is a publisher? No. Thank you.

Now I am going to read out slowly the names of some of the likely principal witnesses in the case and if any of you think you have met any of these people or have close friends and relations who worked for or are acquainted with these people, would you put your hands up? The first name is Mr. Stuart Purvis who was the editor in chief of ITN. various people who worked for Channel 4: Mr. Ian Williams, a reporter. Mr. Chris Heys, a sound recordist. Mr. James Nicholas, a cameraman video tape editor. Mr. Andrew Brudell, a producer. Sue English, a foreign editor. William or Bill Dunlop who is another editor. Nick Gowing, who is a diplomatic editor. Garren Baines, who is an editor or deputy editor of Channel 4 News. Richard Tate, an editor on Channel And then on Channel 3: Penny Marshall, a reporter. Jeremy Irvin, a cameraman. Michael Lawrence, a sound recordist. William or Bill Frost, a video tape editor. Banker, a programme editor. Michael Jeremy, head of foreign news, Channel 3. David Manion, an editor on ITN. Knight, a news editor. Finally, Mr. Thomas Deichman, who is a German author and journalist. None of those names ring a bell

much.

with any of you in the sense of knowing them? Thank you very

2 3 4

The cards will be shuffled and 12 of you will be selected to be the jury in this case.

5 6

7

8

22 23 24

29 30 31

32 33 34

∖39 40 41

42 43 44

46 47

45

48 49 50

52 53 54

51

55

(The jury were sworn)

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Ladies and gentlemen, the first thing I want to say to you is this: you decide the facts in this case and you try this case on the evidence given in this court. It is of the utmost importance that you do not allow anyone to discuss this case with you. You do not discuss this case yourself with anyone, and the time and the place to discuss the case is when all 12 of you are together in the privacy of your retirement room. When I say you decide this case on the evidence given in this court, it may be - I know not - that in the media, in the press or radio or television there may be some mention of this case. That is not the evidence in this You decide it on the evidence given here and in this court.

This case will last possibly three weeks. less than that. It may be, conceivably, a day or two longer than that. Probably less rather than longer.

Our sitting times will be quarter past ten in the morning until one o'clock, two o'clock until about half past four. We will have each day a break of about a quarter of an hour in the middle of the morning and probably a similar break in the afternoon. Certainly if we are going to sit to 4.30 we If we have a short afternoon we probably will not.

The case will begin with Mr. Shields, who is leading counsel for the claimants, to open the case to you and that will take certainly today. It will involve, as you can see, you looking at various television films, rushes, programmes and so forth.

I think perhaps the jurors in waiting should now Thank you for coming here. Your services may be required elsewhere. I know not.

Mr. Shields, all those who have departed will want to come back to their seats before you start.

- MR. SHIELDS: Yes, my Lord. (After a pause):
- MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: If there are no seats, I would prefer that people sat in the gallery - there are a few seats in the front row of the gallery - rather than standing at the back. Mr. Shields.
- MR. SHIELDS: Members of the jury, in this action the claimants, that is the parties bringing the action, seek damages for

libel, that is for damage to their reputation in respect of a press release and article from the editorial published in a magazine called Living Marxism in February 1997. The claimants are Independent Television News Ltd., who I will probably call ITN for convenience from now on - the news company which brings you the news on ITV and Channel 4; and two journalists employed by ITN, Ian Williams for Channel 4 - he sits in front of me here - and Penny Marshall who works on Channel 3 and she sits in front of me here.

It is their case that the press release, the article and the editorial which accompanied it, amounted to a highly damaging attack upon their respective reputations and their professional integrity.

The defendants are a Mr. Michael Hume who is the editor of Living Marxism, and its joint publishers, Informinc LM Ltd. and Helene Guldberg. Now, they are represented by my learned friend Mr. Gavin Millar, who sits here, together with Mr. Anthony Hudson who sits there at the end of the row.

Members of the jury, one of your most important tasks in this trial is to decide what the press release, the article and the accompanying editorial meant, how they would have been understood by reasonable, sensible people back in 1997. But before I invite you to read them, and it may well be that it will be some time this afternoon, it is necessary that we travel together back in time to 1992 to the country formerly known as the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Sadly, by 1992 Yugoslavia, which had since 1946 comprised of six separate republics, was undergoing inner turmoil amongst its citizens. In particular in Bosnia what might be described as near civil war was raging between Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Muslims.

My Lord, it is not for us in the course of this trial to pass judgment on the merit of that conflict, save that, in any such conflict, it gave birth to further examples of The leader of the Bosnian Serbs man's inhumanity to man. a man called Radovan Karadich. According to the Bosnian Muslims, the Serb leaders had embarked upon a policy called ethnic cleansing. That is, it was aimed at rooting out Muslims from their homes and driving them out of the territory which the Serbs claimed as their own. It was the contention of the Bosnian Muslims in mid 1992 that many Muslims were being held in concentration camps run by their opponents. Not surprisingly, there was considerable worldwide interest whether such an allegation could be substantiated or whether in fact it was just another piece of propaganda - false or distorted information put out to mislead or confuse the public.

In late July 1992 Mr. Karadich, the Bosnian Serb leader, visited London. He gave a press conference. It was attended by a representative of ITN. The representative

.39

challenged Mr. Karadich as to whether such camps existed. Mr. Karadich's response was to deny their existence and to invite ITN to Yugoslavia to investigate for themselves. Mr. Karadich having thrown down the gauntlet, ITN duly picked it up. You will hear how it was decided to send two separate teams out there - one representing the Channel 4 News arm of ITN, the other Channel 3.

Now, the first team to go was the Channel 4 team. Ian Williams, then based as Channel 4's correspondent in Moscow, had covered the Gulf War, conflicts in Georgia and ... on the borders of Russia. He was told by Sue English, the senior foreign editor, to fly to Budapest in Hungary where he was to join other members of his team. His brief was this: it was to visit those camps on the list and to find out what was there.

In Budapest he was joined by Andy McDowell who was to act as producer; James Niklen a much travelled cameraman and editor, and Chris Heys a sound recordist. They also had their equipment - hard helmets, flak jackets, edit pack, supplies of food and water and of course their camera. Its total weight was something like 200 kilograms.

Whilst in Budapest, Ian Williams was faxed from London with the list - the list I have just referred you to - of those camps which the Bosnian Muslims were alleging were concentration camps. You are now going to be handed up a bundle of documents and, with his Lordship's permission, you will have one bundle between two people. So two of you will have to share a bundle each. (Same handed). If you look at that bundle you will see in tab 1 there is some manuscript writing:

"Attn - Mr. Jim Akhurst

"ITN - Foreign News."

Below it will you will see in English -- there are some foreign words first and then below it says:

"LIST

"of prisons - concentration camps controlled by the aggressor." $\,$

That list has been issued by the Bosnian Muslims, and the "aggressors" is obviously how they refer to the Serbians. So if you have got that, below that, members of the jury, you will see a list and it says "Place" and it says "Approx. number", that is approximate number of people kept within those camps. You turn over the page and you will see at the bottom, go down to number 57, and you will notice there, because we are going to come across this later, 54 and 55,

Trnopolje and Omarska. You will see those two particular names there.

We are now back in Budapest and I will return to the list later, members of the jury. On 30th July the Channel 4 team left Budapest where they had rendezvoused and travelled by train to Belgrade. Now, Belgrade was the old capital of Yugoslavia and had become the capital of Serbia. They booked into a hotel there. Here they were joined the next day by a team representing Channel 3 News. It was led by Penny Marshall, who I have already introduced to you, who was accompanied by Jeremy Irvin, a cameraman, and Mickey Lawrence, and his role was to act as what is called soundman and assistant to Jeremy Irvin, the cameraman. Now, unlike the Channel 4 team they did not have their own editor with them. You will come to understand in the course of the trial what the role of the editor is. He is the person who essentially produces the film which is broadcast to you on the news at night.

You will hear from them as to what happened in Belgrade but during those three days they made two important discoveries. Firstly, that the camps they visited near Belgrade which had been stigmatised in that list by the Bosnian Serb Muslims as concentration camps were in reality refugee camps and, secondly - this is their second discovery - that contrary to the apparent open-spirit of Mr. Karadich's invitation, there was a considerable reluctance on the part of the Serbian authorities to allow them to travel to north west Bosnia, that is west of Belgrade, where they understood, they had been told, the worst camps to be.

In the event their persistence and their determination to go there brought some limited reward. At 6.00 a.m. on the morning of 3rd August they were flown by helicopter. That is the team from ITN, together with two interpreters and a Mr. Ed Vulliamy from the Guardian newspaper, together with two Serbian soldiers to Pale. Now, that is an hour's flight away. I said limited reward was brought through their perseverance because Pale, which is a former ski resort outside Sarajevo, was south of Belgrade, whereas the camps they wanted to visit were in north west Bosnia.

So that you get a picture of where we are travelling, we have prepared a map. If you turn to index tab 2, we will be able to see together where we are. At the top of the map you will see Budapest where they met. You will know they travelled south to Belgrade. From Belgrade they have taken the flight down to Pale and that is where we are. We will refer to that in the course of this opening speech so you know exactly where we are heading.

Now they are in Pale, and you might wonder what happened next. Well, after a fruitless morning waiting at the headquarters of the Bosnian Serbs there, they met

Mr. Karadich. You remember I have already referred to Mr. Karadich. It was he who made the invitation for ITN to come out and see whether the Muslim allegations were true or false. What Mr. Karadich did for his part was to warn them that the area they wanted to visit was unsafe, but for their part they reminded him of his promise made on television and said that they were prepared to take the risk.

They spent that night in Pale not knowing whether they were going to be allowed to visit the camps up north or not. The next day they travelled, however, in a military bus to Banja Luka where again they spent the night. Now, if you would like to go back to your maps, we can plot their progress. We see down there Pale, and they have travelled in a bus through the day up to Banja Luka.

The following morning -- I am sorry, they then travelled to Prijedor. You see Prijedor is the end of the row - there is Omarska, Trnopelje and we will see Prijedor. they travelled the following day to Prijedor. That is the morning of 5th August. While at Prijedor, I think it is outside the town hall, they see and they talk to and they film queues of Bosnian women. It appears that they are there waiting for papers to enable them to move away from the area. Now, where were their husbands, it was asked, and the whispered response came Omarska. The ITN team was taken into the town hall at Prijedor where, surrounded by armed men, they met and filmed the town's leadership. Once again, they had to overcome a certain resistance to their stated intention to visit those camps at Omarska and Trnopolje. But, once again, their persistence prevailed and that same day they were taken to Omarska travelling, in the case of the Channel 4 team - and remember I think there are four of them plus an interpreter in a green military bus but they have Serbian guards with them; in the case of the Channel 3 team, in a red mini bus which they had hired.

Now, members of the jury, in the course of this trial you will hear from the ITN teams in great detail about what they saw at Omarska and, perhaps more importantly, what they sensed and what they felt about what was happening there, the atmosphere of fear, the haunted looks on the faces of the inmates as they eat their rations of soup and bread, and of the menacing presence of the guards, and perhaps most poignant of all of the camp commander's resolute refusal to give them free access to where the inmates were being kept, where they were sleeping.

Unwelcomed at Omarska they drove on until they approached Trnopolje. Seeing lots of people collected behind a fence, the Channel 3 team and the ITN van insisted on stopping. Penny Marshall, Mickey Lawrence and Jeremy Irvin, the Channel 3 team, took the most direct route to that fence. Among the sights that was to greet them there was that of an emaciated man, stripped to the waist in the hot sun, behind

barbed wire. Ian Williams, leading the Channel 4 team, headed off deliberately in a different direction but towards the same wire in order to divert the presence of the armed guards who were escorting them. As you will hear, Ian Williams was struck by the poor physical condition of the men who were packed in the field, patrolled by armed guards and, as far as he could see, penned in by barbed wire and chicken wire.

Members of the jury, this morning and this afternoon you will hear and see footage of the appalling physical condition of some of those men. You will see footage of the armed guards who were there. You will also see how all those and you will hear from all of them - who visited both those camps were shocked by what they saw. After about an hour they left Trnopolje. They carried with them not only their film of the camp but also an undeveloped role of film. One of those who Penny Marshall had interviewed while she was in Trnopolje was a doctor, Dr. Idriz Merdzanic. He had told her of the terrible physical condition of some of those who had been brought to that camp, of torture, of beatings and of rape. Now he had handed her a camera containing the film which he had secretly taken of inmates at that camp.

The ITN team returned to Prijedor and from Prijedor they travelled together in the Channel 3 minibus back to Belgrade. In Belgrade they reported the ITN staff in London and they told them they had managed to visit the camps and that they felt they had a powerful story. It was agreed that the two teams, but without Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Irvin -- it is very hard to remember all these names, Mr. Lawrence was the sound recordist and Mr. Irving was the cameraman on Channel 3's team, and Mr. Heys was the sound recordist on the Channel 4 team. Apart from them, they should travel to Budapest the next day and prepare items to be broadcast on ITV Channel 3 and on Channel 4 that night. So this is August 5th making preparations for August 6th. As I mentioned to you, there was no editor with the Channel 3 team. There was Mr. Irving, there was Mr. Lawrence, and there was Penny Williams. decision was made in London to fly out to Budapest two editors, a Mr. Frost and a Nigel Baker to edit the film and prepare the item to be broadcast.

Now, members of the jury, you probably appreciate that what you see on your screen, a news item which may sometimes last 30 seconds, which may sometimes last, particularly on Channel 4, three or four or five minutes, is the product of a much longer and involved process. Based on the first-hand evidence of the reporter and the film shot by the cameraman or cameramen, judgments have to be made as to what should be broadcast and what commentary should accompany it. You have already heard how both these teams were sent out with instructions to take up Mr. Karadich's invitation, and their task as they saw it was to report back on what they had seen and found out. It is important that you understand and

remember this. They were sent out to take up that invitation and report back on what they had seen and found out.

That day in Budapest, August 6th, they set about discharging the final element of that task. Now, for Ian Williams, Andy Brudell and James Nicholas for Channel 4 it was an opportunity to see for the first time the film they had shot, because, as you appreciate, they are at the camps and the film is being shot. This is going to be the first time they have a chance to see that film, and that film is known by a technical term - it is called rushes. You will hear that term again and again in this trial, rushes. It is the unedited film. This might be an appropriate moment then for us to see that film together now. So with your Lordship's leave, I propose to show the Channel 4 rushes. So you know where we begin. We begin on the day of August 6th and we are going to begin with film at Prijedor. So if you look at your maps, members of the jury, index 2, we are beginning on August 5th at Prijedor, and then we are going to go from Prijedor to Omarska and then Trnopolje. This is the unedited film.

(Video recording played)

12.20 p.m.

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21 22

23 24

25 26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45

46 47

48 49

50

51

52

53

54 55 MR. SHIELDS: Members of the jury, it had been agreed back in London that the first major broadcast was to take place in the Channel 4 news at 7 p.m. that night and the Channel 4 team had to produce an item for broadcast for about four to five minutes left. You will hear in the course of the trial what discussions took place between Mr. Williams, Andy Prudel and James Nicholas and how, having chosen the picture images they wished to incorporate, Ian Williams then began drafting the script, the script which will accompany the images which are broadcast that night. He had a deadline that was 6.30 that evening to feed (that is, to transmit) the material from Budapest through to London.

Meanwhile, a similar process was being undertaken by the Channel 3 news team. They started somewhat later than their Channel 4 counterparts because they had technical difficulties with the editing equipment. Penny Marshall briefed Nigel Baker and Bill Frost. Those are the two editors who had flown over from London to help them prepare and edit the broadcast. She briefed them as to what she had seen at the camps and what her own impressions were because, of course, she had been there and she had seen both Omarska she had seen Trnopolje. Together they reviewed the rushes. is the film shot by the Channel 3 cameraman Jeremy Irving. You are going to see those rushes now but it is right that you should know that they are not complete because, after their return to London in 1992, one tape went missing. What is missing is the last part of their visit to Omarka (that is, the first camp) and the first part of their visit to Trnopolje (that is, the second camp). So you are going to see those

| 1 2 3 4 | | tapes which survived. They will take, I think, about 25/30 minutes and should take us conveniently to the midday adjournment. | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----|---|------------------|------------|---------|-------|-----|--|--|
| 5 | | | Video recording | | | | | | |
| 7 8 9 | MR. | JUSTICE MORLAND: Woruntil 2 o'clock, memb | | | We will | break | ofi | | |
| ĹŌ | | (<u>Ad</u> | journed for a sh | hort time) | | | | | |

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes, Mr. Shields?

MR. SHIELDS: Members of the jury, we have just seen Channel 3.... In addition to preparing a film to be broadcast that night for News at Ten, Penny Marshall also gave a brief telephone interview for the lunchtime news which was broadcast that day and she also prepared a short piece to be transmitted at 5.40 on the Channel 3 news, where again you will see she gave a further interview.

As you can imagine, it was an intense and frantic period, that day, August 6th, in Budapest. Although the teams worked separately, Channel 4 decided to incorporate some of the material obtained by Channel 3 in its own report to be broadcast at 7 o'clock. Some of that material, I should tell you, is material which was on the rushes which have been lost, which is why, when you see the broadcast, you will not have seen it before. One is am image of a body of a Muslim. His name is Fikret Alic, and I will repeat that name, and it will be repeated to you many times in the course of this trial. He is the emaciated man whom Penny Marshall had seen standing behind barbed wire when she arrived at the Trnopolje camp. You may recall I told you about that.

The other material which was incorporated in the Channel 4 broadcast which came from Channel 3 was some photographs. You also may recall I told you how, when they left Trnopolje, Penny Marshall had with her a camera, a camera containing film which had been handed to her by the doctor. He was a doctor you may also recall having seen in the rushes. He was in his -- I call it his surgery for convenience. You may remember the camera panning in on the table containing some few humble pieces of medicine. Penny Marshall had arranged for that film to be developed that morning in Budapest. Not all of the photographs came out, but it is only right you should see those that they had, as developed that day in Budapest.

If you could turn to tab 3 you will see with me those photographs. You will see there what obviously appears to be a photograph of -- I will call it a camp. Over the page another photograph would appear to be of the camp, and another one would appear to be of the camp. Then we go over the page to a photograph which is fairly meaningless, but it is deemed to come out. Then we turn over again to another picture which should have a yellow lorry in it, turning over at the same I turn over again to another picture of the tree, and over once more and in the middle of the picture there is a man with a hat on askew. Then we turn over and we see a slightly different type of photograph. It is the image of a man and you will see the back of his body is badly, badly bruised. Then you turn over the page and you will see another picture of the back of a man. These were pictures taken by the doctor and handed to Penny Marshall at the camp, and the film which she had developed. Over the page you see a picture

of blood below a basin. Then again another picture of a basin with blood on the floor and on the wall. Then you will see the next photograph is the back of a man, an emaciated man, taken from behind. Then the final photograph is that same man and you will see his back.

Those, members of the jury, are the photographs which had come from that camera containing that film which had been in effect smuggled out of Trnopolje.

That day, particularly that night, Channel 4 and Channel 3 broadcast long news reports based in part on what was being transmitted from Budapest. Now I am going to show you first the Channel 4 broadcast, then I am going to show you the Channel 3 broadcast. What you will see from the Channel 4 broadcast on August 6th is News at Ten, and then you will see the Channel 3, and I think you see a lunchtime short broadcast, and then a 5.45 broadcast, and then the principal broadcast which took place that night on News at Ten. We will have the 7 o'clock Channel 4 to start with, and then the other three as I told you.

(Video Recording played)

3.05 p.m.

MR. SHIELDS: Members of the jury, those broadcasts captured world attention and aroused strong emotions. Although you may have noticed that a number of reports filed by Penny Marshall and Ian Williams contain the words "concentration camps" that was as a result of a decision taken by both teams, both on the ground there and by the editorial team in London. The media, both broadsheet and tabloid, displayed their repugnance and disgust in strong and even emotive language.

The next day's broadcasts on both ITV and Channel 4 contained yet further reports and interviews with Ian Williams and Penny Marshall, and I think it is only right for completeness that you should see them now. I do not know if your Lordship wanted to have a short break before that. They are about 40-odd minutes in length.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Would you like a short break, members of the jury? Yes. We will have a short break. We will say a quarter of an hour break because there is, I think, tea and coffee making machinery in your room. I do not think there are any other alternatives.

(Adjourned for a short time)

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes, Mr. Shields?

MR. SHIELDS: My Lord, we will now watch the Channel 4 and Channel 3 broadcasts the next day, August 6th. It takes about 45 minutes.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. We will not go beyond that probably, will we?

MR. SHIELDS: My Lord, I definitely will read the press release after that.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: You would like to do that?

MR. SHIELDS: I would definitely like to do that.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes, right.

MR. SHIELDS: I am sorry, but we had to show these and they do take time.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

(<u>Video recording played</u>)

4.10 p.m.

MR. SHIELDS: Members of the jury, a week later Penny Marshall in fact did return and you will see footage of her meeting with Dr. Merdzanic - you remember the doctor who took the film - and you will hear how the barbed wire had by then been taken down and how conditions at the camp had suddenly improved.

 Now, members of the jury, we must go forward in time to 1997 and come to the words of which complaint is made. If you turn to tab 4 in your bundle you will see there, and I am now going to read it to you, a press release issued on 24th January 1997 by Living Marxism, and this was sent to a number of media organisations, a substantial number of media organisations, on that day, no doubt with a view to it being picked up and its contents reported. Let us look at what it says together in bold type:

"Journalist exposes the truth behind Bosnia 'death-camp' photograph

- 39

"The picture that came to symbolise the Bosnian war has been condemned by an expert witness to the UN War Crimes Tribunal at The Hague. German journalist Thomas Deichmann says that the image of an emaciated Bosnian Muslim caged behind barbed wire was created by 'camera angles and editing'.

 "The picture provoked an international outcry and was seen by much of the world as proof that the Bosnian Serbs were running Nazi-style 'concentration camps'. But Deichmann in an exclusive article published in February's LM magazine insists that 'the image is misleading and has fooled the world'.

"The picture of Fikret Alic was taken from videotape shot at Trnopolje on 5 August 1992 by an award-winning British television team led by Penny Marshall (ITN) with her cameraman Jeremy Irvin, accompanied by Ian Williams (Channel 4) and Guardian reporter Ed Vulliamy.

"Deichmann has revisited Trnopolje and has also seen unused video footage that shows how this powerful image was created. He found that

- "● there was no barbed wire fence surrounding the Trnopolje camp.
- "• the camp was a collection centre for refugees, not a prison.
- "• the refugees in the picture were not surrounded by barbed wire. The barbed wire surrounded the news team who were filming from inside a small enclosure next to the camp.

"Thomas Deichmann says

"'I am shocked that over the past four and a half years, none of the journalists involved has told the full story about that barbed wire fence which made such an impact on world opinion. The photograph has been taken as proof that Trnopolje was a Nazi-style concentration camp, but the journalists knew that it was no such thing.'

"Mick Hume, LM editor, says

"'If they are not very careful, journalists who have some kind of emotional attachment in a conflict can end up seeing what they want to see, rather than what is really there. Taking sides cannot be an excuse for taking liberties with the facts."

Members of the jury, you will see the references there in unequivocal terms to Penny Marshall, to Ian Williams and the reference beside Penny Marshall's name to ITN, and we say that anyone reading that would be under no illusion as to what was being alleged against those two journalists and the company that employed them and broadcast those images.

"Journalist exposes the truth behind Bosnia 'death-camp' photograph"

The third paragraph down:

"Deichmann has revisited Trnopolje and has also seen unused video footage that shows how this powerful image was created. He found that

- "● there was no barbed wire fence surrounding the Trnopolje camp.
- "• the camp was a collection centre for refugees, not a prison.
- "• the refugees in the picture were not surrounded by barbed wire. The barbed wire surrounded the news team who were filming from inside a small enclosure next to the camp."

You see, what we say, and anyone reading that press release that day would have understood it to mean, is this: the claimants, ITN, Penny Marshall and Ian Williams, had fabricated and broadcast distorted television footage which deliberately misrepresented and sensationalised the treatment of Bosnian Muslims at Trnopolje, that - and you might think this is just as grave a charge - they had set out to distort the truth because they had taken sides. We say it bears that meaning, which we say is an extremely serious meaning to allege against this company and its journalists, these reporters, when you look at what Mr. Hume says in that final paragraph

"'If they are not very careful, journalists who have some kind of emotional attachment in a conflict can end up seeing what they want to see, rather than what is really there. Taking sides cannot be an excuse for taking liberties with the facts'."

Well, what does that convey, or would that have conveyed to someone reading it at the time? A false picture, a distortion, that they have taken sides. And if you take sides, the danger of taking sides is, according to Mr. Hume, that you see what you want to see. That is his indictment of their conduct. And, to make matters worse, what they also allege is that they have kept quiet about this deception for over four and a half years.

Now, just pause there and think what serious allegations there are that are being made against them.

Now, not surprisingly, you might think, they did not take very kindly to having their reputations assailed completely out of the blue in this way. Not a word of notice beforehand that these allegations are going to be made against them. They caused a letter to be written on 24th January 1997 because all they wanted was to stop this magazine being published maintaining this attack upon them. If you turn to tab 5, it is the last thing I think I can do tonight, I can read that letter. It is addressed to Mr. Mick Hume. He is the editor of Living Marxism and is the person whose quote I have just read out to you that comes at the end of the press release.

"Dear Sir

"The picture that fooled the World - Living Marxism February 1997

"We represent Independent Television News Limited (ITN), Penny Marshall and Ian Williams, both ITN journalists.

"On Thursday 23 January 1997 you put out (through UNS) a presentation release headed 'Journalist exposes the truth behind Bosnia "death camp photograph"' which was seriously defamatory of our clients.

"The press release incorrectly alleged that the ITN reports on Channel Four News and News at Ten on 6 August 1992 (by Ian Williams and Penny Marshall respectively) were misleading and fooled the world. It was suggested that the image of an emaciated Bosnian moslem was created (by implication fabricated) by 'camera angles and editing'. Your press release asserted that ITN and its journalists saw what they wanted to see rather than what was really there, took sides, took liberties with the facts and, shockingly you claim, failed to tell the full story about Trnopolje Camp.

"These allegations are repeated in the article due to be published, we understand, on Thursday next week, in the February edition of Living Marxism.

"These defamatory allegations are wholly false. They must be withdrawn immediately and an appropriate apology made. The article must be withdrawn from the February edition and any existing copies pulped. Our clients are also entitled to compensation for the publication of such bogus claims.

"As a result of the press release our client has already received inquiries from media organisations about the proposed story and we note that the press release invites editors to contact the editor of Living Marxism and German journalist Thomas Deichmann via your press officer. Clearly it has been decided to seek to obtain the maximum publicity from peddling these false allegations of which you did not see fit to inform ITN prior to publication and give our clients an opportunity to rebut the untrue assertions set out in the press release and article.

"Anyone who saw the news reports, which were fair and impartial, could not reasonably have drawn the conclusions you published. We require that you preserve all drafts of the article and other documents relating to it and the press release so that the

motives for inventing such allegations can, if appropriate, be examined in due course.

"On behalf of our clients we therefore require:-

- "1. The publication of an appropriate, agreed apology on UNS, PA and such other news services which carried your press release.
- "2. An undertaking not to repeat the allegations contained in the press release and article complained of.
- "3. The destruction of all copies of Living Marxism containing the article complained of.
- "4. Damages for libel.
- "5. Payment of our clients' reasonable legal costs.

"We look forward to hearing from you, or your solicitors, by return. The seriousness of the defamatory allegations you make means that unless they are withdrawn immediately our clients will commence proceedings for libel."

Well, members of the jury, they were not withdrawn. The article was published and if you turn over the tab to tab 6, you will see it there, LM 97. There is the picture which by now you are familiar with.

"It became the symbol of the horrors of the Bosnian war. But it is not quite what it seems.

"Exclusive

"The picture that fooled the world."

That is quite a long article and it, as we say, repeating in much more detail the allegations which I have already touched on in the press releases. If his Lordship is happy, I would suggest that tomorrow morning we begin the proceedings by you reading it to yourselves, and I will make some comments about it.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Members of the jury, would you like to leave now and be back here at quarter past ten. Would you be good enough to leave all your notes and your ring binders here. No-one will look at them. Any notes you make will not be looked at by anybody. It is very important that notes in court do not get out accidentally through being left behind on the tube or a bus or in a taxi, so if you could leave your own personal notes here I can assure you the court is locked and nobody will look at them. If you would like to go now, I have

got a few administrative matters to deal with and we will continue tomorrow morning at quarter past ten.

(The jury left the court)

- MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Before members of the media leave I repeat what I said at the pre-trial review or the management conference. Of course, nothing can be reported that is said in the absence of the jury until the verdict is given. Yes, Mr. Shields?
- MR. SHIELDS: My Lord, your Lordship will recall that at the PTR my learned friend indicated that he intended to cross-examine on the basis of footage shot by Serbian cameramen who were also present at the camp.
- MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

- MR. SHIELDS: And he rightly took the point against me that as no objection had been made to their authenticity he would be freely entitled to do so. If your Lordship would pick up the transcript, your Lordship will see at p.8 how he put his case in relation to that footage.
- MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.
- MR. SHIELDS: Your Lordship will see at the bottom:

"One of the difficulties in a sense of managing the trial and managing the justification defence, which involves proof of the layout of the camp, is that there are out-takes, video footage from two crews, two ITN crews on the day plus some footage from a third crew, a Serbian film crew who were filming, as it were, and that footage was not taken for the purpose of making it clear to the jury ten years' later what the layout of the camp is. It was taken for other purposes. So what one sees on the footage is a series of parts of shots or clues. They are a de-constructed film from which as a total exercise one can, as Mr. Deichmann says he did, construct a clear picture of the layout of the camp".

What we are going to invite the jury to look at are the rushes from that point of view, and no doubt as well from other points of view as well, and it seemed to us it would make sense if that happened at an early stage of the trial, for them to do the viewing. As I understand it, he is going to use the Serbian footage to that end.

My learned friend also, during some stage last week, and I apologise I cannot remember the exact day, sent us a transcript of the Serbian tape. Can I hand up the transcript he has sent us?

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

MR. SHIELDS: (Same handed) Your Lordship may recall -- I quite understand if your Lordship does not -- standing next to Fikret Alic is another man, a slightly better nourished man, and the Serb transcript tape contains an interview of him by Penny Marshall. Of course, that image is not part of the ITN rushes because if it was, it would form part of the rushes which are no longer available. He kindly sent me this transcript of the Serb tape and I would like your Lordship to look at it. Would your Lordship like to read it to yourself?

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. (After a pause) Yes, I have read that.

MR. SHIELDS: Your Lordship has read that. I am assuming it is intended to put that piece of transcript to Penny Marshall. I ask myself this somewhat rhetorically: Your Lordship will recall what the particulars of justification are and your Lordship will find them, if your Lordship still has your PTR bundle, in volume 1, if one looks at p.33, 34, and 35.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

MR. SHIELDS: Your Lordship will see, if one turns to, say, for example, the one that reminds oneself what the meanings are, that is at 32(a), and then one looks at 34 for the particular which is supporting that. I invite your Lordship to look at, particularly, subparagraphs (7), (8) and (9), which we would say would appear to be the sting of the defence.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

MR. SHIELDS: My concern is this. If it is going to be put to Mr. Williams and Penny Marshall that they were aware that there was other material within their possession which would indicate or show that the prisoners were not prisoners at all, that people were happy there and that they had chosen to distort the report by suppressing that information, that is a different line of attack from the one which is presently pleaded.

 The sting of the defence at the moment, as I understand it, is that it is the journalists who are caged in by the barbed wired, not Fikret Alic, and essentially the image which has been used to transmit has falsely conveyed that he was in prison and caged in barbed wired. That is the nub of the defence. If it is going to go further and suggest that in relation to the rushes we have seen, or other rushes which we no longer have, that there exists further material from which that inference could be drawn, then it is a matter which should have been pleaded. That may not mean your Lordship will want to keep it out now. I am not saying it should come in now, but if it is going to be put that way, it has to be pleaded that way.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

1

17

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

29 30

31 32

33

43 44

45

- MR. SHIELDS: My Lord, in fairness to my learned friend we sent a letter to him on Friday, but he did not get it, because it was not sent until late Friday night, so he has not had a opportunity to consider this in an real detail.
- MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Mr. Millar, my first view is that this point of Mr. Shields is a valid one but I certainly would give leave to amend if you so requested it.
- MR. MILLAR: My Lord, my learned friend is right to say that this issue was first raised in a letter that was faxed through at 7.15 on Friday night to my instructing solicitors.
- 16 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.
- MR. MILLAR: He, having gone home for the weekend, it did not come to my attention until this morning.
- 21 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: No.
 - MR. MILLAR: In addition to which when I saw it I was not entirely clear what the point was that was being taken. I have, in the course of the day, sought some clarification from my learned friend. I think it is now clearer in the light of what he has put to your Lordship what the issue is. I am obviously keen to consider what he has just said overnight and the way he has now put it, and I do not think there is any objection to me doing that.
 - MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: No.
- MR. MILLAR: As I understand it, what is wanted is written responses to that solicitors' letter which forms an answer to 34 35 it, clarified as it has been by my learned friend's comments 36 37 now. We will endeavour to draft something tonight, but I do want to understand before we go off today -- and I think we 38 39 probably all do -- what exactly is the extent of the submission and what exactly we are arguing about here. At the 40 41 directions hearing the issue of the admissibility of the Serb 42 tape was raised, your Lordship will remember.
 - MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.
 - 46 MR. MILLAR: We established that it was prima facie admissible as 47 material served under the CPR because its provenance had not been disputed, it is therefore taken to be admitted, that it 48 is a tape as described on the list taken by a Serb film crew 49 at the camp on the relevant day. Your Lordship will recall 50 that you took the point, well then, presumably it also shows 51 52 Miss Marshall or Mr. Williams. The answer is it shows 53 Miss Marshall.
 - 55 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

- MR. MILLAR: Your Lordship has not seen that and were the submission to be going any further than the submission that has been made, which is put on the basis of the transcript, I would ask your Lordship obviously to see the Serb tape before being invited to make any rulings on it of any importance. It seems obvious appropriate that you should do that, if you have not seen it.
 - MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Certainly I would not make any rulings excluding the Serb tape.
- 12 MR. MILLAR: Absolutely.

- MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Or saying that you could not show it to one of the claimants' witnesses or the claimants and say: "Well, look at this tape. Were you present? Did you hear this conversation?" and so forth.
 - MR. MILLAR: Precisely. My Lord, I am grateful. I am not pressing your Lordship to see it now because as I understand what is being put, that is not the submission. You are not being invited to rule ----
 - MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: No.
 - MR. MILLAR: -- that the tape cannot be shown in the trial and then I cannot put it to the jury. What my learned friend wants to know is in respect of cross-examination of Miss Marshall, am I going to put the transcript to her, and if so, to what end, and he wants to pursue a pleading point as he is entitled to, in the light of our clarification of that issue. That is as I understand where we have got to.
 - MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.
- MR. MILLAR: The reason I wanted to raise that at this stage was this. It is obvious that what I want to put in cross-examination to Miss Marshall is going to depend to some extent, as it always does in any case, on what she says inchief.
 - MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Quite.
- MR. MILLAR: Any argument about how I might ultimately use that transcript, if at all in cross-examination, I would not want to be finally resolved one way or the other until close of her examination-in-chief for that reason. My more immediate concern is this, that as I understand the case being advanced by the claimants from the pleading in Mr. Williams's statement (who is the first witness in time, indeed I think he is the first one we are going to have), his case is that at the point at which that Serb film was being taken and showing Miss Marshall and others at the fence, and Fikret Alic, he is in a different location but at the same side of the same fence.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

MR. MILLAR: I am going to be looking with him in crossexamination, as you would expect, in a little detail at his movements around the camp by reference to the rushes and where he and his crew are shown to be on the rushes.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

 MR. MILLAR: I want, in the course of that cross-examination, to put to him at the appropriate chronological point that part of the Serb tape, not to ask him questions about the transcript, because I understand his answer would be: "That was all a distance away from me and out of my earshot".

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

MR. MILLAR: But as part of the complete picture of the movement of the two crews around the camp, in the initial stage when they would go into what we say is the barbed wire compound, to see in particular where they were in relation to him and to the extent that he was conscious of what they were doing. course he uses the image, as you have heard, in his report, even though it is not taken by a C4 cameraman. He uses the So that sort of cross-examination is going to image of Alic. be pursued with Mr. Williams. If my learned friend is content for that and we are not going to have to argue about that. that is on the footing that I am not putting the transcript to Mr. Williams because it was out of his earshot, there is not going to be a problem. But if he is going to dispute my right to do that then I would be grateful if that could be resolved because the cross-examination of Mr. Williams is going to have to start tomorrow.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes, Mr. Shields.

 MR. SHIELDS: My Lord, it is putting the cart before the horse because your Lordship knows a defendant in a libel action is confined to his pleaded case. The claimant deals in the evidence in chief with the pleaded case. It is not a question of waiting to hear how the evidence in chief develops to decide whether you put an allegation or not or decide to introduce an allegation or not. The reason we have to comply with the particulars is that everyone knows before crossexamination starts what is the case which is going to be made against any particular party.

Our submission is this. If it is going to be asserted in addition to the present pleaded particulars that on the basis of the Serbian footage it can be put that Miss Marshall chose to ignore other relevant statements made by inmates of the camp from which it can be inferred either that there was no imprisonment or something in relation to the barbed wire though I know not what. It undoubtedly has to be pleaded, put in writing before she gives her evidence. It applies to any

other area of cross-examination which is going to be developed which is not specifically pleaded. That is why we have particulars, that is why we have further and better particulars. It is quite clear from **Gatley**, at 33.9 that your evidence is confined to your particulars. It is a very sensible demarcation of the ambit of cross-examination. I have not got up and said: "Under no circumstances, I submit to your Lordship, can it be put" because your Lordship said the Serbian footage can come in. But if it is going to be part of the case from which the jury are going to be invited to infer that as the article, we say, surely means they deliberately adopted a philosophy aimed at distorting the footage and carried it through then it is crucial to that allegation that it be so put and so pleaded.

So what I am inviting my learned friend to do is not to wait and see how it develops in cross-examination but to put his hands up, in so far as he has to put them up, and say: "This is it. This is the allegation which I am making against you, Miss Marshall", and in so far as he is going to use it to make an allegation against Mr. Williams I am entitled to know what the allegation is. Because if the allegation, for example, is this: "You did not make enough inquiries to find out what someone else was saying and from that we can infer that you deliberately chose to use that image because it conveyed your journalistic attachment to the cause", it would surely have to be pleaded because it is a particular from which the jury are going to be invited to construe that they These are serious allegations and if they are did so behave. going to be made they ought just to be pleaded. So that is what I am inviting now, and when they are pleaded then we can look at them.

- MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Mr. Millar, the onus is on the defendants to establish justification and in my judgment, subject to anything you say, where you are in possession of material upon which you may seek to justify a defamatory charge you must plead it and not in effect keep it up your sleeve, deciding whether to use it or not. This is not something which has come to your attention at a late stage. Sometimes in cases thing emerge in evidence in chief, or indeed in cross-examination, or even later in the course of a libel trial which would justify an amendment to plead a particular of justification. Here you should be in a position to be able to particularise in writing what you are relying on by way of particulars against both Penny Marshall and Ian Williams.
- MR. MILLAR: My Lord, I thought I had undertaken, and I give the undertaking again to do that overnight and respond in a letter.
- MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes. It is entirely up to you whether you wish to use those particulars in cross-examination but of course because the charge has been made by way of particulars of justification it is entirely a matter for Mr. Shields

whether he wishes the claimants to deal with the matter in chief.

MR. MILLAR: I follow that and all I was trying to clarify at the outset is what are we being asked to cover in response to the letter. I think it is now clear.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

MR. MILLAR: How is the film relied on as against Miss Marshall in cross-examination? How is it relied on in the course of cross-examination of Mr. Williams? We are not being asked to engage in a formal pleading exercise at this stage, as I understand it, but to indicate in writing the answers to those questions.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: It does not matter whether it is a technical pleading or not, the important thing is that it is clear in writing what inferences you are drawing against the individual claimants Penny Marshall and Ian Williams in relation to the Serbian tape and the transcript. Furthermore, of course, Mr. Shields and his instructing solicitors, and indeed Penny Marshall and Ian Williams are entitled to consider together, being parties, those allegations when they reach them in writing before they give evidence. For example, to take a perfectly proper tactical decision, whether to deal with the allegation in evidence in chief or say: "We will wait and hear how the cross-examination is put." But that is clearly something to which both Penny Marshall and Ian Williams are entitled to seek advice.

MR. MILLAR: Yes, I accept that. Having said that, in circumstances where the film was disclosed in July 1999 ---

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes, I am not suggesting ---

े39

MR. MILLAR: -- and in the past, since we intimated to the claimants that we wanted to put it in and rely on it -- at 7.15 on the Friday night before the trial to raise the point and then ask for time, I may ---

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: I am not being unsympathetic to you but I would have thought it should be possible for you to pinpoint in writing what are the specific inferences you are drawing from the Serbian footage and the transcript ---

MR. MILLAR: Yes, my Lord. The point I was making was ---

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: -- and the transcript which you are putting as particulars of justification against Ian Williams and Penny Marshall.

MR. MILLAR: It is. The point I was making is that they have left it very late to ask.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: That may be, and it is also getting very late this afternoon. Is there anything else that we should deal with?

MR. MILLAR: No, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: The chronology, the organisation chart and that document you chose to call "Key Protagonists", will that all go before the jury before the evidence begins?

MR. SHIELDS: If you want it to, my Lord, of course. Would your Lordship think it helpful?

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: I would have thought it would be very difficult for the jury to follow through all these ---

MR. SHIELDS: I agree that names are impossible, so I am happy with that.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Are you happy with that, Mr. Millar?

MR. MILLAR: I have no objection, my Lord.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: What about transcripts of the news, and so forth, that we have been listening to and watching today?

MR. SHIELDS: My Lord, we have got transcripts of all the news bulletins, not of the rushes. I think there may be some discord as to whether they are entirely accurate but ---

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: I think at some stage an effort should be made to agree the transcripts because I would have thought the question of balance may well be something that might be material.

MR. SHIELDS: We intend to put the transcripts because obviously I have got to call -- your Lordship will of course recall what the case is. There is no plea of justification against ITN and I am going to tell the jury that tomorrow.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

 MR. SHIELDS: So I am showing the whole broadcast because I am acting out of fairness to both sides, because there is a lot of reference to the publicity which followed the broadcasts on the 6th and I did not want to be accused of editing it so I have shown them in their entirety and tomorrow Mr. Williams in chief will deal with how he wrote his particular script.

50 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Yes.

MR. SHIELDS: Because in fact what is crucial to the defendants'
case is to show, we would submit, that separately or acting
together they set out to distort the truth and produce a false
image of something together.

| 1 | MR. | J | JSTIC | E M | ORLAND: | Yes | . So | at | some | stage | fairly | early on | |
|---|-----|---|-------|-----|---------|--------|------|----|-------|--------|---------|----------|-------|
| 2 | | I | hope | th | e trans | script | will | be | agree | ed. Ĭi | s there | anything | else? |
| 2 | | | | | | _ | | | • | | | 79 | CIDC. |

MR. SHIELDS: My Lord, yes. We had been moving towards trying to do that and getting a full bundle of the transcripts of all the programmes that we have shown.

MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Good.

9

4 5 6

7 8

10 MR. SHIELDS: I understand that is what we are now going to do.

12 MR. JUSTICE MORLAND: Thank you very much.

13
14 MR. SHIELDS: There was some resistance to doing that.

15
(Adjourned until 10.15 a.m. on Tuesday, 29th February 2000)