

Additional Material for Chapter 11 – Sexual offences, human trafficking, female genital mutilation and forced marriages

Section numbers from the book are used where relevant. Its content provides fuller explanations and context.

11.2 The wide application of the anonymity

Case study: David Dinsmore, former editor of *The Sun*, was convicted in 2016 of breaching the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992, because the newspaper published a photo identifying the victim of a sexual offence. Mr Dinsmore denied the charge, but was found guilty by the Chief Magistrate, District Judge Howard Riddle at Westminster Magistrates' Court. The case was brought by Durham police, and arose from a *Sun* article published after footballer Adam Johnson's arrest in 2015 for illegal sexual activity with a 15-year-old girl. Johnson was jailed for this in March 2016. The article showed part of a photo of him with the girl in which her face was obscured. The article did not name her, and warned that anyone who identified her online would face prosecution. But, Mr Riddle heard, some social media users identified her because they recognised similarities between the original photo, from when it had been visible on a private Facebook account, and the altered version used by *The Sun*. Mr Riddle said he was satisfied that Dinsmore and *The Sun* staff thought they were complying with the law because they took extensive steps to change the photo to obscure the girl's image, including changing the colour and length of her hair, and the background in the photo. Dinsmore, who in 2015 became chief operating officer of News UK, which owns *The Sun*, told the court that the test staff applied was 'can this person be identified by a man or woman on the street?' He was ordered to pay £1,000 in compensation to the girl, and £1,300 in costs. He apologised to the girl (Durham Constabulary press release and *Press Gazette*, 7 March 2016).

Case study: The *Luton Herald and Post* was fined £1,000 in 2013 for identifying a woman victim of a sexual offence. In a report of a man's trial on rape and sexual assault charges, the newspaper did not name her but included a combination of detail which identified her – her age and home country, that she had come to the UK to study, the approximate date and location of her arrival, the name of the placement agency she used, where she was studying, how she had met her attacker and reference to her living arrangements and professional aspirations (*Media Lawyer*, 8 October 2013).

Case study: Trinity Mirror Southern Ltd was fined a total of £10,000 in 2011 after it admitted that the *Aldershot News and Mail*, *Farnborough News and Mail*, *Fleet News and Mail* and the *Yateley News and Mail* had published in a report of a court case the names of two women who were victims of sexual assault. It was also ordered to pay each of them £5,000 compensation. Human error was blamed for this breach of the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992. A Crown Prosecution Service lawyer said: 'The disregard by the newspapers of these women's automatic right to anonymity proved traumatic to those involved and required extensive extra police and victim support' (Hampshire Constabulary's *Frontline* magazine, issue 163, July 2011).

Case study: The *Daily Mirror* was fined £1,200 after it admitted breaching the 1992 Act. Its 2011 report of a man's initial appearance before Teesside magistrates named one of two women he was accused of sexually assaulting. The breach also led Cleveland Police to complain to the Press Complaints Commission on the woman's behalf. The PCC, noting that being named caused the woman considerable distress, said the breach was an 'alarming case'. It ruled that the *Mirror's* report breached clause 11 of the Editors' Code of Practice. The newspaper apologised to the woman. It told the PCC it had launched a thorough investigation into how her name came to be published, and would improve staff training to prevent such breaches in future (*The Guardian*, February 19, 2013; *Cleveland police v Daily Mirror*, PCC adjudication published February 19, 2013).

Case study: In 2007 the *Lancashire Evening Post's* parent company was fined £3,000 and ordered to pay £4,000 compensation to two women victims of trafficking for prostitution, whose anonymity was breached in a report (*Media Lawyer*, December 14, 2007).

Case study: In 2006 the *Daily Telegraph* was fined £2,000, and ordered to pay £5,000 compensation and the *Daily Express* was fined £2,700 and ordered to pay £10,000 compensation after both newspapers published photographs of a servicewoman which breached her anonymity under the 1992 Act. She was a complainant at a court martial at which a serviceman was cleared of a serious sexual assault. The photos pictured her from behind, so her face was not shown. After being prosecuted, the newspapers admitted the photos identified her, but said that at the time they were published it had been genuinely believed her anonymity was preserved. The *Daily Mail*, which also used a similar photo of the woman but changed the colour of her hair, was not prosecuted (*Media Lawyer*, February 23, 2006).

11.8.2 By court order, to lift 'a substantial and unreasonable' restriction on reporting

As explained in 11.8.2 in *McNae's*, a court has power to lift the 1992 Act anonymity if it is satisfied that:

- the anonymity would impose a substantial and unreasonable restriction on media reporting of the trial; and that
- it is in the public interest to remove or relax it.

Case study: Police were hunting a known criminal, Arthur Hutchinson, after three members of the same family were murdered at their Sheffield home after a wedding party. To help trace Hutchinson, police publicly named him as the suspect, which added to the already-intense publicity about the case, and he was captured. The media had also named the murder victims. Some time after being charged with the murders, Hutchinson was also charged with raping a teenage girl linked to the family, in the same terrible attack. The media had not previously been told of the rape allegation. At Hutchinson's trial on the murder and rape charges, lawyers acting for newspapers argued that it would be impossible for them to report the trial

at all if their coverage could not identify the girl as the alleged rape victim, because if they could not do that their reports could not identify the family involved. The lawyers pointed out that publishing Hutchinson's name or that the case was of three murders committed in such circumstances would in itself be enough for the Sheffield public to remember who the family was from the previous publicity, and therefore to identify the girl as the one involved in the trial's evidence. Also, the lawyers pointed out that the evidence of the rape and murders was inextricably linked. The judge agreed that the media could identify the girl, and thus the family, because anonymity would otherwise impose a substantial and unreasonable restriction on reporting of the trial, and it was in the public interest for the trial to be fully reported (*R v Arthur Hutchinson* (1985) 129 SJ 700; (1985) 82 CrApp 51). Hutchinson was convicted.

11.8.4 If the case is 'other than' the sexual or trafficking offence alleged

Newspaper breached anonymity after the rape charge was dropped.

In 2014 the *Northern Echo* newspaper admitted breach of the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992. The district judge who fined it for this breach described the case as 'novel'.

The *Echo* had published a woman's surname when reporting the trial of a man accused of physically assaulting her. During the trial the defendant's barrister had referred to an alleged rape which did not end up forming part of the case against his client. Earlier in those proceedings – before the trial began – a charge that the defendant raped the woman had been dropped.

The fact that the rape allegation did not proceed led the *Echo* to believe that it could legally name the woman in a report of the trial, because the assault charge was not a sexual offence. The *Echo* thought it could rely on the defence in section 1(4) of the 1992 Act. As 11.8.4 in *McNae's* explains, that part of the Act says that a victim or alleged victim of a sexual offence can be identified as such in an article which consist 'only of a report of criminal proceedings other than' proceedings for the sexual offence.

The woman was very distressed about being identified. And the *Echo* accepted - after subsequent research into the origins of the 1992 Act and the wording of that part - that in these circumstances Parliament had intended that the alleged victim of a sexual offence should retain lifelong anonymity even when the only sexual offence charge in the proceedings was dropped or reduced to a lesser, non-sexual charge.

At Teesside magistrates' court the district judge fined the *Echo* £2,400, ordered it to pay £4,500 in compensation, £2,003 in costs and a £480 victim surcharge. Its barrister Guy Vassall-Adams said that the newspaper immediately accepted that, ethically, the woman should not have been named but believed that no law had been broken. He said it was a case of 'genuine legally uncertain terrain' (*Media Lawyer*, 25 and 30 July 2014).

Orders to protect the public from risk of sexual offences

A court which believes a person could commit a sexual offence has two powers created specifically to minimise that risk.

A 'sexual harm prevention order' can be imposed on a person already convicted of a sexual offence or cautioned for one, and who poses a risk of sexual harm to the public. The order could, for example, ban a man convicted of a paedophile offence from communicating with any child, including on the internet, or from loitering near schools. Or it could ban a man who has a record of sexual assault from approaching any woman he does not know. The order can be imposed in a Crown or magistrates' court in a sentencing hearing, or if the police or National Crime Agency applies to a magistrates' court. This type of order replaced an earlier version known as a sexual offences prevention order (SOPO).

A 'sexual harm risk order' can be made – again, to restrict a person's activity – if he or she has done an act of a sexual nature and, as a result, poses a risk of harm, even if he or she has not been convicted of a sexual offence. It can be imposed by a magistrates' court on the application of the police or the Agency.

As explained in 16.6.2.8 of *McNae's*, Home Office guidance says it is normal practice for some police forces to ask magistrates, at the outset of a hearing which decides whether either type of order should be imposed, to make an order under section 11 of the Contempt of Court Act 1981 to stop the person against whom a sexual harm prevention or sexual harm risk order is sought being identified in reports of the hearing. As explained in 16.6.2 and 16.6.3 in *McNae's*, there are various grounds on which use of section 11 anonymity provision can be challenged by the media.

Case study: In 2000 Gary Allen was acquitted of the murder of a Hull prostitute, a verdict widely considered perverse. Soon afterwards he assaulted two sex workers in Plymouth, for which he was jailed. Psychiatric reports said he posed a high risk of sexual re-offending. On his release in 2010 he moved to Grimsby. There, at the police's request, a district judge made a sexual offences prevention order (SOPO) banning Allen from approaching sex workers or entering red-light areas. The judge also made an order under section 11 of the Contempt of Court Act 1981 banning publication of Allen's address in connection with the SOPO. But the *Grimsby Telegraph* was able to legally report, as it did, that Allen had moved to the area, his previous offences and the view that he remained a danger to women. Soon after this it reported that he had been arrested in the red light area in nearby Scunthorpe. Neither report gave his address or referred to the SOPO case (at that time covered by another reporting restriction), so the section 11 order was not breached. Allen asked the High Court for a permanent anonymity order to prevent the media revealing the SOPO's existence. The court refused, saying the public's need to be protected against the risk of Allen re-offending outweighed his rights to privacy (*Allen v Grimsby Telegraph* [2011] EWHC 406 (QB)).

11.9 Ethical considerations

As explained in 2.1.1 in *McNae's*, in 2014 the Independent Press Standards Organisation replaced the Press Complaints Commission. Ipso uses the Editors' Code of Practice to adjudicate on complaints against the press, as the PCC did. Under clause 7 of the Code, the press must not identify children under 16 as being victims or witnesses in 'sex cases' unless there is an exceptional, public interest justification *and* the law allows such a child to be identified in this context (and the law

hardly ever allows this) – see 11.9 in *McNae's*. The clause allows an adult defendant in such a case to be identified in press coverage, provided that coverage does not reveal if a family or other relationship exists or existed between the defendant and child (because this, when the defendant is identified, would identify the child to anyone who knows of the relationship – see 10.12 in *McNae's*). In clause 7 'sex cases' covers any situation in which a sexual offence is alleged – including if the allegation is made in a civil or employment tribunal case. Clause 11 says that the press must not identify anyone as being a victim of a 'sexual assault' or publish material likely to contribute to such identification, unless the law permits this and there is 'adequate justification' for identification. These Code definitions include alleged victims of such offences. The Code's use of the term 'sexual assault' covers a range of sexual offences including rape – again, see 11.9 in *McNae's*.

Case study: In 2017 Ipso's complaints committee (hereafter referred to merely as Ipso, for convenience) upheld complaints that three Scottish newspapers had breached clause 11 of the Code because of details published in their reports of a court case. In it the defendant, named in the reports, pleaded guilty to sexual offences against a child. The details published from the case included the victim's age when the offences began; the time period over which they took place, the circumstances in which the defendant came into contact with the victim, with reference to a specific day of the week; and the victim's current age. Ipso said the details reported were of the kind that would be known within the victim's community, and when reported alongside the time frame of the offences, and the victim's age, were likely to contribute to the victim's identification. A similar complaint about reporting of the case by *Dailyrecord.co.uk* was also upheld. The complaints were considered under clause 11 because the victim was an adult when the reports were published (*A man v Gazette (Paisley)*, *A man v Evening Times*, *A man v Paisley Daily Express*, *A man v Dailyrecord.co.uk*, all issued 15 August 2017). It should be noted that the automatic anonymity in the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992 for victims of sexual offences does not apply to Scottish cases – see the online chapter 'Scotland' on www.mcnaes.com.

Case study: Ipso ruled in 2015 that the *Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard* breached clauses 7 and 11 of the Editors' Code by publishing a particular, paraphrased quotation in an online report of a court case. The coverage named the defendant, a man accused of a sexual offence involving a child. He was acquitted. He complained that the quotation implied a specific connection between him and the alleged victim, and therefore identified that child. Ipso agreed, saying that the paraphrased comments which had been quoted strongly implied a specific connection. Their inclusion in the report was 'highly concerning' and demonstrated a significant failure on the newspaper's part. The man also complained that the newspaper's coverage of the case, by omitting some details in order to protect the child's identity, presented a partial account of his conduct which was misleading, and therefore breached clause 1 of the Code, which seeks to uphold accuracy. But Ipso said clause 1 was not breached. It pointed out his acquittal had been reported and that the Code's requirements and the law prevented publication of some information relevant to his defence (*A man v Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard*, 27 July 2015).

Case study: In 2015 Ipso warned the press to consider if social media sites should be used to report sexual offence cases, because of the danger that readers might post comments speculating about the identity of the victims/alleged victims. It ruled that the *Dunfermline Press* had not breached clauses 7 and 11 of the Editors' Code in a report, posted on its Facebook page, of an individual being charged with sexual offences against a child. Ipso said that the newspaper was not responsible for the comments made elsewhere on social media identifying the child. But Ipso said it 'took this opportunity to draw to editors' attention the need for care in such cases to avoid creating a forum for speculation as to the victim's identity'. It added: 'While editors are not in a position to constrain the circulation of links to stories and hosted on third-party websites, consideration should be given to whether stories involving victims of sexual assault can safely be published on publications' social media sites – particularly where they will be open to comments' (*A woman v Dunfermline Press*, 27 July 2015). For the 'Regulation 19' defence in law if a reader's online comment breaches anonymity, see 22.12 in *McNae's*.

In the three-year period 2011-2013 the Press Complaints Commission upheld 11 complaints that newspaper or magazine articles had identified or had the potential to identify victims or alleged victims of sexual offences, some of them children. These included adjudications referred to below, and those regarding the *Daily Mirror* and *Luton Herald and Post* cases also dealt with in law – see 11.2, above.

Case study: Police began investigating a woman's allegation that she had been raped. The *News Shopper (Bexley and North Kent)* published online a photo of the site of the alleged rape – the woman's home – and video footage showing forensic officers entering it. Recognisable shops were visible in these images, and the article named the general locality and road. The woman complained to the PCC that friends and relatives saw the coverage and contacted her about the matter. She found it inconceivable that the newspaper had not considered that her identification was a likely consequence of its coverage. The PCC ruled that clause 11 of the Editors' Code was breached because the coverage enabled easy identification of her home, with the inevitable and distressing result that she faced inquiries from friends and family previously unaware of the incident. The PCC noted the newspaper's position that it had not been advised of the complainant's connection to the property where the alleged rape occurred, but the PCC emphasised that the responsibility for published material lay with the editor (*A woman v News Shopper (Bexley and North Kent)*, 3 July 2013).

Case study: In 2011 the PCC upheld a complaint against the *Staffordshire Newsletter* because a report about a man being jailed for sexual activity with a child contained detail with potential to enable members of the public to identify the victim. The victim's grandfather complained that the report breached clauses 7 and 11 of the Editors' Code. The report named the offender, and included the child's gender, the child's age when the abuse started and the period of time for which it continued. The grandfather said the victim's identity was now common knowledge in the local community and at the child's school. The PCC said that the newspaper was fully entitled to identify the convicted man. But it added that while each of the details reported might have seemed relatively insignificant, they had the potential to imply

the connection between the accused and his victim. It took into account that the report had been supplied by an outside agency, and so the paper did not know all the case details. But, overall, the PCC 'did not agree that the newspaper had taken sufficient care to avoid this implication'. The result has been 'a serious, albeit inadvertent, error' (*A man v Staffordshire Newsletter*, 3 May 2011).

Case study: In 2011 the PCC upheld a complaint that the *Southern Daily Echo* had breached clauses 7 and 11 of the Editors' Code. In a report of a court case in which a man admitted unlawful sexual activity with a teenage girl, the paper included the victim's age, the dates of the offence, alluded to the man's profession, identified his workplace and reported another charge against him. The girl's mother complained to the PCC that the combination of details made the girl's peers and others in their small town aware she was the victim. The newspaper told the PCC it was at pains to avoid reporting the relationship between her and the man. The PCC said the editor had paid attention to the need to protect her, and that the paper was entitled to identify the man, but that the report included information likely to contribute to identification of the victim. The PCC was concerned in particular that the dates of the offence were included in a context which might have implied the relationship between the accused and the victim (*A woman v Southern Daily Echo*, 6 June 2011).

11.9.2 'Adequate justification'

Case study: In 2016 Ipso ruled that clause 11 was breached by the *Daily Record's* lawful identification, in coverage of a Scottish court case, of a man as an alleged victim (the complainant) of a sexual assault. In the case the woman charged with the assault – she allegedly rubbed her breasts against him at a party – was acquitted. The man complained about the *Record's* report naming him. The *Record* pointed out that under Scottish law he had no anonymity in law. That was because, as explained above, the 1992 Act does not apply to Scottish cases. The *Record* also said that it was clear the alleged offence should not have been classed as sexual assault, that in court the sheriff (judge) had criticised the Crown's decision to prosecute the woman, and that there was 'adequate justification' to name the alleged victim in these circumstances. But Ipso said: 'This justification must be a compelling one in order to outweigh the general public interest in preserving victims' anonymity'. Ipso added: 'The sheriff's criticism of the decision to prosecute was insufficient to justify identification of the complainant, and it was not necessary to name the complainant in order to report this criticism' (*A man v Daily Record*, 27 January 2016).

PCC guidance on reporting sexual offence cases

In 2011 the PCC issued guidance on the reporting of sexual offence cases. This said that - to preserve the anonymity of victims/alleged victims - editors should 'err on the side of caution' when deciding which details could be published. 'For instance, even such apparently incidental details as the precise dates on which offences were alleged to have taken place have contributed to identification'. It warned that editors were responsible for preserving the anonymity even if the report came from a reliable external agency. It also warned against 'jigsaw identification' – a danger explained in 11.3.1 in *McNae's*.

The PCC issued guidance in 2000 about reporting cases involving paedophiles. This stressed that the general protection of privacy now in clause 2 of the Editors' Code applied for relatives and friends of such offenders. It said too that, under what is now clause 9, they should not be identified in coverage of the paedophile's case unless they consented or there was a public interest justification. See Useful Websites, below, for the guidance. Clause 9 is explained in 4.15 in *McNae's* and in the Additional Material on www.mcnaes.com for ch. 4.

Automatic anonymity for victims of forced marriages

In March 2017 law came into effect to automatically ban any publication from identifying a person in their lifetime as being a victim or alleged victim of an offence of forced marriage. This law is in schedule 6A of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime, and Policing Act 2014.

The Explanatory Notes to the Policing and Crime Act 2017, which inserted this anonymity provision into the 2014 Act, say the policy aim is to encourage victims to report forced marriage offences, to increase the number of prosecutions for this crime. UK victims are usually girls or women from communities with a South Asian cultural heritage, who may have been tricked by a parent into travelling abroad for the marriage to take place. But forced marriage is not limited to these communities.

The forced marriage offences

Under section 121(1) of the 2014 Act, a person commits a forced marriage offence if he or she uses violence, threats or any other form of coercion for the purpose of causing another person to enter into a marriage, and believes, or ought reasonably to believe, that the conduct may cause the other person to enter into the marriage without free and full consent. Section 121(2) says that in relation to a victim who lacks mental capacity to consent to marriage, the offence under section 121(1) is capable of being committed by any conduct carried out for the purpose of causing the victim to enter into a marriage whether or not the conduct amounts to violence, threats or any other form of coercion.

A person commits a forced marriage offence under section 121(3) if he or she practises any form of deception with the intention of causing another person to leave the United Kingdom, and intends the other person to be subjected to conduct outside the United Kingdom that is a forced marriage offence under section 121(1) or would be such an offence if the victim were in England or Wales.

Under the Act marriage means any religious or civil ceremony of marriage, and the ceremony does not have to be legally binding.

The scope of the anonymity provision

The anonymity for the victim/alleged victim takes effect when the allegation of a forced marriage offence is made, and in most circumstances remains in place irrespective of whether there is a police investigation, or whether there is a prosecution.

The ban on identifying such victims/alleged victims covers all types of publication, including any report of such a crime/alleged crime or of a court proceedings in which a defendant is accused of or admits an offence of forced marriage, and any feature referring to such a crime or allegation.

The anonymity provision will almost certainly apply too to any report of a 'forced marriage protection order' being granted by a family court, and to any report of court proceedings which consider if such an order should be granted. Such orders can, for example, be sought by police to forbid parents from acting on plans to force a daughter to marry. See Useful Websites, below, for more information on such orders and forced marriage offences. That Government information makes clear that an 'arranged' marriage – in which the couple have free will - is not a 'forced' marriage. If ongoing, family court proceedings also involve child protection powers under the Children Act 1989, anonymity provision will automatically be in force under that Act too – see 14.4 in *McNae's* and the extended version of that chapter on www.mcnaes.com.

The wording of the anonymity protection in the 2014 Act for victims/alleged victims of forced marriage offences is similar to wording in the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 1992 which provides automatic anonymity for the victims/alleged victims of sexual and human trafficking offences, explained in 11.1-11.3 in *McNae's*. This means that no detail must be published which identifies the person during their lifetime as being a victim/alleged victim of a forced marriage offence, and that care must be taken not to publish anything which could lead to 'jigsaw identification' – again, see 11.3.1 in *McNae's* for explanation of this term. The anonymity also applies in respect of any conspiracy to commit a forced marriage offence, and when anyone is accused of aiding, abetting, counselling, procuring or encouraging such an offence.

Because forced marriages are usually arranged by the victim's parents or other adult relatives, a report which can identify a defendant charged with such an offence may well be rare, because to preserve the victim's/alleged victim's anonymity the family cannot be identified. In 2018 a couple from Leeds were convicted under the 2014 Act because they tricked their 18-year-old daughter into travelling to Bangladesh in order to force her to marry a cousin and threatened her with violence if she did not comply. See Useful Websites, below, for detail of that case. Media reports of it could not identify the parents because of the Act's anonymity provision for the daughter.

Also, it may be that a victim of a forced marriage offence is raped or otherwise sexually assaulted by the 'spouse' before or after the marriage takes place. This would mean the victim has anonymity too under the 1992 Act as regards the sexual offence if it took place in England or Wales, and should under the Editors' Code of Practice, Ofcom Broadcasting Code and Impress Standards Code – see 11.9 in *McNae's* - ethically be given anonymity if the offence took place there or abroad. As regards a sexual offence alleged to have taken place abroad, it is possible in some circumstances that the victim/alleged victim, if under 18, would have anonymity under the 1992 Act in respect of that allegation, because UK authorities have jurisdiction to prosecute in the UK some sexual offences committed abroad if the person accused is a UK citizen and the victim/alleged victim is not an adult.

When does the anonymity cease to apply?

If aged 16 or older, a person can give written consent to be identified in a publication as a victim/alleged victim of a forced marriage offence, provided there was no interference with his/her peace or comfort to gain the consent. See 11.8.3 in *McNae's* for similar law in the 1992 Act which allows a victim/alleged victim of a sexual or human trafficking offence to waive their anonymity.

A court can lift the anonymity when it has ruled that otherwise the defence of a person accused of a forced marriage offence would be substantially prejudiced. A court can also lift the anonymity by ruling that the anonymity imposes a substantial and unreasonable restriction on the reporting of the court proceedings, and that it is in the public interest to remove or relax the restriction. See 11.8.1 and 11.8.2 in *McNae's* for similar provision in respect of sexual and human trafficking offence cases.

Liability and defences

Those who can be prosecuted for breaching the anonymity of a victim/alleged victim of a forced marriage offence are the same as for breach of anonymity of a victim/alleged victim of a sexual or human trafficking offence—see 11.7 in *McNae's* - but could also include in some circumstances a 'senior officer' (for example, a director) of a media company, as well as the company.

It is a defence for a person to prove that he/she did not know or suspect or have reason to suspect that the publication included 'the matter in question' (the identifying detail) or that he/she did not know or suspect or have reason to suspect that the allegation in question had been made, or to prove there was valid 'written consent' waiver of the anonymity (see above).

Anonymity for victims of forced marriage and FGM offences – ethical considerations

The Editors' Code of Practice, Ofcom Broadcasting Code and Impress Standards Code do not have specific provision granting anonymity to victims/alleged victims of human trafficking, forced marriage or female genital mutilation offences. But if a media organisation breached the legally-bestowed anonymity such a person has, and the person complained of this to Ipso or Ofcom or Impress, it can be anticipated that the relevant regulator would rule that the person's privacy had been improperly breached, in that the automatic, lifetime anonymity provision in law creates a reasonable expectation that the person would not be identified by the media as such a victim/alleged victim, without consent. For the codes' general protection of privacy, see 4.2 in *McNae's*. Even when the law permits such identification, a regulator is likely to require a media organisation to have a sufficient, demonstrable, public interest justification for such a person to be identified without consent – see 2.4.1, 2.5, 3.4 14 and 4.3 in *McNae's* – unless the person's identification in this context is already in the public domain.

Useful websites

https://www.editorscoderegulation.org.uk/guidance_notes_10.php

Press Complaints Commission guidance on reporting paedophile cases

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/circular-0102014-new-forced-marriage-offences>

Government guidance on forced marriage offences

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/714583/fl701-eng.pdf

Government guidance on forced marriage protection orders

<https://www.cps.gov.uk/yorkshire-and-humberside/news/parents-convicted-forced-marriage>

Crown Prosecution Service press release on 2018 forced marriage case

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-leeds-44290935>

BBC report of the 2018 forced marriage case