

PRESENTERS

William Akel, Simpson Grierson, Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch

William is the senior litigation partner at Simpson Grierson. He has acted for TVNZ News & Current Affairs for many years. He has appeared in many high profile privacy cases including *Hosking* (in the High Court), *Andrews v TVNZ*, *Rogers v TVNZ*, and *Mafart and Prieur v TVNZ*. He has represented media in such well known cases as *Liddell, Re Victim X, Mahanga, Travis Burns*, and *Television New Zealand Ltd v R* (Bain suppression).

Steven Price, Barrister, Wellington

Steven is a barrister specialising in media law, and the author of *Media Minefield*, a guidebook to media regulation in NZ. He also lectures in the topic at Victoria University of Wellington, and contributes freelance articles and commentaries widely. He writes a blog called *MediaLawJournal* in which he discusses issues of media law and ethics.

Robert Stewart, Izard Weston, Wellington

Robert has been a partner of Izard Weston since 1998 and now heads up the firm's media law team. He is the principal external legal adviser to Fairfax Media. Although his principal areas of practice are now media law and litigation, he also has extensive experience in the areas of maritime law, summary prosecutions and company and commercial litigation.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1. SUPPRESSION AND CONTEMPT	9
SUPPRESSION	9
MANDATORY SUPPRESSION	9
<i>Approach to ss 139-139A</i>	9
DISCRETIONARY SUPPRESSION: NAMES AND PARTICULARS	11
<i>Jurisdiction: Who can challenge name suppression orders?</i>	11
<i>Purpose, nature and flexibility of name suppression</i>	13
<i>"Starting point": The open justice principle</i>	14
<i>Refining the edges</i>	15
<i>Discretionary suppression: Wide-ranging orders</i>	19
<i>Liability and penalties</i>	20
SUPPRESSION IN CIVIL PROCEEDINGS	21
CONTEMPT OF COURT	22
INTRODUCTION	22
CIVIL CONTEMPT VERSUS CRIMINAL CONTEMPT	23
BEHAVING BADLY	23
MATTERS BEFORE THE COURTS	24
WHEN IS A MATTER <i>SUB JUDICE</i> ?	25
THE NATURE OF THE RISK	25
TIME AND PLACE	26
DANGEROUS MATERIAL	26
SAFER MATERIAL	27
SCANDALISING THE COURT	28
<i>General principles</i>	28
<i>Media implications</i>	29
PRESSURE ON LITIGANTS/WITNESSES/JURORS	29
FINAL REMARKS	31
2. PRIVACY POST-HOSKING	33
INTRODUCTION	33
<i>Hosking v Runting</i>	34
<i>New Zealand cases since Hosking</i>	36
<i>Uncertainty in the New Zealand position</i>	45
<i>Impact of Hosking on criminal law</i>	50
<i>Hosking and Broadcasting Standards and the New Zealand Press Council</i>	52
<i>Developments in other jurisdictions since Hosking</i>	54
<i>Conclusion</i>	60
3. COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE MEDIA	63
BROADCASTING STANDARDS AUTHORITY	63
<i>Overview</i>	63
<i>The complaints process</i>	64
<i>Codes</i>	64
<i>Decision process</i>	64
<i>Penalties</i>	65
<i>Costs</i>	65
<i>Decisions</i>	65
<i>A selection of significant rulings</i>	67
<i>Appeals</i>	69
<i>Advice to complainants</i>	69
<i>Advice to broadcasters</i>	70
THE PRESS COUNCIL	71
<i>Overview</i>	71
<i>Statement of Principles</i>	72

<i>Process</i>	72
<i>Penalties</i>	72
<i>Costs</i>	72
<i>Under review</i>	72
<i>Decisions</i>	73
<i>A selection of significant rulings</i>	75
<i>Advice to complainants</i>	76
<i>Advice to publications</i>	76
4. DEFAMATION – QUALIFIED PRIVILEGE	77
DEFAMATION OVERVIEW	77
QUALIFIED PRIVILEGE	77
1. <i>Statutory qualified privilege</i>	77
2. <i>Traditional qualified privilege</i>	78
3. <i>Qualified privilege in Lange v Atkinson</i>	78
4. <i>Neutral reportage</i>	83
<i>Impact on New Zealand law</i>	87
APPENDIX A	91