

# Programme complaints bulletin

Standards & Fairness and Privacy

Issue number 6

6 April 2004

**Ofcom**  
OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

# Contents

Introduction..... 2

## Standards cases

Upheld ..... 3

Resolved..... 14

## Fairness and Privacy cases

Upheld ..... 21

Upheld in part..... 22

Not Upheld ..... 23

Resolved/Discontinued..... 24

## Introduction

Some of the following complaints were received by the legacy regulators prior to the commencement of Ofcom. Under the terms of the Communications Act 2003, they became the responsibility of Ofcom on 29 December 2003.

The Communications Act allows for the Codes of the legacy regulators to remain in force until such time as Ofcom has developed its own Codes. These will be published at the end of 2004 following a full public consultation.

The Codes currently in force for programming are:

- **Advertising and Sponsorship Code**  
Radio Authority
- **News and Current Affairs Code & Programme Code**  
Radio Authority
- **Code on Standards**  
Broadcasting Standards Commission
- **Code on Fairness and Privacy**  
Broadcasting Standards Commission
- **Programme Code**  
Independent Television Commission
- **Code of Programme Sponsorship**  
Independent Television Commission

These are all available on the Ofcom website: [www.ofcom.org.uk](http://www.ofcom.org.uk)

The cases have been considered against the above Codes.

- Some programmes will have breached the relevant code (Upheld).
- Others will not have breached the code (Not upheld).
- However, there may be occasions where Ofcom recognises that a broadcaster has taken appropriate action in response to an issue (for instance, the broadcaster may recognise that an error has occurred and taken responsible steps to rectify it). Ofcom will consider that these complaints have been resolved. But even when such action has been taken, Ofcom may still consider it appropriate to find that the programme breached the Code due to the seriousness of the issues involved.

The layout of the report reflects these distinctions.

# Standards cases

## Upheld cases

### Ministry of Mayhem

ITV1 (Carlton), 10 January 2004, 09:25

---

#### Issue

Two viewers complained about an item which included a clip of a nine month old baby being fed a teaspoon of lemon juice to see his reaction. At the end of the film one of the presenters informed viewers that the stunt was safe because the baby was a doctor's child.

The presenter went on to encourage viewers to "do it on your brothers and sisters as it's very, very funny". One complainant was concerned at the effect the item may have on children, especially if a baby was fed something that could be potentially life threatening.

*Ministry of Mayhem* is a children's entertainment programme.

---

#### Response

Carlton explained that all their children's programmes were scrutinised closely because of their young audiences and they went to great lengths to avoid anything that might conceivably endanger viewers.

The reason the presenter mentioned the fact that the baby was the son of a doctor was to convey to the audience that a doctor was aware of what was happening. Carlton felt that if a doctor was content, it would reassure the audience that it was safe. Carlton asserted that no harm would come to any child who swallowed lemon juice as it is merely a highly flavoured natural food, like salt and pepper. Carlton believed the scene was handled responsibly. They felt older children were unlikely to be influenced to give younger children anything that might harm them and believed that babies were rarely left unattended by an adult. Carlton did not feel the sequence was dangerous enough, unusual enough or alluring enough to raise a real risk that the scene was likely to encourage harmful imitative behaviour by children.

---

**Decision**

We accepted that feeding lemon juice in itself would not be harmful to a baby. However, we were particularly concerned that a presenter of a children's programme should encourage children to feed a baby at all. We believe that there is an inherent danger in encouraging children to feed babies (irrespective of the substance). We also felt that there could be a risk of children imitating the 'stunt' with more harmful substances.

The Programme Code requires broadcasters to take particular care with "material, including comic treatments, which may lead children to fail to recognise potentially dangerous play especially where there is no serious outcome".

**The item was in breach of section 1.2(i) of the Programme Code (Children and Imitative Behaviour)**

**LBC (London)**  
8 February, 05:15

---

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>Issue</b>    | Two listeners complained that a presenter burst into laughter when a guest mentioned cockles and whelks in reference to the recent deaths of Chinese nationals, who drowned off the coast of Morecambe.  |
| <b>Response</b> | The station told us that although the presenter had failed to offer an apology immediately after the broadcast, he did make an extended apology at the start of his next programme a week later. The station accepted that the presenter's response had clearly been inappropriate and that he had not acted properly by failing to offer an apology immediately after the broadcast. The presenter deeply regrets any offence he may have caused. |
| <b>Decision</b> | <p>We thought that the manner in which a guest had introduced the subject of the Morecambe tragedy and the subsequent response of the presenter was both insensitive and offensive. While we noted that an apology had been broadcast by the presenter a week later, we did not think that this was adequate, given the nature of the offence caused.</p> <p><b>The item was in breach of Section 1.1 (Taste, Decency).</b></p>                    |

---

## Cool FM (Belfast)

9 February, 16:30

---

**Issue** Six listeners complained that a presenter read out a 'joke', sent to him by text, which he claimed not to understand. The complainants thought that the joke was grossly offensive. It concerned the recent deaths of Chinese nationals, who drowned off the coast of Morecambe .

---

**Response** Cool FM said that the presenter read out the 'joke', but did not understand the meaning of it. Cool FM said that when he realised the significance of what he had done, he faded down the music and apologised. He made a further apology at the end of the record. The station immediately suspended the presenter for two weeks. The managing director of Cool FM acknowledged that it was hard to believe that the presenter had not made the connection between the 'joke' and the tragedy at Morecambe Bay but said that he was acutely embarrassed and upset for causing such offence. The group of listeners who originally sent the text had since written to the station apologising for their actions.

---

**Decision** The presenter's remarks were certainly insensitive and ill judged. Even though the presenter's subsequent swift apology went some way to lessen the offence caused, we believe that such comments in such a context were not acceptable for broadcast and were therefore in breach of the Code. Nevertheless, we welcomed the internal measures that the station had taken in response to the incident.

**The item was in breach of Section 1.1 (Taste and Decency).**

## TNA Wrestling and Combat Zone Wrestling

Friendly TV, 21 December 2003, 09:30  
and 22 December 2003, 16:00

---

### Issue

We received two complaints about wrestling programmes on this satellite channel.

One viewer complained that *TNA Wrestling* was too violent for the time of day when it was shown. The programme included a scene in which one of the wrestlers put a chain around the neck of his opponent and appeared to hang him off the side of the ring, where he was seen to be choking.

Another viewer complained about *Combat Zone Wrestling*. The wrestlers in this programme used props such as tables, chairs and ladders as weapons. There were also occasions when the participants appeared to be injured and visibly bleeding. The complainant was concerned about the intense violence and considered that the use of props could be copied by children, especially since the programme was being shown during the day.

*TNA Wrestling* presenters were also encouraging viewers to go to a website and promoting the merchandise available there. Further, both programmes were labelled as 'sponsored by' the Wrestling Channel when in fact the Wrestling Channel is the producer of the programmes.

---

### Response

Friendly TV said that they agreed that the hanging scene in *TNA Wrestling* went too far for a programme shown at 09:30. They said that they constantly reviewed their programme output and had realised that this programme had been cleared by mistake for broadcast. However, no repeats had been scheduled.

As for *Combat Zone Wrestling*, Friendly TV said that the programme contained frequent references, including some prominently displayed on screen text, to the fact that the action was simulated. The wrestlers are actually well-choreographed actors. Friendly TV felt that the inclusion of warnings about the nature of the action on screen made it suitable for a wide audience. At several points during the show the wrestling was described as being faked and the actors were shown setting up each stunt prior to it being executed. Friendly TV said that this was intended to ensure that viewers who may have believed the violence to be real knew exactly what was happening and what to expect from the programme. Friendly TV said that while they believed the programme to have been suitable they would concede that it would be better suited to a later time-slot.

With regard to the promotion of merchandise, Friendly TV said that there was no impression of external commercial

influence on the content of the programme. The inclusion of associated merchandising was relevant to the show's topic. The programme was made for wrestling fans and not to sell t-shirts and videos from a website. Friendly TV pointed out that there is provision in the Programme Code for programme related material such as books and videos to be promoted at the end of the programme. Friendly TV said it was unfortunate that the inclusion of the merchandising mention did not occur at the end of the programme, but that this did not represent a breach of the Code. Friendly TV agreed that the use of the term 'sponsored' was a misnomer.

---

## Decision

The Programme Code requires that the portrayal of dangerous or harmful behaviour easily imitated by children should be avoided, especially before 9pm. In particular, programmes including hanging or preparations for hanging, which are capable of easy imitation, should not be scheduled to start when children are likely to be watching. As the broadcaster acknowledged, the hanging scene in TNA Wrestling exceeded what audiences would reasonably expect at 09:30 in the morning during the school holidays.

We noted that *Combat Zone Wrestling* contained several on screen text warnings. Nevertheless, the general level of violence, including the use of everyday objects like tables and ladders as weapons, and the injuries that appeared to be caused, meant that this programme was not suitable for broadcast at 16:00.

In *TNA Wrestling*, the presenters promoted commercial products not provided by the broadcaster. This was not what is defined as programme support material. Commercial products should not be promoted within programmes.

The definition of a sponsor in the Code of Programme Sponsorship effectively excludes the broadcaster or producer (of the programme). As the producer of the programmes, the Wrestling Channel should be acknowledged in the production credits, but should not have been given sponsorship credits around the programmes.

Friendly TV has now had a number of compliance problems and its compliance record is of concern to Ofcom. We will be discussing this with the broadcaster.

**TNA Wrestling and Combat Zone Wrestling were both in breach of section 1.2 of the Programme Code (the Watershed/Children and Imitative Behaviour).**

**TNA Wrestling was also in breach of section 8.4 of the Programme Code (undue prominence).**

**The matter relating to the programme producer being labelled a sponsor of the programmes was resolved.**

## **Millennium: A thousand years of history**

BBC2, 31 December 2003, 09:00

---

**Issue** A viewer complained about the scheduling of this programme due to the explicit footage it contained. The programme showed images from the Japanese invasion of Nanking and from the Second World War. This included a scene of an execution showing the moment of death, and footage from the Holocaust showing, in close-up, corpses left piled up outside.

---

**Response** The BBC said that their schedulers were not aware that the final episode of this series contained such graphic archive footage, and agreed that the programme was unsuitable for transmission at that time of day. The BBC said that they now had a new process in place for ensuring that programmes are suitable for their transmission times which should prevent this kind of oversight occurring again.

---

**Decision** We welcome the action taken by the BBC to prevent similar incidents, however broadcasters are expected to ensure that the programmes they show are suitable for the time of day they are broadcast. We agreed that this programme exceeded acceptable limits for the time when it was broadcast.

**The programme contravened the Code on Standards.**

## Union Jack

Channel 4, 30 November, 13:10,  
1 January, 09:30, 4 January 14:10

---

### Issue

Nine viewers complained about aspects of these programmes, considering them inappropriate for the time of transmission. The majority of complainants were concerned about the inclusion of bad language and inappropriate sexual references pre-watershed. Items complained of included an agony aunt sketch in which Sharon Osbourne appeared to say 'fuck off' and an interview with Marilyn Manson containing sexual content.

---

### Response

Channel 4 said the series was commissioned specifically for transmission within the T4 zone on Sundays. T4 is aimed specifically at a mixed audience aged 16-34 years and audience figures showed that over 86% of *Union Jack* viewers were over 16 years of age.

From the outset the series was intended to be a platform for Jack Osbourne's personal, adolescent and mischievous take on life in Los Angeles. Inevitably, some low level language and innuendo was going to form part of the approach. The series was closely scrutinised to ensure the content remained inside compliance parameters for the scheduled transmission time whilst at the same time not removing the juvenile humour and taste which the programme was designed to reflect.

Channel 4 was fully aware that 'fuck' could not be included un-bleeped in the programme and the production company involved had actually bleeped out the word. However, after viewing the episode, Channel 4 decided to broadcast an on-air apology at the end of the programme in case some viewers believed they had heard the full word. After transmission, those responsible for bleeping the word were reminded of the need to ensure that the entirety of the word needs to be bleeped.

In addition, the broadcast version of the interview with Marilyn Manson was heavily edited from the original recorded material to try and attain a balance between the constraints imposed by the transmission time and the editorial objectives of the programme.

---

## **Decision**

The Code requires broadcasters to ensure that material unsuitable for children must not be transmitted at times when large numbers of children may be in the audience. We acknowledge that the type of programming broadcast during the T4 zone is unlikely to attract the youngest children and recognise the steps taken by Channel 4 to ensure the content of the series was suitable for the time of transmission. Although the general content might not appeal to all viewers, we thought that it was unlikely to have been found unacceptable by the target audience. However, the inclusion of 'fuck off', which could be heard clearly despite the attempts to bleep it, in addition to the sexual content of the Marilyn Manson interview in the programme broadcast on 30 November went beyond generally accepted standards for a programme transmitted before the watershed.

**These items in the programme of 30th November were in breach of Section 1.2 of the Programme Code (Family viewing and the watershed).**

### **Chain Reaction**

Extreme Sports Channel, 3 January, 19:00

---

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>Issue</b>    | One viewer complained about the use of very strong language ('motherfucker' and 'fuck') in this programme about 'extreme' cycling. The language was clearly audible in the background music and was also used by one of the bikers.   |
| <b>Response</b> | The Extreme Sports Channel said that it had been incorrect of them to broadcast the programme at this time considering its content. They said that they had reiterated to their compliance staff that inappropriate language in music lyrics is no more acceptable than in programme dialogue. The Extreme Sports Channel also said that they had decided to increase the strength of their compliance department by recruiting additional staff. |
| <b>Decision</b> | <p>We agreed that the language was not appropriate for a programme broadcast at this time of day. We are concerned that this is not the first time that the Extreme Sports Channel has transmitted such strong language pre-watershed. We are reassured that the channel is taking steps to strengthen its compliance department.</p> <p><b>Chain Reaction was in breach of Section 1.5 of the Programme Code (Bad Language).</b></p>             |

---

## Resolved cases

### **Sex Empires**

BBC2, 2 November 2003, 21.00

---

**Issue** This final episode in a three-part documentary series looked at the explosion of internet pornography and sexual services. It featured frank discussions of internet induced behaviour and scenes of sexual activity; pixillated when appropriate. Six viewers contacted us with their concerns that the programme featured material that went beyond the general expectations of an audience for this channel immediately after 9pm.

---

**Response** The BBC pointed out that this was the third part of a series looking at aspects of the porn industry and that the subject matter was a legitimate one to address. However, they recognised that, despite the preceding episodes, the content of this episode may still have been more explicit for some viewers than expected. They accepted that the material was better suited to a later slot and said that it would not be repeated at 21:00 in its current form.

---

**Decision** We accept that, as the third programme in this series, many viewers would have formed certain expectations about this documentary. However, although the images served to illustrate the topic under discussion, we agreed that they were too explicit for some viewers immediately after 9pm. Should the programme be repeated in this form, the BBC intends to schedule it later in the evening. Given the BBC's assurances and recognition of the problem, we considered the matter resolved. However, we would like to remind the BBC of its audience's expectations immediately after the watershed.

**The complaints were resolved.**

## **Rhona's Rudest Home Videos**

ITV1, 13 December 2003, 21:30

---

**Issue** This programme was a pilot for a proposed series. It featured clips of animals copulating, various mishaps and people 'exposing' themselves.

A total of 26 viewers complained that this material was unacceptable on a terrestrial channel – even though it was broadcast after 9pm, they felt that it went beyond their expectations for a mainstream ITV entertainment programme.

---

**Response** ITV said that the programme had been designed for later in the evening but they wished to experiment with an earlier time slot to gauge viewer reaction. The programme was then re-edited in the light of the earlier scheduling. ITV had subsequently decided that any series would be better scheduled to start at 10pm – a full hour after the watershed.

---

**Decision** Television companies in a complex commercial environment are within their rights to experiment with programming and schedules. However they need to ensure that programmes such as these – which are certainly not to everyone's taste – do not go beyond the expectations of particular audiences – taking into account channel profile, type of programme and time of day.

However, ITV had ensured that the programme was clearly labelled and very definite warnings about the content were issued both in sound and vision. It would have been evident from both the title and the material at the start of the show what the theme was likely to be whilst the strongest material was only broadcast near the end.

We accept that the broadcaster's action was an appropriate response to the concerns raised by viewers about the audience's expectations for this channel.

**The complaints were resolved.**

### **Only Fools and Horses**

BBC1, 25 December 2003, 21:30

---

**Issue**

Two viewers complained about the use of the expression 'mong' in this programme. They were concerned it was unacceptable slang and referred to people with Down's Syndrome.

---

**Response**

The BBC argued that there are two interpretations of the word. One is derived from an Australian expression abbreviating the word 'mongrel'. The BBC claimed that this is its most frequent use. However they accept that there are still many people for whom the word is inseparable from the other sense (a shortening of the word 'mongoloid') and who regard it as unacceptably insensitive and offensive. Given, the potential for possible offence, the BBC believed that, in retrospect, it had been a mistake to include the word in the programme.

---

**Decision**

There is undoubtedly still a great sensitivity about the use of this word, despite its two possible meanings. In the light of the BBC's response, we feel that no further intervention is necessary on this occasion.

**The complaints were resolved.**

## Missing Chink

Channel 4, 19-22 January 2004, 19.55

---

### Issue

The *Missing Chink* was a series of four short (three minute) films broadcast on Channel 4 after the news. These films sought to explore the under representation of British Chinese people in our society. The films discussed issues around acting, sport and sex. It was written and acted by two British Chinese comedians, Paul Courtney Hyu and Paul Chan.

Ofcom received 191 complaints (138 pre-transmission) about the use of the word 'Chink'. Complainants felt the use of the term was both racist and offensive.

---

### Response

Channel 4 argued that it was essential that the title should not be considered in isolation of the programme. They accepted that, out of context, the word 'Chink' can offend. However, the broadcaster felt strongly that its use on this occasion was ironic and, when contextualised, had the advantage of making the programmes' eye-catching and therefore bringing viewers to something they might not have otherwise watched.

The title itself was Paul Hyu's own. All of those that were involved in the making of the films, including the Chinese writers and actors felt, at the time, very strongly that the use of the term was justified in context. Paul Hyu said "the word Chink in the title is deliberately set up to be demolished by the performances and script content of the show. Expectations are confounded". He stated that the word is racist and pejorative, but the use of the word reflected his anger at the expectations that surround it and it was used intentionally to be ironic and to get noticed.

The programmes contended that British Chinese people are definitely a 'missing' ethnic minority. The title aimed to highlight this lack of public awareness. These issues were explored in a light-hearted and ironic way to encourage people to take notice of a British Community that has been largely ignored.

Channel 4 said the production company consulted and gained advice before the programmes were broadcast. They spoke to an academic, the Great Britain China Centre as well as prominent Chinese people in the media.

However, the broadcaster acknowledged that it had received a large number of complaints about the title and in particular from the Chinese community. After careful consideration and on reflection they believed that the title was too provocative and decided to apologise in the community's press. The

broadcaster wished it to be known that they continued to stand by the programmes and their important message.

---

## Decision

The broadcaster had clearly felt that it should be able to be provocative in the context of a challenging programme. While it was clear that many in the community had been offended, others felt equally strongly that the programme context justified the use of the expression, stating that it brought an otherwise neglected issue to the forefront of media attention.

It is essential that strong or offensive language (of any type) is justified by the context. Section 1.8(i) of the Programme Code specifically states:

“Their [racist terms] inclusion is acceptable only where it can be justified within the context of the programme. Careful account should be taken of the possible effect upon the racial minority concerned, as well as the population as a whole, and of changes in public attitudes to what is, and is not, acceptable.”

When judging whether such language was acceptable, Ofcom needed to consider such factors as: who said it; their intention and the scheduling. The title is part of the programme and therefore cannot be judged in isolation. Some of those who were most offended by the title did not watch the programme.

It is equally important to note that Channel 4 did not seek to condone or justify the general use of the word 'Chink'. It was not used to denigrate the Chinese community or used as a term of abuse. Importantly, the broadcaster did not seek to normalise the word.

It is important to separate the use of such terms which are used in a gratuitous way (for example, supportive of a racist message) and when used ironically as part of an overall point for communities to question their own approach to racism, racist words and their treatment of minority communities. The programme sought to expose such attitudes.

We also note that the title was devised by Paul Hyu (one of the writers) and the actors and British Chinese production team were supportive of the title. However, in light of the complaints, Mr Hyu re-considered his view and felt that it had not achieved its purpose. We therefore welcomed Channel 4's positive move to apologise directly to those who were offended.

We feel that the broadcaster has suitably resolved this matter and no further action is necessary.

**The complaints were resolved.**

## **Shake Your Coconuts: Junior Senior**

POP Plus, 20 February 2004, 07:00

---

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>Issue</b>    | <p>A viewer complained that this music video featured a man climbing inside a refrigerator. The complainant believed the video might encourage children to copy the behaviour.</p> <p>POP Plus is a children's music channel operated by Chart Show Channels Limited.</p> |
| <b>Response</b> | <p>Chart Show Channels Ltd explained that the brief shot was not noticed during their normal compliance checks. As soon as the complaint was drawn to their attention, the video was replaced with a version in which the shot had been edited out.</p>                   |
| <b>Decision</b> | <p>In view of the very prompt action taken, we concluded that the broadcaster had suitably resolved the matter.</p> <p><b>The complaint was resolved.</b></p>   |

---

**Many Men: 50 Cent**  
Kiss TV, 3 January 2004, 14:00

---

**Issue** Two viewers complained about the use of the word 'fuck' during this video, considering it inappropriate for the time of broadcast.

Kiss TV is a music channel operated by EMAP Performance TV.

---

**Response** EMAP Performance TV acknowledged that the version of the video was unsuitable for daytime play. Emap had introduced a new broadcast system over the Christmas period that required many new procedures to be carried out. When they realised, pre-broadcast, that the video was unsuitable, instructions were issued for its removal but inexperience along the line meant this was not carried out. As soon as EMAP became aware of this error, the video was removed from their system and not played again.

As a result of the error, EMAP have tightened their compliance procedures.

---

**Decision** We accepted that the video had been broadcast by mistake and concluded that the broadcaster had suitably resolved the matter.

**The complaints were resolved.**

# Fairness and Privacy cases

## Upheld

### **Complaint from Ms Louise Thompson Meridian News**

Ofcom received a complaint by Louise Thompson that she was treated unfairly and her privacy was infringed in both the making and broadcast of *Meridian News*. The programme broadcast on 3 July 2003 contained film of a police drugs raid on her house and a back view of her in handcuffs and in her nightwear.

We accepted that the programme was factually accurate in reporting the police raid on Ms Thompson's house on suspicion that heroin would be found and that, after an extensive search nothing but "syringes and other drug taking equipment" were recovered. However, the image of Ms Thompson in handcuffs had a powerful visual impact and may have led viewers to conclude that she was involved in criminal activity. Importantly, no mention was made in the programme that she had not been charged with any offence. This was unfair to Ms Thompson.

Ms Thompson told the programme-makers she did not want to be filmed. Given the circumstances, it was reasonable for her to expect privacy while handcuffed and in her nightwear. Ofcom decided that it was not necessary to show the film of her to highlight the police drugs raids. There was no justification for infringing her privacy when filming her and in the broadcast.

**Unfairness in programme – Upheld**

**Infringement of privacy in making and broadcast of programme – Upheld**

---

## Upheld in part

### **Complaint from Mr X and Mrs X** *Traffic Cops: Fatal Attraction*

Ofcom received a complaint by Mr X and Mrs X that their privacy was infringed in both the making and broadcast of *Traffic Cops*. The BBC1 programme, broadcast on 8 April last year, looked at the work of South Yorkshire Police traffic department and in particular road safety. It included film of an accident involving Mr and Mrs X.

The BBC accepted they should have gained Mrs X's permission to broadcast the film of her. Given the circumstances, she would have expected her treatment by a paramedic to be private. It was reasonable for Mr X to expect to be able to comfort his wife in private. The BBC should have also obtained permission to broadcast pictures of him. Ofcom decided that it was not necessary to show this film to highlight the issues of road safety.

However, the programme was not unfair to Mr X in showing an interview with him about the accident. It was clear that the programme did not seek to apportion blame or show Mr X in a derogatory light.

**Unfairness in programme – Not upheld**

**Infringement of privacy in making and broadcast of programme - Upheld**

## Not Upheld

**Complaint from Dr Barry Groves**  
*Tonight With Trevor McDonald*  
Granada, 30 May 2003

Unfairness

---

**Complaint from Ms X**  
*Britain's Streets of Crime*  
BBC1, 10 November 2003

Unfairness and unwarranted infringement of privacy in the broadcast

## Resolved/Discontinued

### **Complaint from Mr Denis Marsden**

*Package Holiday Undercover*

ITV1, 29 July 2003

Ofcom received a complaint by Mr Denis Marsden that his privacy was unwarrantably infringed in *Package Holiday Undercover*, broadcast on 29 July 2003 on ITV1. The programme included brief footage of Mr Marsden sunbathing by a hotel swimming pool.

Granada Television, responding on behalf of Yorkshire Television, undertook to remove the footage of Mr Marsden from any further transmission. Ofcom considered the broadcaster's action fair and reasonable in the circumstances and decided it would not be appropriate to proceed further with the complaint.

---

### **Complaints from Mrs Lynda McConkey, Mrs Wendy Gristock and Mrs Beverley Hill**

*Week In Week Out: Hitting the High Street*

BBC1 Wales, 26 & 29 November 2002

Ofcom received complaints by Mrs Lynda McConkey, Mrs Wendy Gristock and Mrs Beverley Hill that they were treated unfairly and their privacy was unwarrantably infringed in *Week In Week Out: Hitting the High Street*, a programme broadcast on 26 and 29 November on BBC1 Wales.

Because legal proceedings started which related to the subject matter of the complaints, Ofcom was unable to take their complaints any further.

---

*Where a complaint is upheld, a summary of the adjudication is included. Where a complaint is not upheld there is only a note of the outcome.*

*For a copy of the full adjudication in either case go to Ofcom's website at [www.ofcom.org.uk/bulletins/](http://www.ofcom.org.uk/bulletins/) or send a stamped addressed envelope to: Ofcom, Riverside House, 2a Southwark Bridge Road, London SE1 9HA..*