



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

IE-Ireland: High Court refuses to strike out presidential candidate's claim over televised election debate

Ó Fathaigh, R.

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

IRIS

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Ó Fathaigh, R. (2017). IE-Ireland: High Court refuses to strike out presidential candidate's claim over televised election debate. *IRIS*, 2017(6), 16-17. [21].
<http://merlin.obs.coe.int/iris/2017/6/article21.en.html>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

IRIS 2017-6/21

IE-Ireland: High Court refuses to strike out presidential candidate's claim over televised election debate

On 11 April 2017, the High Court delivered a judgment in *Gallagher v. RTE*, concerning a presidential candidate's legal action against the public broadcaster RTE over a 2011 televised election debate. The claim centred on RTE's 2011 election debate, when the presenter had questioned the candidate about a statement concerning him that had just been made on the supposed official Twitter account of another candidate. It later turned out that the tweet had been attributed, in error, to the official Twitter account of the other candidate. In March 2012, the Broadcasting Authority of Ireland (BAI) held that the programme had been in breach of section 39(1)(b) of the Broadcasting Act 2009, being "unfair" to the candidate (see IRIS 2012-5/27). However, The Committee decided that the complaint was not of such a serious nature as to warrant an investigation or public hearing.

Nonetheless, in the High Court action, the candidate, who had not been elected, claimed RTE had acted negligently in putting the question to him over the tweet, and sought to undermine his credibility. The candidate also claimed RTE directed the debate with the improper aim of altering the course of the election, that RTE promoted the electoral chances of another candidate, and that RTE's conduct was targeted malice that was intended to damage him.

Many legal claims against Irish media result in protracted and expensive proceedings, and while the candidate's legal action had been initiated in 2013, it was still ongoing in 2017. Therefore, RTE sought an order dismissing the action, due to a failure of the candidate to make proper discovery to RTE (i.e. disclose relevant documentation). RTE claimed that the candidate had failed to make voluntary discovery over a year after RTE made the request, and six months after a court order.

In its judgment, the High Court held that two of candidate's affidavits were deficient, he had failed to swear an affidavit in the appropriate form, failed to make discovery of certain relevant metadata that he holds, and had failed, more generally, to make proper discovery of the documentation (including electronically stored information) in his possession or power. The High Court judge stated that "while I do not find that default to be wilful or contumelious, I am driven to the conclusion, in the context of the evidence I have sought to summarise, that it was negligent. Nonetheless, I do not think that it has yet compromised the prospect of a fair trial to the extent that the justice of the case warrants an order striking out the proceedings". Therefore, the Court dismissed RTE's request for the claim to be struck out. Instead, the Court ordered that the proceeding should continue, made various orders compelling the candidate to make proper discovery, and ordered both parties to indemnify 50% of the costs.

• *Gallagher v. RTE* [2017] IEHC 237
<http://merlin.obs.coe.int/redirect.php?id=18507>

EN

Ronan Ó Fathaigh

Institute for Information Law (IViR), University of Amsterdam

The objective of IRIS is to publish information on legal and law-related policy developments that are relevant to the European audiovisual sector. Despite our efforts to ensure the accuracy of the content, the ultimate responsibility for the truthfulness of the facts on which we report is with the authors of the articles. Any opinions expressed in the articles are personal and should in no way be interpreted as representing the views of any organisations represented in its editorial board.

© European Audiovisual Observatory, Strasbourg (France)