



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

IE-Ireland: Broadcaster's prank call violated public official's privacy

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: Broadcaster's prank call violated public official's privacy. *IRIS*, 2017(2), 14-15. [20]. <http://merlin.obs.coe.int/iris/2017/2/article20.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 2017-2/20

IE-Ireland: Broadcaster's prank call violated public official's privacy

On 21 December 2016, the Broadcasting Authority of Ireland (BAI) held that a prank call made by a broadcaster to a state agency employee violated Principle 7 of the BAI Code of Programme Standards on respect for privacy. The programme concerned was the Nick Richards Show, which is a music-driven show broadcast on weekday mornings. During a July 2016 broadcast, a prank call was made to an employee of the State Examinations Commission (SEC) by a member of the show, as part of a pre-recorded daily comedy spot featuring prank calls. The call usually ends with the presenter revealing the prank nature of the call; however, on the occasion in question, the SEC employee ended the conversation before the "reveal".

The SEC made a complaint to the BAI on behalf of its employee, as it had a "duty of care to protect the interests of its employees". It argued that its employee had not been informed before or after the call that it had been recorded, and the employee "would not have consented" to the material being broadcast. It was argued that the broadcast violated the employee's right to privacy recognised under Principle 7 of the BAI Code of Programme Standards.

The BAI's Compliance Committee decided to uphold the complaint. First, the Committee noted that Principle 7 of the BAI Code of Programme Standards recognises that individuals have a right to privacy. As such, "broadcasters are required to respect, and not unreasonably encroach upon the privacy of the individual, either in the manner in which programmes are made or broadcast". Secondly, the Committee also noted that under Principle 7, "broadcasters are obliged to have due regard for the concept of individual consent and ensure that participants in a broadcast are generally aware of the subject matter, context and the nature and format of their contribution so that their agreement to participate constitutes informed consent". The BAI held that, having regard to the fact that the recording of the caller was broadcast without the caller's consent, "the caller's privacy was encroached upon unreasonably. There had thus been a violation of the Code of Programme Standards.

- Broadcasting Authority of Ireland, Broadcasting Complaint Decisions, December 2016, p. 18
<http://merlin.obs.coe.int/redirect.php?id=18314>

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)