# Topic Two – Defamation (CoA)

## 1. Defamatory Matter

[x] may be liable for the tort of defamation against [y] for [z], which aims to protect an individuals reputation (Tolley; s 8 UDA) It is within the 1yr limitation period (s 5(1AAA) LAA), which may have been extended to 3 yrs (s 23B LAA). The judge is to determine whether the defamatory imputations are capable of being pleaded, and at trial by either judge of jury to make the final decision.

#### a. What Is Matter?

## s 4 Defamation Act (2005)

'Matter' includes:

- a) Article, report, advertisement or other thing communicated by means of a newspaper, magazine or other periodical, and
- b) Program, report, advertisement or other thing communicated by means of TV, radio, Internet or any other form of electronic communication, and
- c) A letter, note or other writing, and
- d) A picture, gesture or oral utterance, and
- e) Any other thing by means something may be communicated to a person.

## Monson v Tussauds Ltd [1894] Wax figure with gun, in room of known criminals

- Doesn't really matter how defamation is communicated
  - o Publication in permanent form, but doesn't need to be words.
- Defamatory because it suggests Monson was guilty

# b. What Imputations Are Conveyed By The Material?

#### **Multiple Imputations'**

• <u>s 8 UDA</u>: A person has a *single cause of action* for defamation in relation to the publication of defamatory matter about the person *even if more than one defamatory imputation* about the person is carried by the matter

#### Roles of plaintiff, defendant, judge and jury

- Plaintiff: Commence COA. Particularise meaning they have relied on
  - So D knows what they are to offend
  - Put the most serious spin the enhance damages
  - o Amend pleadings? If variant or nuisance and no more injurious
- Defendant: Options:
  - 1. Accept P's imputations and just say they aren't carried.
  - 2. Try have P's imputations stuck out at interlocutory stage Court may strike certain imputations.
  - 3. Accept imputations but raise defences.
  - Assert other imputation if *variant*, & no more injurious **Hore-Lacey**
- Judge: Up to judge to decide whether imputations pleaded are capable of bearing those meanings. If yes, will go to trial. (Judge or Jury)
  - o Up to judge to decide that material is capable of being defamatory?
- Jury: To decide if trial by jury

#### **Types of Meanings**

- Natural and ordinary meaning: conveyed directly
  - o *Meaning publication would convey* to an ordinary person **(Tolley)** 
    - Hard for D to argue against the meaning
- Natural and ordinary meaning: inferred
  - o *Implied, inferred or indirect* meaning capable of being detected from language itself by *ordinary reader* (incl public knowledge?)
- True (or legal) innuendo
  - Where a person has *extrinsic knowledge*, the otherwise innocent publication may become defamatory. **(Tolley)** 
    - Prove at least 1 reader has extrinsic fact at time of publication

# **Tolley v Fry [1930]**

- Facts: Ad caricature of amateur golfer with chocolate bar unauthorised
- *Imputation:* P agreed to have his image used; for payment; prostituted his reputation as an amateur pro-golfer, seeking notoriety and gain; guilty of conduct unworthy of his status
- Held: In context, unauthorised caricature was regarded as imputing he had done something inconsistent with his status.
  - o Capable of being drawn by ordinary reader? v true innuendo?

### **Single Meaning Rule**

- Court affirmed long-standing CL rule that you have to *decide on a single meaning on a single imputation* where multiple can be read. **(Cornes)** 
  - o i.e. Girlfriend = lesbian v friend

## c. Is The Matter Defamatory?

#### Tests for Defamation:

- 1. Injure reputation of another by exposing to *hatred, contempt or ridicule* (Parmiter)
- 2. Lower plaintiff in estimation of right thinking/ordinary members of society (Sim per Lord Atkin) Issue: Moral judgement?
  - Mallik: Tendency test: don't need to show actual adverse damage
  - Byrne v Deane:
    - → Facts: Report of illegal gambling. Anon note: But he who gave the game away, May he byrne in hell and rue the day.
    - → Imputation: Underhand disloyalty to fellow club members.
    - → Held: Even though some may consider trivial, right thinking man cannot ever view reporting a crime as defamation.
- 3. Cause people to *shun and avoid* **(Youssoupoff per** Slesser LJ)
  - Cf. test 2: No moral discredit, just shun & avoid. Not reputation?
    - → Sexual impurity cases
    - → Disease cases
    - → Insanity cases
- 4. Display in *ridiculous light / expose to ridicule* without moral blame **(Boyd)** 
  - Fat and slow couldn't play his position (NO)
  - So fat was ridiculous (YES) In ridiculous light but not disparaging
  - Let condition to degenerate; hopeless player (YES) impute fault (2)
  - Publish naked photo: think consented (YES) (**Ettingshausen**)