

To whomever it concerns

I am writing to complain about a number of clear breaches of the OFCOM Code that occurred during "Good Morning Britain" (GMB) broadcast on ITV1 on Friday 9th February 2024.

The breaches occurred during and in interview conducted by Kate Garraway and Ben Shephard with Mr Martin Hibbert. The broadcast aired at 8:26am (Duration 10 minutes).

Multiple breaches occurred under Section 5 and 7 of the OFCOM Code.

Mr Hibbert is the complainant in an ongoing civil case brought against the defendant Mr Richard D. Hall. The case has significant public interest and has been widely reported in the mainstream media.

The claimants' (Mr Hibbert's) case asserts that Mr Hall's claim---that the Manchester Arena bombing in 2017 did not occur as described by the UK Government---amounts to harassment and GDPR breaches.

This is a matter of major political controversy related to UK government national security policy.

As noted in your recent ruling with regard to the opinions of Mr Richard Tice, aired by Mr Martin Daubney:

"The Code is clear that when programmes are dealing with matters of major political controversy [. . .] heightened impartiality requirements apply. Specifically, rules 5.11 and 5.12 require that an appropriately wide range of significant views must be included and given due weight in such programmes."

Further your ruling specified:

"Mr Tice presented his views [. . .] with insufficient challenge"

and:

"The programme [. . .] did not include and give due weight to an appropriately wide range of significant views.

The same, and further, breaches occurred during GMB's interview with Mr Martin Hibbert.

OFCOM Code Section 5 Breaches

5.11 GMB did not act impartially. They did not ask Mr Hall for comment and only broadcast

the opinion of Mr Martin Hibbert. GMB clearly favoured one side of an ongoing case---that has garnered significant national interest and has major policy implication---over another. GMB acted without any due impartiality, let alone "heightened impartiality."

5.12 GMB did not even mention the significant views of Mr Hall and failed to give them any weight whatsoever.

The following views and facts were misrepresented by GMB as they allowed Mr Hibbert to express his opinion without any question or challenge.

1. GMB stated "a conspiracy theorist claimed that nights tragic events didn't happen": – Mr Hall is an investigative journalist who has presented evidence suggesting what happened was not as described. He is not a "conspiracy theorist" and does not allege "events didn't happened."

2. Mr Hibbert claimed Mr Hall posted a video discussing Mr Hibbert in the summer of 2018: - This is false and the timing of this is crucial to the ongoing litigation and Mr Hall's defence. GMB jeopardised Mr Hall's defence by broadcasting factual errors.

3. Mr Hibbert claimed to have been shown photographs of himself at Manchester Arena: - This was accepted as fact by GMB news but challenging this claim is central to Mr Hall's defence. As there is no public record of the alleged images and no court has ever seen them, Mr Hall questions their existence. GMB did not report this to their national audience and jeopardised Mr Hall's defence.

4. Mr Hibbert claimed Mr Hall put a video of his daughter on the internet: - This is false and was not challenged by GMB.

5. Mr Hibbert claimed Mr Hall attacked his daughter: - This is false. Mr Hall sought to investigate and verify where and when Mr Hibbert and his daughter sustained their injuries. He has conducted his investigation in a legitimate and respectful manner. He is an investigative journalist researching an important story of national interest. He has not "attacked" anyone. GMB accepted and reported Mr Hibbert's claim as fact. This is false and, again, GMB jeopardised Mr Hall's defence.

6. Mr Hibbert claimed Mr Hall thinks Eve Hibbert is an actor: - This is false. Mr Hall has made no such claim.

7. Mr Hibbert claimed Mr Hall thinks Mr Hibbert's spinal injuries are not real: - This is false. Mr Hall has made no such claim.

8. Mr Hibbert claimed the GMB interview was the first time he has spoken about his case with Mr Hall: - This is false. Mr Hibbert has spoken about the case with the media on a number of previous occasions.

9. Mr Hibbert claimed Mr Hall put a camera in his family's garden: - This is false. Mr Hall did no such thing

OFCOM Code Section 7 Breaches

GMB only reported the views and opinion of Mr Hibbert in the midst of an ongoing legal case. They gave Mr Hall (the defendant) no opportunity to respond. GMB did not invite Mr Hall to offer any comment and did not report any of the evidence that Mr Hall has uncovered with regard to the Manchester Arena bombing.

GMB treated Mr Hall unjustly and unfairly and breached OFCOM Code 7.1.

GMB disregarded, omitted and misrepresented claimed "facts" in a way that was unfair to Mr Hall. They did not offer Mr Hall and opportunity to contribute and breached OFCOM Code 7.9.

GMB portrayed alleged facts, events and Mr Hall in a manner that was unfair to Mr Hall and breached OFCOM Code 7.10

GMB allowed Mr Hibbert to allege significant wrongdoing against Mr Hall, during an ongoing trial, and gave Mr Hall no opportunity to respond and breached OFCOM Code 7.11

GMB misrepresented the views of Mr Hall and breached OFCOM Code 7.13

Thank you for considering this complaint.