

**IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION**  
*UNDER THE CIArb/IMPRESS ARBITRATION SCHEME RULES*  
*AND THE ARBITRATION ACT 1996*

**BETWEEN**

**Alexander Robert Bailey**

*Claimant*

– and –

**Dorset Eye Ltd**

*(Company Number: 12493520)*

**Deborah Anne Cridland**

**Jason Richard Cridland**

*Respondents*

---

**POINTS OF CLAIM**

---

Arbitration Reference: DAS-01218-Y0S3H

Arbitrator: Clive Thorne FCIArb

Date of Submission: 28 May 2025

## KEY TO REFERENCE AND STRUCTURE

*This document constitutes the Claimant's formal Points of Claim in support of arbitration under the CIArb/IMPRESS Arbitration Scheme Rules and the Arbitration Act 1996. Section and page references are provided for the convenience of the Arbitrator and the parties. Where appropriate, references to annexed evidence are provided in brackets (e.g., [A1], [A8]).*

### **1. Parties (pp. 5–6)**

Sets out the identities and roles of the Claimant and Respondents, including their respective publishing, web hosting, and social media infrastructure.

### **2. Jurisdiction (p. 7)**

Describes the legal and regulatory basis for this arbitration, with reference to the Impress regulatory framework and the parties' acceptance of CIArb/IMPRESS procedures.

### **3. Background and Factual History (pp. 8–9)**

Chronological narrative of the Claimant's local activism and events leading to the Respondents' publication conduct and subsequent dispute.

### **4. Procedural History (pp. 10–11)**

Summarises the procedural course from initial complaints and host interventions through to arbitration, including correspondence with web hosts and IMPRESS.

### **5. Impugned Publications / Events (pp. 12–30)**

Comprehensive breakdown of core defamatory articles (a) to (q), with cross-referenced archived URLs and annexed full-text PDFs.

Also details:

- **Offline conduct**, including the distribution of a defamatory leaflet during the 2024 local election, referencing Dorset Eye articles and subject to police investigation [A8];
- **Third-party harassment** (notably of Mr Mark Vine and Mrs Kate Robson), including anonymous or pseudonymous attacks traceable to Respondents' infrastructure;
- **Evasive hosting and digital behaviour**, including domain migrations, Cloudflare proxying, and repeated takedown circumvention;
- **Amplification tactics**, including coordinated social media sharing, AI-generated article reproduction, and persistent republication across multiple platforms.

## **6. Issues for Determination (pp. 31–33)**

Sets out the core factual and legal issues arising under the IMPRESS Standards Code and the Defamation Act 2013 for the Arbitrator’s decision.

## **7. Legal and Evidential Grounds (pp. 34–36)**

Details the statutory, regulatory, and case law framework for the claim, including analysis of relevant authorities and standards.

## **8. Impact and Harm (pp. 37–39)**

Outlines the reputational, psychological, professional, and electoral consequences suffered by the Claimant, with specific reference to financial losses, time expenditure, and police complaints [A6], [A7], [A8].

## **9. Aggravating Factors (pp. 40–41)**

Highlights aggravating circumstances, such as repeated republication, digital evasion, bad faith conduct, and prior regulatory violations (notably the Laura Hitchcock case [A5]).

## **10. Relief and Remedies Sought (pp. 42–44)**

Itemises the remedies requested by the Claimant, including declarations, mandatory takedown, apology at original URLs, damages, and indemnity for legal costs.

## **11. List of Evidence and Annexes**

Key exhibits, indexed for cross-reference. All full-text articles and correspondence listed below have already been provided to the Arbitrator and Respondent via email, with PDFs and archival URLs included.

- **A1:** Full Text of Impugned Articles (a–q)  
(PDFs and URLs for all principal and supplementary articles, as listed in Section 5)
- **A2:** Email Correspondence with Hosting Providers  
(20i Limited, Hostinger, Cloudflare)
- **A3:** Claimant Arbitration Request Form
- **A4:** Portland Port Press Release Archive
- **A5:** IMPRESS Complaints History (Laura Hitchcock, 2022)
- **A6:** DORSETEYE.co.uk Domain and Hosting Receipts (£204.89)
- **A7:** Candidate Spending Return for 2024 Parish Elections

- **A8: Police Reports and Defamatory Leaflet Evidence**  
(Copies of Dorset Police correspondence, leaflet distributed in Littlemoor/Preston, and supporting evidence of campaign harm and Claimant's response)

## **12. Statement of Truth (p. 45)**

A sworn declaration by the Claimant, attesting to the truth of the facts and submissions set out in this document.

## **1. Parties**

1.1 The Claimant, Alexander Robert Bailey, is a private individual residing in Weymouth, Dorset. He is a former local campaigner who was publicly involved in the “No To The Barge” (NTTB) protest movement, which opposed the stationing of the Bibby Stockholm asylum barge in Portland. Mr Bailey has no affiliation with any far-right, xenophobic, or extremist organisations. His involvement in the campaign was grounded in legitimate civic concern, democratic engagement, and peaceful public discourse.

1.2 The NTTB campaign began as a Facebook group named “Portland Immigration Barge Discussions (aka Barge Bitchin’),” created by Amy Sharpe. Mrs Sharpe added the Claimant as an administrator without his prior knowledge or consent. The group was later renamed “No To The Barge” and has since undergone an ideological shift. It is currently titled “W&P Standing Against Starmer & Socialism,” and its membership has dropped from nearly 5,000 to under 500. The Claimant has had no administrative role or editorial input in the group’s activities or direction since late 2023.

1.3 The First Respondent, Dorset Eye Ltd, is a private limited company incorporated in England and Wales under Company Number 12493520. The company was incorporated on 2 March 2020 and remains active. It owns and operates the news and opinion website [www.dorseteye.com](http://www.dorseteye.com) and is regulated by IMPRESS, the independent press regulator.

1.4 The company previously operated under the name Dorset@Eye Ltd (Company Number 08531149), incorporated on 16 May 2013, and formally dissolved on 1 September 2015.

1.5 The Second Respondent, Deborah Anne Cridland, is a director of Dorset Eye Ltd and serves as co-editor of the website. She holds joint responsibility for its editorial policy, publication of online content, and moderation of its social media activity.

1.6 The Third Respondent, Jason Richard Cridland, is a director and principal editor of Dorset Eye Ltd. According to his publicly available LinkedIn profile, he describes himself as an independent journalist. He is understood to be the primary author of the defamatory articles and associated content forming the basis of this claim. He is further responsible for managing and distributing that content via both the Dorset Eye website and a network of affiliated social media platforms. Some of the impugned material is believed to have been published or disseminated under pseudonyms, including “Liz Bladon” and “Penny Lane,” and further shared or endorsed under the name “David Owens.”

1.7 The Respondents are administrators or moderators of a large network of public Facebook groups and pages which they have used to publish, republish, and disseminate defamatory and harassing content. These include:

- “Weymouth & Portland: News and Views” (approx. 31,200 members)
- “Dorchester: News and Views” (approx. 37,100 members)
- “Bridport: News and Views” (approx. 9,500 members)
- “Swanage: News and Views” (approx. 2,300 members)
- “Bournemouth: News and Views” (approx. 2,700 members)
- “Dorset Eye” Facebook page (approx. 5,200 followers)
- “Dorset Eye” Facebook group (approx. 8,200 members)
- “NO TO THE BARGE (WITHOUT THE RACISTS)” (approx. 300 members), created in August 2023

These platforms were established by the Respondents on or around January 2018 (with the exception of the Dorset Eye page and group created in 2012 and 2014 respectively). They have since been used repeatedly to share defamatory content concerning the Claimant, to coordinate harassment against him and other individuals, including Mrs Kate Robson, and to perpetuate false narratives impugning the Claimant’s reputation and motives.

1.8 The Respondents amplifies their allegations across multiple platforms, deploying both their own and third-party channels:

- Website & Facebook: The primary home for their articles and Facebook groups under the Dorset Eye banner.
- X (formerly Twitter): @dorset\_eye (22,300 followers)
- YouTube: Dorset Eye channel (@DorsetEye) (1,200 subscribers; 343 videos). Notably, on 7 December 2024 he uploaded “When Humanity Overcame The Dark Side In Weymouth & Portland” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kvm-vcowFMw>—a 249-view video, credited to “David Owens,” portraying local “anti-asylum seeker racists” as being “overwhelmed by the decency” of refugees and community members. The use of this pseudonym underscores a broader practice of masking authorship to propagate defamatory narratives.
- Bluesky: @dorseteye.bsky.social (757 followers, 714 following, 228 posts)

## **2. Jurisdiction**

2.1 This claim is brought under the CIArb/IMPRESS Arbitration Scheme, administered pursuant to the Arbitration Act 1996.

2.2 The Respondents are members of IMPRESS and fall within the regulatory jurisdiction of the scheme, which provides for binding arbitration in civil claims relating to defamation and similar media-related harms.

2.3 The subject matter of this claim—namely, the publication and republication of allegedly defamatory material via a regulated online platform—falls squarely within the scope of the IMPRESS scheme and the substantive law of England and Wales.

2.4 The designated arbitration number is DAS-01218-Y0S3H, and the matter is currently before Clive Thorne, the appointed arbitrator under the rules of the Scheme.

### 3. Background and Factual History

3.1 In early August 2023, the Respondent's website, *Dorset Eye* ([www.dorseteye.com](http://www.dorseteye.com)), published an article entitled "Fear, Grievance, and Hate: How a Community Became Radicalised" (11 August 2023), which falsely portrayed the Claimant as the ringleader of a "campaign of hatred" and as having "radicalised" members of the Weymouth & Portland community into racism.

3.2 Over the following years, the Respondents continued to publish a series of articles and social-media posts attributing to the Claimant a range of defamatory allegations, including, but not limited to:

- leadership of a "band of merry racists" who intentionally harmed the local economy;
- organising anti-refugee "invasions" and spreading "fear, racism and hatred";
- fabricating quotes from the Claimant's mother accusing the government of genocidal conduct;
- associating the Claimant with far-right, Islamophobic and xenophobic material.

3.3 Many of these publications were authored under pseudonyms (for example "Liz Bladon", "Penny Lane" or "David Owens") and repeatedly republished—often without correction—by the Respondents across their website and affiliated Facebook pages and groups.

3.4 The Claimant has never engaged in or endorsed any extremist or racist activity. His sole public involvement was as an administrator of a Facebook group formed in mid-2023 to debate the proposed Bibby Stockholm barge—originally titled "Portland Immigration Barge Discussions (aka Barge Bitchin')"—which he ceased to administer in late 2023 and which has since been rebranded entirely.

3.5 Beginning in early 2024, the Claimant notified the Respondents' web hosts of the defamatory content. On 1 February 2024, 20i Limited terminated the Respondents' account and removed multiple articles. The Respondents then migrated to Hostinger, only to have their site suspended again in February 2024 following further complaints. Thereafter, they relocated to an overseas host—Virtual Systems LLC (Ukraine)—using Cloudflare to conceal their actual hosting provider, and republished the same defamatory material.

3.6 In parallel, the Respondents used their Facebook network (including "Weymouth & Portland: News and Views" and its sister groups) to repost the impugned articles, to harass the Claimant and

third parties (notably Mrs Kate Robson and Mr Mark Vine) and to impersonate the Claimant via fake profiles.

3.7 By January 2025, the Claimant estimated he had invested in excess of 160 hours documenting and countering the Respondents' ongoing defamation and harassment, which has had a profound impact on his personal wellbeing, public reputation and continuing civic engagement.

## **4. Procedural History**

### **4.1 29 April 2024 – Initial Assessment & Stay**

IMPRESS's Regulatory Committee determined that the Claimant's request satisfied the criteria for defamation but not for malicious falsehood or harassment. On notification from Dorset Police of an active investigation that might be prejudiced by arbitration, the Committee "stayed any consideration of arbitration until further notice."

### **4.2 13 December 2024 – Request to Reopen**

The Claimant wrote to IMPRESS, copying the Dorset Police investigator, to confirm that the referenced inquiry (Dorset Police ref. 55240057083) had concluded in May 2024 and asked that arbitration resume.

### **4.3 16 January 2025 – Confirmation of No Ongoing Investigation**

IMPRESS advised both parties that Dorset Police had confirmed there were no live investigations affecting the arbitration, and invited the Claimant to confirm whether he wished to proceed.

### **4.4 7 February 2025 – Formal Application**

The Claimant submitted his Form 7A (Request for Arbitration), alleging 17 defamatory articles and related conduct between August 2023 and January 2025.

### **4.5 4 April 2025 – Exchange of Statements of Case**

- 11:52 AM: Claimant served his detailed "Full Text of 5 Impugned Articles and Additional Context (Part 1)."
- 2:56 PM: Claimant served his detailed "Full Text of 5 Impugned Articles and Additional Context (Part 2)."
- 4:11 PM: Respondents confirmed removal of five of six articles "approximately a year ago," denied creating fake accounts, and undertook to file a point-by-point response with evidence.
- 4:15 PM: Arbitrator Gerald Simpson KC acknowledged both positions and noted no timetable objections.
- 4:56 PM: Arbitrator invited Claimant to confirm waiver of an oral hearing.
- 6:36 PM: Claimant agreed to the timetable, waived an oral hearing, and reiterated that Articles 1, 4 & 5 remained live online, with Article 6 accessible via redirect.

#### 4.6 14 April 2025 – Change of Arbitrator

At 4:03 PM, Gerald Simpson KC notified the parties that, “for personal reasons, I have to step down from this arbitration.” Both Claimant and Respondents expressed their thanks and understanding. IMPRESS/CI Arb subsequently appointed Mr Clive Thorne as Arbitrator.

#### 4.7 May 2025 – Confirmation of Compliance with Directions

- Evidence Provided: The Claimant has already served, via emails dated 4 April 2025, full copies of the original and republished versions of Articles 1–5 (the “Full Text of 5 Impugned Articles and Additional Context (Part 1 & 2)” bundles).
- Points of Claim: The Claimant has confirmed (by 16 May 2025) that he will submit fresh Points of Claim rather than rely solely on his annexed summary. He will serve those Points of Claim by the 30 May 2025 deadline.
- Respondents’ Defence: The Respondents remain obliged to file their formal Response by 13 June 2025.
- Next Procedural Step: An online directions hearing will take place during the week commencing 23 June 2025, at which the Arbitrator will resolve any outstanding procedural or evidential matters prior to the substantive hearing. In preparation for this hearing, the Arbitrator has issued the following instruction:

“I am not prepared to consider documents arising after the date of the commencement of the arbitration submitted by either party on a piecemeal or daily basis.

If either party wishes to apply for the admissibility of such documents at the directions hearing, would they please identify and list them individually, identified by the date and title of each document, in a separate document and supply copies to me and to the other party as an enclosure to a single email at least 3 days in advance of the directions hearing.

The other party will be entitled to make submissions as to the admissibility of such documents at the directions hearing.”

— *Clive Thorne, Arbitrator, 15 May 2025*

- This previous instruction applies equally to both parties and is intended to promote procedural fairness and efficiency in managing post-commencement materials.

## 5. Impugned Publications / Events

5.1 Since August 2023, the Second and Third Respondents through their publication Dorset Eye and associated websites and social media accounts, has engaged in a sustained campaign of publication that has been substantially defamatory, harassing, and misleading toward the Claimant. This conduct has included the use of pseudonyms, republishing of removed content, and the circumvention of takedown actions by changing web hosts and article titles. Many of these publications have directly or implicitly identified the Claimant associating him with racism, extremism, and criminal harm to the community—all without evidence.

5.2 The following publications form the core of this claim. They were disseminated on the Dorset Eye website and republished across various platforms including Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), and external websites such as The Prisma and Anarchist Federation.

### (a) "Fear, Grievance and Hate: How a Community Became Radicalised"

Original publication: 11 August 2023

Archived: <https://web.archive.org/web/20230811195311/https://dorseteye.com/fear-grievance-and-hate-how-a-community-became-radicalised/>

Republished after takedown:

- <https://web.archive.org/web/20240218004701/https://dorseteye.com/fear-grievance-and-hate-how-a-community-became-radicalised/>
- <https://web.archive.org/web/20240313114458/https://dorseteye.com/fear-grievance-and-hate-how-a-community-became-radicalised/>

This article, published anonymously but attributed to "Liz Bladon," makes a series of severe, defamatory allegations against the Claimant. It accuses the Claimant of having "radicalised" the Weymouth and Portland communities, operating a "campaign of hatred," and associating with far-right extremists. The article repeatedly refers to the Claimant by name, describing him as a "keen liar," "narcissist," and comparing his conduct to fascist agitators. It further implies that the Claimant incited racism and contributed to online and real-world abuse, including threats of violence.

The article's tone fails to distinguish between fact and opinion, in breach of Clause 1.2 of the IMPRESS Standards Code. Its allegations are bolstered by selectively cropped screenshots and partial quotations, all presented without verifiable context. The author purports to cite racist material supposedly shared by the Claimant or his associates, yet these either did not originate from the Claimant or are presented without evidence, attribution, or explanation. The Claimant is also

falsely accused of circulating “a litany of screenshots” about non-white offenders and is linked—via the Respondents’ own file-naming conventions—to so-called “Baileys-Racism,” as evidenced by the URLs below:

- <https://dorseteye.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Baileys-Racism-2-295x300.jpg>
- <https://dorseteye.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Baileys-Racism-3-300x275.jpg>
- <https://dorseteye.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Baileys-Racism-229x300.jpg>

In reality, the Claimant had simply shared unedited articles from trusted mainstream outlets without commentary or alteration. To falsely recast these neutral links as acts of racial provocation—and then to encode this smear directly into the image filenames—is not merely misleading; it is a calculated and pernicious attempt to brand the Claimant a racist in the public eye.

The byline “Liz Bladon” is highly likely to be fictitious. No such individual appears in the local electoral register or group membership records. The two Facebook profiles bearing the name "Liz Bladon" were created approximately three weeks after the article’s first publication, and both were used solely to promote the article before being deleted. The author was not credited in third-party republications (e.g. by The Prisma or Anarchist Federation), strongly suggesting that the true author is Mr Jason Cridland, operator of Dorset Eye.

Furthermore, the article contains numerous factual inaccuracies, including an unsubstantiated quote supposedly from the Claimant's mother and the misleading claim that the Claimant posted a “Britain First” video—when the original video came from TikTok and was created by third-party users with no far-right affiliation. Other quoted remarks are falsely attributed or lifted out of context, including a heavily edited excerpt from a GB News interview. The repeated republication of this article, even after two web hosts removed it for breach of their terms of service, further aggravates the defamation.

Of particular concern is the misleading introductory claim—added during its 2024 republication—that “legal experts have assessed the content and are now pursuing legal action against a number of parties,” and that the article forms the basis for “at least two ongoing documentaries and a series of national and international articles.” This appears to be a calculated attempt to lend the article false credibility and intimidate the Claimant, especially given that no such legal action has ever materialised.

**(b) “Local organisations in Weymouth and Portland ‘disgusted’ with ‘Herr Bailey’ and the racist ‘No To The Barge Group’”**

Original publication: 1 September 2023

Archived link: <https://web.archive.org/web/20230904133126/https://dorseteye.com/local-organisations-in-weymouth-and-portland-disgusted-with-herr-bailey-and-the-racist-no-to-the-berge-group/>

This article falsely attributes outrage to unnamed “local organisations” regarding the Claimant’s alleged leadership of a “racist” group, without providing evidence of any such organisational statements or identities. The headline alone, which refers to the Claimant as “Herr Bailey,” employs a Germanic epithet suggestive of Nazi affiliation—an implication that is both offensive and defamatory, and in breach of Clause 4.1 (Discrimination) and Clause 1.2 (Distinction between Fact and Opinion) of the IMPRESS Standards Code.

The piece proceeds to present inflammatory value judgments—such as accusations of leading a “vile racist diatribe”—as fact, without supporting quotes or verifiable sources. It further alleges that the Claimant, under the alias “Backtrack Bailey,” was actively sabotaging efforts to welcome asylum seekers by stuffing bags of toiletries—an anecdote neither evidenced nor credible. The article’s author claims to discern this from an online video’s live chat, a source that cannot support the allegation and appears entirely fictitious.

This piece forms part of a wider pattern of pseudonymous publication and reputational targeting by the Respondents. In addition to the fabricated byline “Liz Bladon,” the Respondents have also disseminated content under the name “Penny Lane”—a pop culture reference to a Beatles song, not a verifiable individual. These fabricated identities are used to mask authorship and lend a false sense of community consensus.

Taken together, the tone, language, and lack of verification render this article a clear example of targeted character assassination. It creates the false impression of widespread institutional condemnation of the Claimant and attributes moral culpability for racism and community division to him—assertions wholly unsubstantiated and seriously harmful to reputation. The article was ultimately removed by both 20i Limited and Hostinger for breaches of their acceptable use policies, but has not, to date, been republished.

**(c) “GB News exposes Alex Bailey admitting that his band of merry racists intentionally hurt Weymouth economy”**

Original publication: 11 September 2023

Archived link: <https://web.archive.org/web/20230912054643/https://dorseteye.com/gb-news->

[exposes-alex-bailey-admitting-that-his-band-of-merry-racists-intentionally-hurt-weymouth-economy/](#)

This article, attributed to the pseudonym “Penny Lane” (a known Beatles reference and further example of pseudonymous publication), was removed by two web hosts—20i Limited and Hostinger—for breaching acceptable use policies. It has not been reinstated.

The article accuses the Claimant of orchestrating a Facebook campaign to “troll Dorset” by spreading “fear and disinformation” and attributes to him personally a string of extreme ideologies—namely racism, Islamophobia, xenophobia, and far-right propaganda. It further alleges that the Claimant’s actions intentionally harmed the Weymouth economy by prompting the cancellation of cruise ship visits to Portland Port.

These accusations are factually inaccurate and gravely defamatory. At no point has the Claimant admitted or implied that he caused economic disruption or led a group with such motivations. The Claimant’s media appearance on GB News, referenced by the article, includes no such admission. The article misrepresents the facts and fails to substantiate its claims, in breach of Clauses 1.1–1.3 of the IMPRESS Standards Code.

Moreover, the assertion that the Claimant caused £400,000 in losses is misleading. Portland Port’s official press release (since removed from its website but preserved via archive) only stated that it was in the process of “gathering information to establish the full facts behind the cancellation.” The port’s estimate was based on generalised industry averages for passenger spend and not on any direct causal assessment of the protest or any individual’s involvement.

Press release archived here:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20240808175533/https://www.portland-port.co.uk/public/files/PRESS%20RELEASES%20%26%20NEWS/2023/>

[Counting%20the%20cost%20of%20Cancellation%20for%20website%2011\\_07\\_2023.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20240808175533/https://www.portland-port.co.uk/public/files/Counting%20the%20cost%20of%20Cancellation%20for%20website%2011_07_2023.pdf)

The article’s tone and unsubstantiated claims present serious harm under Section 1 of the Defamation Act 2013 and further support the Claimant’s assertion that the Respondents have engaged in harassment by publication under Clause 5 of the IMPRESS Standards Code.

**(d) "Who Let Portlander Simon Avery Back into the No to the Barge Facebook Group?"**

Original publication: 11 March 2024

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/who-let-portlander-simon-avery-back-into-the-no-to-the-barge-facebook-group/>

This article, published anonymously on Dorset Eye and currently hosted on the site's third known server (Virtual Systems LLC, Ukraine), contains highly defamatory, misleading, and inflammatory statements directed at the Claimant. The author—identified only as “Anonymous”—accuses the Claimant of enabling hate speech, mocking anti-racist campaigners, enjoying the abuse of others, and being cowardly for supposedly abandoning the movement “when his feelings were hurt.” It falsely implies that the Claimant failed to act after a serious incident involving a group member (Simon Avery), when in fact the Claimant did remove the individual from the group and can provide documentary evidence of this.

The article includes the following passage:

“I would like to ask him if he’s ready to apologise to the people of Portland for ‘invading’ our island, spreading racism, fear, and hatred. Only to f\*\*\* off when his feelings were ‘hurt.’”

Such language is egregiously defamatory. The term “invading” suggests a violent or unlawful intrusion, while the accusation of “spreading racism, fear and hatred” implies grave moral and social misconduct. These allegations are presented without substantiation, in breach of Clause 1.2 of the IMPRESS Standards Code (Distinction Between Fact and Opinion), and paint the Claimant as a malicious figure. The vulgar suggestion that the Claimant “f\*\*\*ed off” because he was emotionally weak is both personally insulting and reputationally harmful.

The article also purports to relay private conversations with the Claimant, as well as with a journalist from “Dorset News.” These claims are unverified and at times factually inaccurate—particularly the assertion that the Claimant knowingly allowed Avery to remain in the group after misconduct, when, in fact, the Claimant had removed him.

Notably, this piece continued to circulate online after the Claimant’s successful efforts to have previous defamatory content removed by two UK-based web hosts. Due to the Respondent’s use of Cloudflare and foreign hosting infrastructure, the Claimant was initially unable to determine the new host, which deliberately obscured the site’s IP address. This pattern of evasive conduct, coupled with continued publication of false and damaging material, has contributed to a sustained campaign of reputational harm and psychological distress.

**(e) "How the Conservative Government and GB News Stitched Up a Community with Bibby Stockholm"**

Original publication: 7 January 2025

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/how-the-conservative-government-and-gb-news-stitched-up-a-community-with-bibby-stockholm-weymouth-portland-racism/>

This article, published under the pseudonym “Lord Frankly of Shankly,” presents a sweeping and highly partisan narrative about the deployment of the Bibby Stockholm barge in Portland Port. While purporting to expose governmental and media failings, it repeatedly and explicitly maligns the Claimant by name and implication.

The piece singles out the Claimant, Alex Bailey, as one of several “local figures with anti-migrant agendas” who were allegedly platformed by GB News to stir division and racism within the Weymouth and Portland community. The Claimant is further accused of using “loaded language to provoke fear and anger,” and the article explicitly connects him to a rise in “hate speech,” “xenophobia,” and “radicalisation,” all of which are serious and damaging assertions.

These claims lack evidential support and are presented as fact, in breach of Clause 1.2 of the IMPRESS Standards Code, which requires clear distinction between fact and opinion. The article also fails to cite any verifiable source to support the characterisation of the Claimant’s public contributions as racist, inflammatory, or extremist.

Moreover, the article links back to the previously impugned “Fear, Grievance and Hate” piece as a source of validation, compounding the defamatory narrative by creating a cross-referential loop of harmful insinuations.

Separately, the article cites economic harm supposedly caused by protests linked to the No To The Barge campaign. However, Portland Port’s original press release—since removed but preserved via archive—contained qualified and cautious language, stating only that:

“Portland Port calculated the figure using industry statistics based on spend per head by passengers as well as spend by crew and additional revenues for local transport operators and other suppliers. The port is in the process of gathering information to establish the full facts behind the cancellation.”

The article fails to reflect the uncertainty or tentative nature of the economic claim, instead presenting the Claimant as causally responsible for damaging the local economy, in what may constitute a malicious falsehood.

Finally, while the article purports to promote unity and grassroots resistance, it implicitly casts the Claimant and others associated with his former campaign as the primary sources of division, fear, and hate.

**(f) "‘Leader of No To The Barge’ Goes Into Full Denial. Which One Is It, Alex Bailey?"**

Original publication: 27 August 2023

Archived: <https://web.archive.org/web/20230902093252/https://dorseteye.com/leader-of-no-to-the-bergo-goes-into-full-denial-which-one-is-it-alex-bailey/>

Republished under new title: "From the Leader of the Pack to Hiding in the Shadows"

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/from-the-leader-of-the-pack-to-hiding-in-the-shadows/>

This article falsely accuses the Claimant of dishonesty, cowardice, and association with “racists and hate merchants.” The piece claims the Claimant abandoned the “No To The Barge” (NTTB) Facebook group after allegedly being exposed, suggesting he contradicted himself and “succumb[ed] to [his] own venom.” These are highly defamatory insinuations, especially in light of the Claimant’s documented and public departure from the group, which was peaceful and principled.

The article relies heavily on sensational and hostile language, describing the Claimant’s supporters as “odious” and invoking an extended metaphor of a sinking ship, with the Claimant as a deserter. It closes by taunting: “What is going on? Why have you abandoned your ship? Have you been tipped off about the iceberg that is coming?”

The follow-up article (republished under a new URL and title) restates these claims, maintaining defamatory assertions while adding that “legal experts have assessed this content and fully approved its publication.” This statement is unverified and misleading. Despite the Claimant’s repeated denials, the Respondent has continued to insinuate that the Claimant misled the public and media—a claim disproven by contemporaneous documents and the Claimant’s own admissions, which acknowledge his leadership role in NTTB at the time.

The entire narrative arc across both versions of the article is designed to ridicule and delegitimise the Claimant’s public stance while stoking suspicion and contempt. The metaphoric framing (“iceberg coming,” “abandoning ship,” “hiding in the shadows”) reinforces the defamatory suggestion that the Claimant is duplicitous, evasive, and morally compromised. This portrayal—offered without evidence—exceeds the limits of fair comment and constitutes a clear breach of Clauses 1.2 (Accuracy: distinguishing fact and comment), 5.1 (Harassment by publication), and 8.2 (Invented or unverified sources) of the IMPRESS Standards Code.

**(g) “GB News shy away from exposing vile racism”**

Original publication: 16 September 2023

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/gb-news-shy-away-from-exposing-vile-racism/>

This article, published by Dorset Eye under the name "Dorset Eye" (presumed to be Mr Cridland or an associate), unfairly targets the Claimant and GB News journalist Jeff Moody, both of whom were prominently involved in covering and discussing the Bibby Stockholm barge controversy.

The article is littered with unsubstantiated and defamatory commentary that implies both individuals and their broader campaign were aligned with racism, bigotry, or cowardice. The Claimant and Mr Moody are described as "notorious for self-promotion," purveyors of "ill-informed bigotry," and—most egregiously—as "the intellectual equivalents of bowel movements." These statements, couched in inflammatory language, are not only patently false but plainly designed to ridicule and damage reputations without offering any factual basis or substantiating evidence.

Further, the article claims that GB News and its contributors offered "loaded platitudes" and failed to challenge "ignorant fascists"—a deeply prejudicial insinuation that aims to cast the Claimant and others as morally negligent. These phrases are presented not as subjective opinion, but as sweeping assertions about journalistic integrity and community engagement, with no care taken to distinguish fact from opinion as required by Clause 1.2 of the IMPRESS Standards Code.

In tone, language, and content, the article exemplifies deliberate mischaracterisation and reputational harm. Its publication contributes to the pattern of coordinated public denigration already established by other impugned articles, violating standards on both accuracy and harassment by publication.

This article remains publicly accessible.

#### **(h) “Never Mind the Hate as Decent People Welcome Refugees to Bibby Stockholm”**

Original publication: 18 October 2023

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/never-mind-the-hate-as-decent-people-welcome-refugees-to-bibby-stockholm/>

This article, published under the collective byline “Dorset Eye,” was released after two earlier takedowns of the defamatory "Fear" article and continues the same narrative, implicitly referencing the Claimant while attempting to reposition public sentiment against him.

Most notably, the article includes the inflammatory closing line:

“There are monsters among us, but they are being exposed to the world. Don’t let them scare you. We are stronger.”

The use of "monsters among us"—in the context of an article addressing the refugee issue and local opposition—is a thinly veiled reference to the Claimant, already prominently targeted in earlier

articles by the same publisher. This language strongly implies that individuals such as the Claimant are not just mistaken in their views but morally corrupt, dangerous, and deserving of public contempt. Such framing is highly prejudicial and crosses the boundary from advocacy into defamation.

By reiterating this narrative while republishing and linking to previously impugned content, the Respondents have sustained a pattern of targeting the Claimant through coded language and associational defamation. The article portrays those who oppose the Bibby Stockholm barge not as political actors with dissenting views, but as malicious threats to community values—without naming the Claimant directly, yet continuing a clear pattern of attribution understood by any reasonable reader familiar with previous Dorset Eye publications.

The phrase “we are stronger” closes the article with a rallying call against those branded as “monsters”—a rhetorical tactic aimed at isolating, vilifying, and excluding individuals associated with the No To The Barge campaign, particularly the Claimant.

This continued demonisation, in context and tone, breaches Clause 1.2 of the IMPRESS Standards Code (distinction between fact and opinion) and Clause 5.1 (harassment by publication), particularly given the prior takedown history of similar material and the Respondent’s refusal to desist.

**(i) “Statement from the Independent Media Association re the defamation and intimidation of the team at Dorset Eye”**

Original publication: 30 September 2023

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/statement-from-the-independent-media-association-re-the-defamation-and-intimidation-of-the-team-at-dorset-eye/>

This article, attributed to the Independent Media Association and published on Dorset Eye, makes serious and unsubstantiated claims that harm the Claimant’s reputation by falsely associating him with criminal, far-right, and extremist behaviour. The article purports to defend the Dorset Eye team from alleged harassment, stating that individuals “associated with the article’s subjects” have engaged in unwelcome visits, persistent phone calls, fake account creation, and other acts of intimidation.

While it does not name the Claimant directly, it follows the publication of multiple defamatory articles targeting him, and its proximity in time and topic makes it highly likely to be understood as referring to the Claimant as the principal figure behind the alleged conduct. This vagueness, combined with inflammatory language and lack of evidence, constitutes a breach of the IMPRESS

Standards Code, particularly Clause 1 (Accuracy), Clause 5 (Harassment), and Clause 4 (Discrimination), by promoting a narrative that aligns the Claimant with groups like Patriotic Alternative and the BNP without any substantiation.

The article further urges police action and encourages readers to hold “those responsible” accountable under the law, implying criminal culpability despite no legal basis or evidentiary support. These claims are defamatory and risk prompting unwarranted scrutiny of the Claimant, while fostering a public perception of him as a threat to public order or journalistic freedom. It compounds the ongoing reputational damage initiated by earlier articles and materially adds to the pattern of harassment by publication.

**(j) “Clarification following racist lies on Portland”**

Original publication: 19 April 2024

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/clarification-following-racist-lies-on-portland/>

This article, authored by “Douglas James,” frames recent concerns raised by members of the Portland community about safety incidents involving asylum seekers as “racist lies,” without substantiating that characterisation. The piece refers to alleged community responses as “rancid racism” and equates critics of the asylum accommodation scheme with being “lost in the bowels of hell forever.” It also claims—without evidence—that “some of the worst racists on the island” were exploiting parental fears, and refers to platforms like GB News as “the gutter press” spreading hate and lies.

Although the article does not explicitly name the Claimant, it clearly associates critics of the Bibby Stockholm barge and its implications for local residents—including the Claimant, who had been a visible campaigner—with hate-driven rhetoric. The piece promotes a narrative of moral binary (“those of us who are genuinely decent” vs. “the bowels of hell”) that unfairly vilifies dissent and aligns it with extremism.

The author claims to rely on anonymous local sources and asserts, without evidence, that accusations from residents (including women reporting attempted grabs) were fabrications. It dismisses claims made in community forums as racist scaremongering, despite police involvement in at least one reported incident. This risks portraying the Claimant and others as inciters of community panic or disinformation, contributing to reputational harm through guilt by association.

In line with previous conduct by the Respondents, this piece demonstrates a continued pattern of attacking dissenters through unverified claims and moral condemnation. It contributes to a defamatory mosaic that consistently positions the Claimant as deceitful, racist, and harmful to the

community—all in breach of the IMPRESS Standards Code, particularly Clause 1.2 on accuracy and Clause 5 on harassment by publication.

**(k) "Bibby Stockholm brought out the best and the worst in people"**

Original publication: 24 July 2024

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/bibby-stockholm-brought-out-the-best-and-the-worst-in-people/>

This article, authored by “Douglas James,” revisits the Bibby Stockholm asylum barge controversy and purports to present a balanced view of the local community’s response. However, it relies heavily on polarising and defamatory framing. It associates local anti-barge campaigners with “racism and intolerance,” claiming they spread “fears and prejudices... rooted in racism and intolerance” and engaged in “inflammatory rhetoric and misinformation.” Though no individual is directly named, the Claimant was a well-known figure within the campaign and would be clearly understood to be one of the subjects targeted by the article, especially given his repeated identification in other Dorset Eye pieces.

The article states that “right-wing media” like *GB News*, along with unnamed “billionaires,” have “incited hate,” and that local protests sparked a wave of “hate crimes.” While it praises figures such as Caralyn Parkes and Stand Up To Racism Dorset, the article implies by contrast that anti-barge voices—including the Claimant—are morally corrupt or socially dangerous. These indirect associations reinforce a pattern of character assassination through innuendo, framing the Claimant as part of a racist movement without substantiating such claims.

**(l) “Southport and Southend are tip of the iceberg as fascist groups target the low educated”**

Original publication: 31 July 2024

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/southport-and-southend-are-tip-of-the-iceberg-as-fascist-groups-target-the-low-educated/>

This article, authored under the byline “Douglas James,” explores alleged far-right activities following high-profile incidents in Southport and Southend. However, midway through the piece, the author introduces a defamatory comparison that directly references the Claimant:

“Whether it is Southport, Southend, the ‘racist hate mob in Weymouth and Portland’ or anywhere else, it is important to understand how they are being radicalised by the devious and narcissistic.”

The phrase “racist hate mob in Weymouth and Portland” is hyperlinked directly to the previously impugned article “Fear, Grievance and Hate: How a Community Became Radicalised,” which

extensively targeted the Claimant. This linking reinforces and republishes defamatory content, again framing the Claimant as a dangerous instigator of racial hatred without any substantiating evidence.

The rhetorical construction—equating the Claimant with hate groups involved in violent incidents—seeks to stigmatise him by association. While Southport and Southend are used as broader examples, this specific reference to Weymouth and Portland re-injects the defamatory narrative already examined in earlier articles. The implication is that the Claimant is among those “devious and narcissistic” individuals responsible for radicalising others into racist extremism.

Such repetition not only revives previously removed content but magnifies its defamatory impact by embedding it in new national-level commentary, creating a cumulative reputational harm. This constitutes both republication and fresh defamation under Clause 1.2 of the IMPRESS Standards Code and represents ongoing harm, given the reach and permanence of online content.

**(m) “Many people are in a panic as courts send social media haters to prison”**

Original publication: 13 August 2024

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/many-people-are-in-a-panic-as-courts-send-social-media-haters-to-prison/>

This article, published under the name “Douglas James,” presents an ostensibly general commentary on criminal prosecutions related to online hate speech, but does so within a context and editorial environment that strongly suggests indirect targeting of the Claimant. The publication was released during a period of escalating defamatory content against the Claimant and coincided with other Dorset Eye articles that sought to imply he was responsible for, or aligned with, hate speech and far-right activism.

Although the Claimant is not named directly, the cumulative context of surrounding articles—including those expressly attributing racist conduct to him or groups he was associated with—renders this post highly suggestive. It implicitly reinforces a defamatory narrative that individuals like the Claimant are among those “social media haters” allegedly “in a panic” as courts impose prison sentences.

By juxtaposing legitimate criminal cases involving violent or racist threats with broader, vague references to “minor infractions” and “keyboard warriors,” the article blurs the line between legal reportage and insinuation. The Claimant contends that the piece contributes to a wider campaign of reputational harm by Dorset Eye and its operators, reinforcing defamatory tropes already established in earlier articles—such as the now repeatedly republished “Fear” article—and associated social media commentary.

Although framed as a general news analysis, this article’s publication on a site that had repeatedly linked the Claimant to racism, disinformation, and harassment must be viewed in context. It supports a harmful and defamatory impression in the minds of right-thinking members of society, in breach of Clauses 1.2 (Accuracy – distinction between fact and opinion) and 5.1 (Harassment by publication) of the IMPRESS Standards Code.

**(n) “Ignoring Bigotry and Hate is at an End as Government Launches New Counter-Extremism Policy”**

Original publication: 18 August 2024

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/ignoring-bigotry-and-hate-is-at-an-end-as-government-launches-new-counter-extremism-policy/>

This article promotes a new UK government initiative to combat extremism following recent national unrest. However, within the text, the Respondent includes a highly prejudicial and defamatory reference to the Claimant and others involved in the anti-barge campaign. It states:

“Many of those in this article could now be convicted when new legislation is introduced. The vile and disgusting comments witnessed will hopefully see courts punish these people and even issue banning orders from social media.”

Embedded within this sentence is a hyperlink directing readers to the previously discredited article, *“Fear, Grievance and Hate: How a Community Became Radicalised.”* This repeated linkage not only revives the defamatory content of that article but also wrongly suggests that the Claimant’s conduct could amount to criminality under future legislation.

This is a grave escalation. The article implies that the Claimant's peaceful protest and online activity could lead to prosecution under new counter-extremism laws—despite no charges or police findings to that effect. The Claimant has never incited hatred, promoted violence, or been investigated for such actions. The innuendo created by linking his name and image to terms like “vile,” “disgusting,” and “convicted” within a legal context is plainly defamatory and breaches Clause 1.2 (distinguishing fact from opinion) and Clause 5.1 (harassment) of the IMPRESS Standards Code.

This publication is further evidence of a continued pattern by the Respondent of using broader political topics as a pretext to revive defamatory narratives and cast aspersions on the Claimant’s character and conduct.

**(o) "Hate Speakers' Use of Nazi Ideology Is Delivering a Global Nightmare"**

Original publication: 21 February 2025

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/hate-speakers-use-of-nazi-ideology-is-delivering-a-global-nightmare/>

This article is a broad political commentary linking various public figures—including Donald Trump, Suella Braverman, Elon Musk, and others—to Nazi-inspired rhetoric. While the Claimant is not explicitly named in the text, the article links back to the repeatedly republished defamatory piece, *"Fear, Grievance and Hate: How a Community Became Radicalised."* This hyperlink is inserted in the sentence: *"Those named are merely the tip of a very ugly iceberg"*—suggesting that the Claimant is part of a network of extremists comparable to the public figures named above.

This rhetorical device—associating unnamed individuals with Nazi ideology and global authoritarian movements—relies on innuendo and defamatory implication. The embedded link to the "Fear" article makes it clear to readers that the Claimant is among those being vilified. The juxtaposition of named hate figures and the Claimant's linked article gives rise to a defamatory inference by association. This technique fails to distinguish between fact and opinion (Clause 1.2), presents implication as assertion (Clause 1.3), and perpetuates an ongoing campaign of reputational harm.

The piece is especially troubling because it purports to analyse global extremism, but then narrows its lens by tying local figures—such as the Claimant—to worldwide fascistic ideologies without evidence or clarification. In doing so, the article escalates the existing harm and increases the risk of vilification and real-world consequences.

**(p) "Facebook Has Become a Haven for Pedophiles, Racists, Transphobes and Antisemites"**

Original publication: 25 February 2025

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/facebook-has-become-a-haven-for-pedophiles-racists-transphobes-and-antisemites/>

This article, published under the Dorset Eye banner, opens with the statement "Let us start here: Warning: some of this content is vile and disgusting," followed by a series of extreme examples of online hate and criminal conduct. Although the piece appears to focus on Facebook's moderation failures, it includes a direct hyperlink to the "Fear, Grievance and Hate" article—previously identified as defamatory and removed by two separate web hosts—as an example of such "vile and disgusting" material.

By embedding that link within the broader context of child exploitation, racism, and extremist ideologies, the article strongly implies that the Claimant (whose name and alleged actions are

central to the "Fear" article) is connected to or representative of this dangerous content. This is a profoundly defamatory association. No warning or disclaimer is given to indicate that the article contains disputed or controversial claims, nor is there any clarification of the Claimant's denial of involvement in any such conduct.

The juxtaposition of the "Fear" article with a list of 20 categories of hate speech—ranging from paedophilia to antisemitism—serves to reframe the Claimant's public actions as morally reprehensible or criminal. The implication that the Claimant's online conduct could fall within these classifications is both deeply prejudicial and unsupported by evidence.

The publication also continues the established pattern of defamatory republication and indirect vilification, in breach of Clause 1.2 of the Impres Standards Code (failure to distinguish fact from opinion) and Clause 5.1 (harassment). The article recirculates the defamatory narrative of the "Fear" article, doing so in a context designed to provoke revulsion and public condemnation.

**(q) "As it's Immigration Week, Let's Challenge the Fake News and the Lies"**

Original publication: 3 March 2025

Link: <https://dorseteye.com/as-its-immigration-week-lets-challenge-the-fake-news-and-the-lies/>

This article functions as a thinly veiled editorial targeting individuals critical of the Bibby Stockholm asylum barge project, republishing the "Fear, Grievance and Hate" article yet again—this time under the ominous framing that "the following bigotry and hate speech became normal for many." While not naming the Claimant directly, the repeated hyperlinking to prior defamatory articles, especially the "Fear" piece, functions to restate the same false narratives that the Claimant radicalised his community, incited hatred, and trafficked in racist disinformation.

These inferences are amplified by the context of the article, which warns of "normalised" hate speech and outlines how "people can be gullible" to bigoted ideas due to cognitive laziness, social influence, and misinformation. The structure and language imply that those mentioned in the "Fear" article—including the Claimant—are examples of such gullibility and bigotry.

Furthermore, the publication uses a generative AI template—a trend seen across many of the impugned articles—which presents issues such as "ten reasons people may seek asylum" or "eight consequences of Brexit" in a listicle format. The generic structure, recycled arguments, and boilerplate phrasing indicate the content was likely composed with minimal human editorial oversight. This raises further concerns under Clause 1.2 of the IMPRESS Standards Code, given the apparent use of AI-generated or minimally edited content without clear disclosure. IMPRESS guidance requires publishers to maintain full editorial responsibility over AI-assisted output,

including ensuring accuracy and transparency. The continued republication of defamatory material within these formulaic or auto-generated articles contributes to cumulative reputational harm and breaches core ethical standards.

5.3 Despite formal takedown actions issued by two successive hosting providers—20i Limited and Hostinger—the Respondents have persistently republished the defamatory content using alternative hosts, modified headlines, and pseudonymous bylines. Among the most troubling examples is the article *“Fear, Grievance and Hate: How a Community Became Radicalised,”* which was republished after takedown via both Virtual Systems LLC (Ukraine-based) and third-party syndication platforms including *The Prisma* (<https://theprisma.co.uk/2023/08/14/fear-grievance-and-hate-how-a-community-became-radicalised/>) and the Anarchist Federation (<https://www.anarchistfederation.net/portland-fascists-expose-themselves/>).

These repostings were not isolated incidents but part of a sustained strategy to keep the defamatory content in circulation. The Claimant has documented at least eighteen instances of republication or derivative articles, often accompanied by inflammatory social media posts.

In addition to digital dissemination, defamatory content from Dorset Eye was used in printed leaflets distributed during an active election campaign.”

5.4 Following the suspensions by 20i Limited and Hostinger, Mr Cridland migrated the Dorset Eye platform to Virtual Systems LLC, where he resumed publication of previously removed material, including a republished version of the “Fear” article on **12 March 2024** (<https://web.archive.org/web/20240313114458/https://dorseteye.com/fear-grievance-and-hate-how-a-community-became-radicalised/>). This demonstrates a wilful attempt to circumvent content moderation frameworks. He also used Cloudflare to mask the IP address of his hosting provider and frustrate further takedown efforts.

5.5 The most egregious escalation involved not only the Claimant but extended to innocent third parties, notably Mr Mark Vine, organiser of a local family-friendly Pirate Festival. Mr Vine was subjected to coordinated online threats and manipulation after he refused to endorse Mr Cridland’s false narrative. According to records and screenshots, Mr Cridland issued an ultimatum to Mr Vine, giving him a 10am deadline to withdraw or face reputational and personal consequences. The threats included veiled language about Mr Vine’s safety “as a parent and grandfather”.

Cridland further attempted to coerce Mr Vine by insinuating insider knowledge of anonymous accounts, leveraging fear to suppress opposition. This pattern of behaviour is not only alarming but also demonstrates a deliberate abuse of his platform’s reach, which Cridland himself boasts spans

“tens of millions.” It is of particular note that Dorset Eye continued to publish posts referring to Mark Vine’s Pirate Festival in hostile tones, manipulating unrelated local events to reinforce defamatory narratives.

Following Vine’s resistance to these tactics, Cridland posted what appeared to be a “legal notice” on 19 September 2023 in the Dorset Eye Facebook group—widely interpreted as a veiled threat and an attempt to intimidate through faux-authoritative messaging.

5.6 In addition to sustained personal attacks on the Claimant, the Respondent has facilitated or ignored the targeting of third parties, notably Kate Robson, through the misuse of platforms under his control. One such platform is the Facebook group “Weymouth & Portland: News and Views”, which boasts over 31,000 members and is administered by Jason Cridland, the Respondent, under the joint account “Deb-jase Cridland.”

In September 2023, an anonymous Facebook page originally named “NO to the racists”—later renamed “No Hate, No Fear”—posted mocking and defamatory content about Mrs Robson.

- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/194459954626645/posts/1537774230295204/>

The post falsely accused her of causing financial damage to local businesses following her appearance in a news clip. When Mrs Robson’s husband asked for the post to be removed, not only was his request denied, but both his and Mrs Robson’s comments were partially deleted, ensuring the defamatory post remained prominently visible. Despite being made aware of the abuse, Mr Cridland, as the group’s administrator, refused to take any action.

This pattern aligns with the Respondent’s broader conduct: cultivating an environment of coordinated hostility, using multiple aliases and platforms to amplify abuse while claiming plausible deniability. Notably, the group “Weymouth & Portland: News and Views” was later used to host a highly inflammatory post by Stewart Osborne on 27 March 2025 (<https://www.facebook.com/groups/194459954626645/posts/1881551215917502>), falsely alleging that the Claimant was linked to rape threats and criminal intimidation.

- [https://www.facebook.com/groups/194459954626645/posts/1881551215917502/?comment\\_id=1881980139207943&reply\\_comment\\_id=1882003452538945](https://www.facebook.com/groups/194459954626645/posts/1881551215917502/?comment_id=1881980139207943&reply_comment_id=1882003452538945)

The lack of moderation and active silencing of victims within platforms controlled by the Respondent underscores a wider strategy: not merely to defame but to intimidate, isolate, and vilify. The use of renamed or pseudonymous Facebook accounts (e.g. “No Hate, No Fear,” formerly “NO

to the racists”) reflects a deliberate effort to evade accountability while continuing to disseminate harmful narratives.

This sustained campaign of intimidation against third parties like Kate Robson highlights the real-world consequences of the Respondent’s digital conduct and supports a broader claim of harassment by publication, platform abuse, and regulatory evasion.

5.7 The Claimant engaged in good faith with all two identified hosting providers.

- 20i Limited ultimately terminated the Dorset Eye account after determining Acceptable Use Policy violations.
- Hostinger issued a 48-hour takedown notice before suspending the domain upon non-compliance.
- Cloudflare was used by the Respondents to obscure further hosting details, making accountability more difficult.

#### 5.8 Defamatory Leaflet Campaign During 2024 Local Election

In April 2024, during the Claimant’s campaign for election as a local councillor, a defamatory election leaflet was distributed in the Littlemoor and Preston areas of Weymouth. This leaflet directly referenced Dorset Eye material and included a QR code linking to the “Fear, Grievance and Hate” article, which had previously been taken down by two web hosts for violations of Acceptable Use Policies.

The leaflet falsely described the Claimant as a “far-right activist” and insinuated that he had “radicalised” his community—allegations taken directly from Dorset Eye’s impugned article. These statements were not only untrue and defamatory but were disseminated during a live election campaign, thereby compounding their harm.

Evidence of the incident includes:

- Multiple complaints received from residents and shared with the Claimant;
- Confirmation by Dorset Police that the matter was logged as a complaint (Ref: 55240057083) and considered potentially defamatory and in breach of electoral law, though no further action was taken;
- Correspondence from police and electoral services acknowledging that the content and QR code led directly to a Dorset Eye article [A8 & A7].

Given that the linked article remained live on the Respondents' website at the time, and the content mirrored material promoted by Respondent-linked social media accounts such as “David Owens” and “No Hate, No Fear”, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondents were either directly involved in or materially responsible for enabling the leaflet’s creation and circulation.

In response, the Claimant had to self-fund a rebuttal leaflet at a cost of £80 to correct the public record and defend his character during the election campaign. This is documented in police correspondence and financial receipts [A8 & A7].

This incident marks a further escalation of the Respondents’ defamation campaign:

- It took defamatory content offline into the physical world, compounding reputational harm;
- It occurred in a targeted and coordinated fashion during a politically sensitive period;
- It resulted in financial loss, voter confusion, and increased psychological stress for the Claimant.

### **5.9 Electoral Harm and Voter Manipulation**

The leaflet campaign not only defamed the Claimant but also interfered with democratic participation and the integrity of the electoral process. It:

- Spread falsehoods to the electorate about the Claimant’s views and history;
- Misused journalistic material (via QR code to Dorset Eye) without clarification or right of reply;
- Was posted by hand through doors in targeted electoral areas, creating the false appearance of official or widely endorsed messaging.

This constitutes a form of electoral manipulation that leverages defamation as a political weapon. It demonstrates how the Respondents’ defamatory publications have real-world, measurable consequences beyond online discourse, including:

- Distorted voter perceptions;
- Suppressed turnout and engagement among the Claimant’s supporters;
- A chilling effect on future participation in public life by the Claimant and similarly situated individuals.

## **6. Issues for Determination**

Pursuant to the IMPRESS Standards Code and the Defamation Act 2013, and in light of the Respondents' documented pattern of regulatory breaches (see: *Laura Hitchcock v Dorset Eye*, 2022 Final Adjudication), the following issues arise for determination:

### **6.1 Accuracy (Clauses 1.1–1.3)**

6.1.1 Whether the impugned publications conveyed materially false statements of fact about the Claimant, including—but not limited to—allegations that he:

- “radicalised” the Portland and Weymouth community;
- led a group of “merry racists”;
- was solely responsible for an alleged £400,000 loss to the local economy;
- encouraged or excused hate speech or criminal behaviour.

6.1.2 Whether the Respondents fabricated or misattributed quotations, identities, or sources, such as:

- pseudonymous bylines and contributors (“Liz Bladon,” “David Owens,” “Penny Lane”), as seen in both this case and the Hitchcock case (“the Publisher failed to contact, seek permission from, or appropriately credit the originator of the content”);
- screenshots and evidence of unverified origin;
- purported remarks by the Claimant’s family members, or unattributed repetition of news copy and social media posts.

6.1.3 Whether the Respondents failed to take reasonable care over accuracy by:

- selectively quoting from interviews (e.g. GB News);
- omitting key contextual facts;
- conflating satire, innuendo, and speculation with factual assertions, in a manner previously criticised by IMPRESS for “serious concerns about the quality and legality of [Dorset Eye’s] editorial processes.”

### **6.2 Distinction Between Fact and Opinion (Clause 1.2)**

6.2.1 Whether the Respondents presented statements of value judgment—such as references to the Claimant as “Herr Bailey,” comparisons to Nazis, or claims of fascist alignment—as factual allegations rather than clearly identifiable opinion.

6.2.2 Whether the Respondents clearly distinguished between opinion-based commentary and factual reportage, including in AI-generated or automatically republished content, contrary to IMPRESS guidance and previous findings.

### **6.3 Attribution and Plagiarism (Clause 2.1)**

6.3.1 Whether the Respondents reproduced third-party content (including press releases, social media statements, or campaign material) without proper attribution.

6.3.2 Whether the consistent replication of language and claims across multiple anonymous platforms and affiliated sites—echoing findings from the Hitchcock adjudication—breached attribution standards, suggesting coordinated publication without transparency of source.

### **6.4 Harassment by Publication (Clause 5.1)**

6.4.1 Whether the volume, tone, and persistence of publications targeting the Claimant—especially after he stepped down from public campaigning—amounted to harassment, as defined by IMPRESS and reflected in past complaints.

6.4.2 Whether additional third parties (including Mr Mark Vine and Mrs Kate Robson) were similarly harassed via Respondent-linked platforms or pseudonymous threats, escalating the overall harm and violating the Code.

6.4.3 Whether the physical distribution of a defamatory leaflet during the Claimant’s 2024 election campaign—linked directly to Dorset Eye articles and social media activity—constituted a coordinated and aggravating form of reputational harm and electoral interference.

6.4.4 Whether these actions, individually or cumulatively, met the threshold for “serious harm” under Section 1 of the Defamation Act 2013, especially given the Respondents’ record of ignoring regulatory correction and advice.

### **6.5 Discrimination (Clauses 4.1–4.3)**

6.5.1 Whether terms such as “invasion,” Nazi comparisons, or similar rhetoric amounted to discriminatory or prejudicial language based on the Claimant’s nationality, beliefs, or perceived affiliations.

6.5.2 Whether the Respondents’ portrayal of the Claimant distorted his public identity, including anti-racism advocacy, in a manner likely to incite hatred or exclusion, contrary to the standards repeatedly referenced in prior IMPRESS decisions.

### **6.6 Use of Sources (Clause 8.2)**

6.6.1 Whether the Respondents breached the prohibition on invented sources by:

- attributing content to unverifiable “insiders” or anonymous individuals;

- fabricating claims about online conduct or authorship;
- falsely asserting family ties to controversial individuals (e.g. “Bob Bailey” and the BNP).

## **6.7 Obstruction and Intimidation (Clause 6.1)**

6.7.1 Whether the Respondents attempted to obstruct the pursuit of justice or chill witness participation by:

- issuing threats to Mr Vine in relation to his role in a community festival;
- refusing to acknowledge control over pages used to harass others while simultaneously claiming inside knowledge of their authorship;
- targeting police-liased individuals with misinformation or reprisals.

## **6.8 Remedies and Relief**

6.8.1 If one or more breaches are found, what remedial actions should the Arbitrator order, including:

- permanent takedown of defamatory materials;
- replacement of the “Fear” article with a public apology (with heightened scrutiny given the Respondents’ previous refusal to implement proportionate correction, per Hitchcock);
- correction of online records across all platforms administered or influenced by the Respondents.

6.8.2 Whether the Claimant is entitled to an award of general, special, or aggravated damages, and reimbursement of legal and administrative costs reasonably incurred in defending his reputation and mitigating harm, especially given the Respondents’ repeated non-compliance with IMPRESS directives.

## 7. Legal and Evidential Grounds

### 7.1 Defamation Act 2013

#### 7.1.1 Serious Harm (Section 1)

Each impugned publication contains statements liable to cause serious harm to the Claimant's reputation. The threshold is satisfied by repeated allegations imputing:

- racism and far-right extremism;
- dishonesty and duplicity in public advocacy;
- complicity in harassment;
- direct responsibility for economic damage to the community;
- links to criminal or hate groups (e.g. Britain First, BNP).

This harm is both *actual*—as demonstrated by the defamatory flyer circulated during the election—and *probable*, in light of widespread publication, targeted amplification, and the enduring nature of internet archives.

#### 7.1.2 Defamatory Meaning (Section 2)

The publications, taken individually and collectively, convey meanings that would lower the Claimant in the eyes of right-thinking members of society. These include false allegations that he:

- led a “racist hate mob”;
- spread “fear, disinformation, and bigotry”;
- acted as a “manipulator,” “infiltrator,” or “instigator of division”;
- bears moral likeness to Nazi propagandists or fascists;
- harmed the local economy for political motives.

#### 7.1.3 Defences (Sections 2–4, 6–8)

The following statutory defences are not available to the Respondents on the current facts:

- Truth (Section 2): The burden lies with the Respondents to prove the substantial truth of their allegations, yet no verifiable or admissible evidence supports the core defamatory imputations.

- **Honest Opinion (Section 3):** Where defamatory views are presented as opinion, they fail one or more statutory requirements—being either not honestly held, not based on true facts, or not sufficiently identified as opinion.
- **Public Interest (Section 4):** Although issues such as asylum policy and community protest are matters of public interest, the Respondents’ articles cross the line into personal attack, misleading representation, and baseless insinuation. The inclusion of fabricated bylines, AI-generated content, and uncorroborated sources removes the protection afforded to responsible journalism.
- **Other Defences (Sections 6–8):** No facts in this case support application of peer-reviewed privilege, operator protections, or offer of amends.

#### 7.1.4 **Limitation and Republication (Section 4A)**

The Respondents have republished the same or substantially similar defamatory content on multiple occasions, across at least three hosting providers and several social media platforms. These republications:

- reset the limitation clock under Section 4A;
- include modifications of article titles, use of aliases (e.g. “From the Leader of the Pack to Hiding in the Shadows”), and re-uploading to third-party sites (e.g. The Prisma, Anarchist Federation);
- were often accompanied by new social media pushes or embedded in additional online and offline materials (e.g. the defamatory election flyer).

Each instance gives rise to a new actionable publication.

## 7.2 **Applicable Authorities**

### 7.2.1 **Lachaux v Independent Print Ltd [2019] UKSC 27**

Clarifies that *serious harm* must be proved on the balance of probabilities, reinforcing the Claimant’s entitlement to redress where public dissemination materially impacts personal or professional standing.

### 7.2.2 **Monroe v Hopkins [2017] EWHC 433 (QB)**

Illustrates the failure of “honest opinion” where factual assertions are inaccurate or where tweets and posts—like those used by the Respondents—carry implied factual meanings.

### 7.2.3 **Charleston v News Group Newspapers [1995] 2 AC 65**

Confirms that truthful elements do not neutralise the defamatory impact of misleading headlines or framing—highly relevant in cases where clickbait-style article titles were used against the Claimant.

### 7.2.4 **Reynolds v Times Newspapers Ltd [1999] 4 All ER 609**

Remains relevant to the standard of responsible journalism, particularly where the Claimant is not offered a right of reply, and pseudonymous authorship obscures editorial accountability.

### 7.2.5 **Hulton & Co v Jones [1910] 2 KB 48**

A seminal authority confirming liability where the claimant is identifiable to ordinary readers—even where the publication purports to be anonymous or fictional (e.g. “Liz Bladon”).

### 7.2.6 **IMPRESS Standards Code (Clauses 1-8)**

Provides the applicable regulatory framework. Breaches include:

- Clause 1: Failure to take reasonable care over accuracy;
- Clause 2: Lack of attribution and potential plagiarism;
- Clause 4: Use of discriminatory and inflammatory rhetoric;
- Clause 5: Harassment through repeated targeting;
- Clause 6: Interference with third-party participation in law enforcement (e.g. threats to Mr Vine);
- Clause 8: Use of fictitious or unverifiable sources.

## **8. Impact and Harm**

### **8.1 Reputational Injury**

8.1.1 The relentless publication and republication of demonstrably false and defamatory statements—including allegations that the Claimant “radicalised” his community, led a “band of merry racists,” and was the architect of a £400,000 economic loss—have caused severe, lasting reputational injury. These claims were circulated under pseudonyms (e.g. “Liz Bladon,” “David Owens”), deliberately masking true authorship and evading accountability, in clear echo of tactics condemned by IMPRESS in the Laura Hitchcock adjudication (“publication of unsubstantiated and damaging statements, amplified by refusal to correct or remove content”).

8.1.2 The defamatory allegations have been disseminated to an exceptionally wide audience:

- 22,000+ followers on X (@dorset\_eye);
- 1,200+ YouTube subscribers and 343 videos;
- Multiple Facebook groups (totaling 31,200+ members), including “Dorset Eye,” “No to the Barge (Without the Racists),” and “Weymouth & Portland: News and Views.”

Barge (Without the Racists),” and “Weymouth & Portland: News and Views.”

This reach entrenched damaging narratives within both local and national public discourse, in a pattern of broad digital harm similar to that in the Hitchcock case.

8.1.3 The Claimant’s name and reputation were further targeted in physical space: during the 2024 local elections, a leaflet—mirroring language from the Respondents’ “Fear” article—was distributed to households in Littlemoor and Preston, explicitly linking the Claimant to far-right extremism and dishonesty. The leaflet referenced and QR-linked to Dorset Eye’s content, multiplying its reach. The matter was serious enough to warrant formal complaints to Dorset Police (Occurrences 55240057083 and 55240050167), evidencing real-world harm far beyond the digital sphere.

8.1.4 A persistent “digital footprint” now connects the Claimant to allegations of racism, harassment, and extremism, severely impairing future employment, volunteer, or civic opportunities. As in the Hitchcock case, third-party republication (e.g. The Prisma, Anarchist Federation) and extensive search visibility have made the defamatory claims inescapable and enduring.

### **8.2 Emotional and Psychological Harm**

8.2.1 The Claimant has suffered enduring psychological harm, including anxiety, disrupted sleep, and exhaustion, from persistent and coordinated harassment. The use of anonymous, pseudonymous, and AI-driven platforms has created an ongoing sense of surveillance and vulnerability, much as was found in the Hitchcock adjudication where persistent refusal to correct

the record “exacerbated distress to the complainant.”

8.2.2 Baseless accusations of racism and extremism have led to social ostracism, personal confrontations, and severe erosion of local trust. The humiliation of being branded a “fascist sympathiser” has directly undermined the Claimant’s established history of anti-racist advocacy.

8.2.3 Psychological injury was compounded by the Respondents’ publication of invented remarks purportedly from the Claimant’s mother, weaponising familial relationships for reputational attack.

8.2.4 The Claimant has spent over 160 hours collating evidence, drafting complaints, and corresponding with police, legal advisors, web hosts, and IMPRESS—time and emotional energy that should have been devoted to work and family. This toll was intensified by the coordinated targeting of third parties, most notably Mark Vine, who himself was subjected to threats and reputational assault for simply expressing concern about the Respondents’ conduct.

8.2.5 The Claimant was forced to witness and respond to the manipulation of community grief and trauma for ideological purposes, with particular distress arising from the public targeting and harassment of Mr Vine, whose situation closely parallels the secondary harm recognised by Impress in the Laura Hitchcock case.

### **8.3 Professional and Electoral Consequences**

8.3.1 The Claimant’s campaign for Parish Council in 2024 was materially harmed by the dissemination of defamatory content. Leaflets echoing Dorset Eye’s language were distributed in the constituency during the election period, targeting the Claimant at a critical juncture and prompting multiple complaints to authorities. The Respondents’ social media pages promoted and repeated these claims, suggesting at least tacit, if not active, coordination.

8.3.2 The Claimant has incurred significant financial costs directly attributable to the Respondents’ actions, including £204.89 for domain and hosting of a rebuttal website (dorseteye.co.uk), £952.16 in verified campaign expenditure, and £80 in personal costs for printing and distributing a corrective leaflet.

8.3.3 Despite clear evidence of reputational and financial harm, no apology or retraction has been forthcoming. As was observed by IMPRESS in the Hitchcock case, the Respondents’ unwillingness to acknowledge or correct their falsehoods has left the Claimant solely responsible for defending his reputation at substantial personal expense.

8.3.4 The lasting digital association of the Claimant’s name with racism and extremism now presents a barrier to future employment, particularly in safeguarding-sensitive fields such as education and public service.

8.3.5 The burden of seeking arbitration, compiling documentation, and managing ongoing online

hostility has diverted considerable time and energy from the Claimant's civic, professional, and family obligations—mirroring and amplifying the harm found in the Laura Hitchcock case, and supporting a finding of aggravated defamation.

## **9. Aggravating Factors**

### **9.1 Repeated Republication**

9.1.1 Despite multiple formal takedown actions—including by 20i Limited (which removed at least eight articles) and Hostinger (which suspended the Respondent’s website for breach of terms)—Mr Cridland repeatedly republished defamatory content, particularly the “Fear, Grievance and Hate” article. These reposts occurred across at least three different web hosting services, sometimes within days of removal.

9.1.2 Each republication was deliberate, accompanied by fresh social media amplification through pages and groups linked to Mr Cridland. These included the Facebook group “Weymouth & Portland: News and Views,” managed by him, and were supported by alias accounts such as “Liz Bladon” and “David Owens.” These personas were not only used to mislead readers but also to obscure liability and artificially distance the Respondent from the defamatory narratives.

9.1.3 This behaviour extended beyond online republication. Defamatory claims first published online—such as accusations that the Claimant was a “far-right activist” or bore responsibility for economic sabotage—were later adapted into physical campaign leaflets distributed during the 2024 local elections in Littlemoor and Preston. The leaflet echoed the language of Dorset Eye articles and linked directly to the “Fear” article, providing tangible proof of cross-platform coordination and persistent reputational targeting.

9.1.4 That these republications followed regulatory warnings, takedown actions, and police reports further illustrates the Respondent’s wilful defiance. Rather than retract or correct demonstrably harmful statements, Mr Cridland doubled down—ensuring that defamatory claims remained accessible and viral in the digital space and in real-world political contexts.

### **9.2 Evasive Hosting Conduct**

9.2.1 Following takedowns by 20i and Hostinger, the Respondent adopted evasive digital practices to frustrate further moderation. These included routing his domain through Cloudflare—a service which masks the origin server IP—before migrating to a third host, Virtual Systems LLC, based in Ukraine and known for non-interventionist hosting policies.

9.2.2 The use of DNS masking, domain cloaking, and revised article titles (e.g., “Pandora’s Jar”) demonstrates a sophisticated effort to conceal ongoing violations of platform terms. Each time content was removed or flagged, Mr Cridland altered article names or URLs to bypass detection and reupload materially identical material.

9.2.3 This level of digital obfuscation, when combined with repeated pseudonymous publication, suggests not mere negligence but an orchestrated attempt to evade accountability, prolong reputational harm, and undermine both Impress oversight and platform governance mechanisms.

### **9.3 Historical Misconduct (“Laura Hitchcock” Case)**

9.3.1 The Respondent has a documented and recent history of breaching fundamental Impress Standards. In August 2023, Impress upheld a complaint by Laura Hitchcock (editor of The BV Magazine) against Dorset Eye for plagiarism, finding “a breach of Clauses 2.1 and 2.2 – Attribution & Plagiarism,” specifically that “the Publisher failed to contact, seek permission from, or appropriately credit the originator of the content.” Impress concluded that “the Publisher did not have a clear and adequate editorial process for checking and approving third-party content for publication.”

9.3.2 The Committee’s formal adjudication made clear that “removal of the article by the publisher was not a sufficient or proportionate correction for the error,” and that “the Publisher’s article was wrongly attributed to ‘Dorset Eye’ in the byline at the top of the page, despite the original author’s name still appearing at the bottom.” In that case, as in the present, the Respondent refused to provide any meaningful redress—ignoring requests for compensation or public acknowledgment and instead advising the complainant “to refer the matter to Impress if she had any further issues.”

9.3.3 This episode demonstrates a systemic disregard for regulatory standards and for the rights of those targeted or misrepresented by Dorset Eye’s publications. The Committee found that the Respondent’s failure “raises serious concerns about the quality and legality of its editorial processes” and required not only a published corrective statement but also “details of its revised editorial procedures.” There is no evidence these lessons were heeded; rather, the Respondent has escalated his non-compliance in the present case through repeated republication, digital evasion, and personal targeting.

9.3.4 These facts, alongside the Respondent’s pattern of refusing to engage with mediation or acknowledge errors, justify a finding of aggravated defamation. The recurrence and escalation of similar breaches—from misattribution and inadequate corrections to outright defamation, harassment, and discrimination—strongly support an inference of malice. The Respondent’s persistent misuse of the Dorset Eye platform “under the guise of editorial freedom” warrants heightened scrutiny and the imposition of enhanced remedies.

## **10. Relief and Remedies Sought**

### **10.1 Declaration of Falsity and Defamation**

10.1.1 The Claimant seeks a formal declaration that the impugned publications—particularly those asserting that he “radicalised a community,” “led a band of merry racists,” “cost the local economy £400,000,” and acted as a “far-right activist”—were and are materially false, defamatory, and unjustified under the Defamation Act 2013 and the Impress Standards Code.

10.1.2 The declaration should also record that these allegations were published with actual or constructive knowledge of their falsity, or at minimum with reckless disregard for the truth, as evidenced by their repeated republication and persistent refusal to correct—even after formal takedown orders and regulatory findings, echoing the pattern condemned by Impress in the Laura Hitchcock case.

### **10.2 Mandatory Retraction and Apology**

10.2.1 That the Respondent be ordered to remove all impugned articles from:

- The Dorset Eye website and its mirror domains;
- Associated social media channels, including @dorset\_eye on X (formerly Twitter), the Dorset Eye YouTube channel, and affiliated Facebook groups/pages under his control;
- Third-party pages known to be under the Respondent’s influence, such as “Dorset Against Fascism” and “No Hate, No Fear.”

10.2.2 That the Respondent publish, under his legal name, a formal public apology to the Claimant at the exact URL(s) previously hosting the article “Fear, Grievance and Hate: How a Community Became Radicalised.”

#### *Justification:*

The URLs in question have been widely disseminated—shared via pseudonymous and anonymous accounts, embedded in QR-coded campaign literature, cited in external reporting (The Prisma, Anarchist Federation), and linked from numerous digital and physical sources. It is not practicable for the Claimant to notify every recipient or downstream re-publisher. Posting the apology at the original URLs ensures that all existing backlinks, bookmarks, and shares are redirected to the correction—providing a proportionate and realistic remedy to the “viral” nature of the reputational harm.

10.2.3 That the apology remain publicly accessible and prominently displayed at that URL for no less than 21 consecutive months, mirroring the sustained period of reputational damage inflicted by the article’s original and repeated publication.

10.2.4 That the apology:

- Acknowledge the falsity of the key claims;
- Set out corrected facts regarding the Claimant’s conduct and political affiliations;
- Affirm that the Claimant is not and has never been a “far-right” or racist activist;
- Include a commitment not to republish, recirculate, or promote any version of the impugned claims, including under pseudonyms or via affiliated platforms.

10.2.5 That a further declaration be made that the inclusion of the defamatory “Fear” article in printed election material—distributed in Littlemoor and Preston—constituted unlawful republication in violation of electoral and civil standards.

### 10.3 **Compensatory and Aggravated Damages**

10.3.1 That the Respondent be ordered to pay the maximum permitted sum of £3,000 under the Impress Arbitration Scheme, representing both general and aggravated damages. This sum reflects:

- The scale and repetition of the defamatory allegations;
- The use of pseudonyms and digital obfuscation to evade regulation;
- The tangible professional, emotional, and electoral harm suffered;
- The aggravating factors detailed in Section 9, including threats, publication during a political campaign, and the targeting of third parties such as Mr Vine and Mrs Robson.

### 10.4 **Costs**

10.4.1 That the Respondent be directed to pay all reasonable legal, evidential, and administrative costs incurred by the Claimant in pursuing this arbitration. These include but are not limited to:

- Over 160 hours of time spent compiling evidence, issuing takedown notices, and responding to false claims;
- Submissions and documentation to web hosts (20i, Hostinger, Virtual Systems LLC), Impress, and Dorset Police;

- Personal electoral expenses of £952.16, incurred while campaigning under active reputational attack;
- £204.89 in costs associated with hosting and publishing rebuttals via DorsetEye.co.uk;
- £80 in direct spending to counter defamatory election materials, necessitated by the Respondent's involvement in circulating misleading leaflets during the 2024 local campaign.

*This section is drafted to align closely with both the standards applied in the Laura Hitchcock adjudication (where IMPRESS criticised refusal to correct or remove harmful content) and the aggravating circumstances of republication, electioneering, and coordinated digital attack identified in this claim.*

## **12. Statement of Truth**

I, Alexander Robert Bailey, believe that the facts stated in this Points of Claim are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

Signed: *ABailey*

Date: 28.05.25