

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS LIST

BEFORE:

B E T W E E N:-

GABBY LOGAN AND KENNY LOGAN

Claimants

and

ASSOCIATED NEWSPAPERS LIMITED

Defendant

STATEMENT IN OPEN COURT

Counsel for the Claimant

My Lord, in this action I appear for the Claimant, Gabby and Kenny Logan.

The First Claimant is a well-known television presenter and journalist. The Second Claimant is her husband who is an ex-professional rugby player who now works as a businessman in the sports industry.

The Defendant is Associated Newspapers which publishes the *Mail Online* which has a vast daily readership within the jurisdiction and is one of the most widely read English-language newspapers both in the jurisdiction and in the world with hundreds of millions of page views per month.

On 28 February an article appeared on the *Mail Online* website with this headline "***BBC star Gabby Logan and her husband Kenny were paid more than £500,000 to promote major tax avoidance scheme to their celebrity friends***".

The false assertions made about Gabby and Kenny Logan in the article amounted to allegations that.

- i) Through a company associated with them, Gabby and Kenneth Logan were paid commissions totalling more than £500,000 in return for introducing their friends to tax avoidance schemes marketed by Welbeck Solutions; and
- ii) There were reasonable grounds to suspect that companies under Gabby and Kenneth Logan's control tried to disguise some taxable income as loans in order that the companies might avoid paying tax on that income.

These allegations were wholly untrue, as the *Mail Online* has now acknowledged.

Following my clients' initial complaint to the Independent Press Standards Organisation the Defendants published this apology and retraction on 24 May: *"An article on February 28 said that Gabby and Kenny Logan received £500,000 to promote tax-avoidance schemes to their celebrity friends. In fact Gabby played no part in the business and earned no income from it. Kenny's role was solely to introduce clients to companies who promoted legitimate business services rather than tax avoidance schemes. In addition, they did not 'disguise' any income from this activity in order to avoid paying tax, as we reported. We apologise for the errors and are happy to set the record straight"*.

In response to Mr and Mrs Logan's subsequent threatened claim against Associated Newspapers for defamation, the publisher offered to undertake not to repeat the allegations, to compensate Mr and Mrs Logan by way of substantial damages and to pay their legal costs, an offer which they have accepted.

Since the purpose of these proceedings has now been achieved, I seek my Lord's leave to withdraw the record.