

**1<sup>st</sup> April 2010**

**Statement from the British Chiropractic Association regarding the BCA vs Simon Singh**

Commenting on the Court of Appeal ruling allowing the Appeal by Simon Singh, Richard Brown, President of the British Chiropractic Association (BCA), said:

“The case against Dr Singh has always been simply to set the record straight and correct what the BCA considered were libellous comments by Simon Singh in the Guardian. Originally we asked Dr. Singh for a retraction and an apology and he declined. The Guardian subsequently offered a right of reply but this fell short of our expectations, not least of which because the original libel would have remained uncorrected. Having reached stalemate and feeling our reputation had been tarnished we sought legal advice which unambiguously indicated that in order to get an appropriate apology and retraction, a writ needed to be served.

The same advice was that this was best achieved by directing the action against the author rather than the newspaper. The BCA has followed its legal advice throughout this case. The motivation for this action was always to clear our good name, particularly in respect of the implication that we acted dishonestly. It never was, and it is still not our intention, to curb freedom of speech, whether in the field of scientific research or elsewhere, although sadly we recognise that this is how it has been portrayed by Dr. Singh and his supporters”.

The BCA brought the case because in his article Dr Singh made a serious attack on the reputation of the BCA, which stated in print and on-line, that the Association “...happily promotes bogus treatments”. In May 2009 Mr Justice Eady, one of the country’s leading libel judges, agreed with the BCA’s interpretation of the article. He ruled that Dr Singh had made the “plainest allegation of dishonesty”. Today the Court of Appeal ruled, by virtue of their interpretation, that the words published were “comments” or “opinions” and not allegations of fact.

The BCA is considering its position in the light of the ruling. Richard Brown concluded “We are of course disappointed to lose the appeal, but this is not the end of the road and we are considering whether to seek permission to appeal to the Supreme Court and subsequently proceed to trial. Our original argument remains that our reputation has been damaged. To reiterate, the BCA brought this claim only to uphold its good name and protect its reputation, honesty and integrity”.

More media information from Carl Courtney on 07785397321