

## Office of Communications (OFCOM) Fairness and Privacy complaint

### Complaint against license holder **China Global Television Network (CGTN)**

2019-11-27.

Filed to Ofcom via email address [ofcomfairnessandprivacy@ofcom.org.uk](mailto:ofcomfairnessandprivacy@ofcom.org.uk)

Fairness and Privacy Complaints Content Standards, Licensing and Enforcement,  
Riverside House 2a, Southwark Bridge Road, London, SE1 9HA.

### What happened?

I, Hong Kong citizen Simon Cheng, employed by the United Kingdom's Consulate in Hong Kong, and working normally as a Trade and investment officer, was officially tasked with boosting interest in Chinese investment in Scotland and I had recently also been tasked to gather information on the ongoing protests in Hong Kong, a fairly routine task for any embassy or consulate.

On August 8, while returning from a one day trip from Shenzhen, a city in China bordering Hong Kong, I was stopped by Chinese police at the West Kowloon high-speed train station within Hong Kong territory. Having a Chinese immigration post inside Hong Kong has been very controversial. Immigration officials claimed that I was being stopped on "orders from the top". I was then taken by train back to mainland China, into Shenzhen and detained by police of the Public Security Bureau (PSB). As soon as I was in custody, agents from the Ministry of State Security (MSS) took over.

After this, after a first night spent in a regular detention centre with other inmates, I was moved to solitary confinement and was kept in solitary confinement for the remainder of my captivity. The world, including the UK government, and my parents and family, were not aware of my place of disappearance or what was happening to me. I was held incommunicado the entire time, not allowed any access to a lawyer, nor to my family. My whereabouts were kept secret, even after news broke about my detention some 11 days later.

On or around August 20, after a prolonged period of both physical and mental torture, as defined by Article 1 of the Convention Against Torture, ratified by both China and the UK, I was made to start recording a number of videos by the MSS and the police. The first filmed recording comprised questions and answers between me and a uniformed officer. Later I was taken out of the interrogation room to a reception hall and filmed again. I was

also asked to write two letters of repentance, and then to read both of them into the camera. Later, on August 24, I was handed a script written by the MSS and told to read it out and this was filmed, with many re-takes.

On November 20, several months after my release, the BBC released an interview with me in which I disclosed, in violation of a forced “agreement” with the MSS, why I was detained, how I was questioned, tortured and more.

The very next day, a newspaper owned by the Chinese Communist Party released a video of me “confessing”, and later that day this video was broadcast, along with a news presentation, by CGTN’s China24 program, worldwide including on United Kingdom air waves. The broadcast was issued in direct response to my interviews with UK media and other international media, with the intention of painting the process of my mistreatment as legal. The broadcast not only violates numerous regulations under the Broadcasting Code, but also includes direct and easily proven lies.

## **Credibility, and how was this Forced TV Confession extracted?**

I have posted in-depth notes<sup>1</sup> about my experience, released alongside my interview with the BBC (and interviews with many other British and international media).

I have been interviewed in detail by the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). The breach of UK diplomatic security of the UK’s Hong Kong operation through the actions of the mainland police against me was considered significant.

My account of events has been deemed credible by a variety of sources, including the UK government. As reported in The Times of London<sup>2</sup>, Foreign Secretary Dominic Raab said my allegations were credible and that my treatment “amounts to torture”. Amnesty International said my testimony was credible because my allegations were “in line with the endemic torture and other ill-treatment in detention we have repeatedly documented in mainland China”<sup>3</sup>.

Safeguard Defenders, an NGO that has most thoroughly documented China’s use of Forced TV Confessions, has released in-depth reports<sup>4</sup> and a book<sup>5</sup> on this subject and has gathered and archived a large trove of testimony from Chinese and foreign victims of the torture that precedes such videos, as well as the production of the videos. It has also confirmed that my testimony mirrors typical treatment. Furthermore, my treatment mirrors the specific treatment used by the MSS in other cases, especially cases of victims who may have to be released on short notice due to international pressure (often non-PRC citizens).

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/notes/cheng-man-kit/for-the-record-an-enemy-of-the-state/2490959950941845/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/british-consulate-worker-tortured-by-chinese-92vf0jxqz>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7710089/Simon-Cheng-China-releases-footage-former-UK-consulate-worker-soliciting-prostitutes.html>

<sup>4</sup> <https://safeguarddefenders.com/en/publications>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.amazon.com/Trial-Media-Chinas-expansion-Chinese/dp/0999370626>

Hence, my testimony below has been deemed credible by a variety of respected and trusted institutions and organisations.

Throughout all of my interrogations, some taking place at the initial police station, some at the Lo Wu Detention Centre, but most at an incognito location, I was forced to sit in a lockable steel “tiger chair.” I was strapped into the chair and could not move.

My interrogations were mostly focused on three types of question: 1.) The UK role in the Hong Kong “riots”; 2.) My role in those “riots”; 3.) My relations with mainland Chinese citizens who joined the “riots”.

During my entire period in custody, my spectacles were kept from me. With my poor eyesight, this meant that for the entire time I was in a state of dizziness unable to see anything clearly.

The official reason for my detention, the MSS told me, was that “external sources” had reported that I “solicited prostitution”. If I cooperated, then I would face a less harsh treatment, only administrative detention, and I would not get a criminal record. The alternative was indefinite criminal detention, severe criminal charges and harsh treatment in the hands of the secret police. So I had no choice but to give a confession. That was their narrative.

It should be pointed out that when China first admitted to having detained me, they did not say that I was detained because of any suspicion of soliciting prostitutes. This false justification only came out later.

They threatened that my case would be reported to my family by the police sending a written letter to Interpol, which would then be forwarded to Hong Kong police, then Hong Kong police would send a letter to my family. However, they claimed to be uncertain at which point Hong Kong police would know, because they were too busy handling the protests. The Hong Kong police were indeed not notified at all.

They also claimed I had no right to a lawyer because I had been placed under so-called *administrative detention*, which was a purely police matter and not a criminal or judicial process involving prosecutors, courts or trials. This is a lie and is not true according to Chinese law. I was entitled to a lawyer. They simply blocked my access and legal rights to legal counsel. That and their refusal to notify my family meant I was being held incommunicado and illegally.

They wanted me to admit, in writing, to two different types of allegations: one being “soliciting prostitutes” the other being the much more serious “crimes against national security” By various modes of duress and torture, they pressured me to the point where I involuntarily wrote ‘repentance letters’ about both allegations. They then filmed me involuntarily reading out those repentance letters to the camera.

In their effort to fabricate evidence of UK involvement in the Hong Kong protests, which the Communist Party is parroting in China’s domestic media to avoid responsibility for the Hong Kong unrest, I was held under tremendous duress. I was handcuffed and interrogated within the detention centre. Secret police arrived and the detention centre

staff and warders monitored the whole process. Secret police coerced me to open my iPhone by grabbing my hair and forcing me to do facial recognition entry. The interrogator said: "We suspect you are a British spy and secret agent". After this violent treatment, I gave them my pass code.

The detention centre warders seemed shocked when they witnessed this use of force. The secret police asked them to lock me with the handcuffs on the bar attached to the tiger chair. Although the warders seemed hesitant, they complied with this order.

Many interrogations by the MSS took place at a secret location. When the secret police took me out of the detention centre, I was handcuffed, shackled, blindfolded and hooded. I could scarcely breathe.

Before I was blindfolded and hooded, I glimpsed an unmarked van. They asked me to wear the prison jumpsuit and vest turned inside-out to hide my status and situation from any onlookers outside. Then I was handcuffed, shackled, blindfolded and hooded. They dragged me into the unmarked van, then instructed me to lie down on the rear seat, to prevent any onlookers from seeing me. It was like a kidnapping. The drive lasted around 30-40 minutes.

We arrived at this unidentified place and I heard the sound of something like furniture moving. I feared they might be setting up the tools of torture. I said, "I will confess whatever you want, torture is not necessary". They said, it is not torture but "training".

Still handcuffed and shackled, I was suspended on a steep X-Cross in a spread-eagle pose for hour after hour. I was forced to keep my hands up, and blood was not circulating into my arms. It felt extremely painful. Sometimes, they ordered me to do "stress tests", which included an extreme strength exercise such as "squat" and "chair pose" for hours on end. They beat me every time I failed to do it, using something that felt like sharpened batons. They also poked my vulnerable and shivering body parts, such as my knee joints. I was blindfolded and hooded during the whole torture experience and interrogations. I sweated a lot, and felt exhausted, dizzy and suffocated.

Sometimes, they ordered me to stand still (handcuffed, shackled, blindfolded, and hooded) for long hours. I was not allowed to move or fall asleep. If I did, then I would be punished by being forced to sing the Chinese national anthem.

In the first week, the secret police saw that I was seriously bruised on my ankles, thighs, wrists, and knees. They ordered me to not tell the truth to the doctors back in the detention centre, and to claim it was caused by me slipping on the floor during the interrogations outside the detention centre. Back in the detention centre, the doctors there noted my injuries on a medical record.

Realising I could not even walk during the following days, my interrogators paused the physical torture and resorted to more psychological methods. They told me that I still had a chance to be "reborn" (released) after 15 days if I showed a "cooperative attitude" by revealing "connections" between the protests and the UK. I relented and told them I would confess.

They then presented two different types of “decision documents”. One was for a 15-day detention as originally proposed and signed previously. The other was for two more years, in the name of “re-education” through confinement. What they were saying was do as we want and you get released, or refuse and you spend at least two years in a camp and perhaps face charges of crimes against national security.

Then an interrogator asked me a series of questions:

- 1) Do you want your parents to be notified? – I replied “Yes”. He gave me the decision document on two-year “re-education” imprisonment to sign. I realised he was threatening me. I replied “No”. He said I did very well and had shown a “good attitude.
- 2) If no, why? Because you feel shameful? – “Yes”.
- 3) Have you been tortured or enforced to confess? – “No”.
- 4) Did the police treat you well? – “Yes”.
- 5) Why didn’t you ask for a lawyer? – “I am too shameful to ask for help”.

Then the policeman turned on the camera to film those answers. After that they filmed many more video clips in several different locations of me supposedly “confessing” to the various allegations.

A uniformed officer asked me out to the front lobby of the detention centre, ordered me to place a plate with my name on it in front of my chest and started filming my apology and confession for “soliciting prostitution”.

I was taken back to the interrogation room and the plainclothes officer passed two sheets of A4 paper to me. He asked me to prepare two written “repentance statements”, one for “soliciting prostitution” and one for “betraying the motherland”. After review, I was asked to recite everything and they filmed it.

Finally, before my release, a brand-new team of secret police came and submitted me to a new round of interrogation. This round lasted the longest. It went on continuously for 48 hours. There were three officers in the interrogation room and a back-up team of around five officers were stationed in the next room.”

After a few hours break the final video confession was filmed. I was handed a script with questions and answers for the purpose of filming my “confession” and “testimony” against a well-decorated background. They filmed this several times in re-takes.

After this they escorted me to the Hong Kong border on August 24. Even though there is an agreement between Hong Kong and mainland China to notify each other if a citizen is detained in each other’s territory, the mainland authorities ignore and violate this agreement. Because of that, I had to go to the Hong Kong police to cancel the missing person report on me.

## **On China Global Television Network (CGTN)**

In 2018 Beijing announced a reorganisation of Chinese State TV, placing it, directly under Chinese Communist Party control, rather than State control. The massive reorganisation

ordered by President Xi Jinping in his signature new policy on the role of Chinese media, was designed to make it an organ of the Party, always to do the Party's bidding. This change was dictated in a public document: the *Program for the Deepening Reform of Party and Government Organs* (深化党和国家机构改革方案).

CGTN is the international arm of China Central Television (CCTV). It operates an Africa division, an Americas division, and is launching a European division, for which their new office in London will be the headquarters. It also operates French, Spanish, Russian and Arabic language channels, as well as CCTV-4, an international channel which is broadcasting in mandarin Chinese.

In the United Kingdom, CGTN holds this license:

CGTN (TLCS000575BA/2)

<http://static.ofcom.org.uk/static/radiolicensing/html/tv/cs/tlcs000575ba2cgtn.htm>

Last year the United States Department of Justice ordered CGTN and China's state-owned news agency Xinhua, to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA), considering them to be foreign agents operating for a foreign government in the United States.

## The broadcast



**Channel:** China Global Television Network (CGTN)

**Programme:** China24

**Date:** 2019-11-21

**Length of broadcast:** 54 seconds

**Time of broadcast:** 12:15-13:00 (possibly rebroadcast at next broadcast of programme, 01:30) (All times GMT-0 as per CGTN official schedule). China24 runs twice a day, at 01:30 and 12:15.



## Violations of rules and law

This list of violations is based upon the Broadcasting Code, sections 7 (privacy) and 8 (fairness). This is part A, below.

It also includes information related to sections 2 (Harm and offense), 3 (Crime, disorder, hatred and abuse) and 5 (Impartiality and accuracy), because the broadcast is in clear violation of those and therefore liable for a **standards breach** investigation, which I urge Ofcom to undertake, too. This is part C, further below.

Furthermore, due to its duty as a public authority, under the Human Rights Act, to protect rights enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), a section (B) on that is also included.

### a) Privacy and Fairness complaint

#### Section 7: Fairness

**Article 7.1: Broadcasters must avoid unjust or unfair treatment of individuals or organisations in programmes.**

The cited CGTN broadcast states that I was 'tried' in August. They say, and I quote; *"Shenzhen police has released videos of Simon Cheng soliciting prostitutes and of his trial on [sic] August"*. This is a direct lie. There has been no trial, not even an indictment. In fact, I was, according to Chinese police, placed in "administrative detention", which is not a judicial process at all, it is an extra-judicial measure. Based on Chinese law, there cannot even

theoretically be a trial, as it is a matter decided by the local police under the same administrative regulation as a petty fine. Hence, this statement by CGTN is a direct lie.

The broadcaster states that I am guilty of soliciting prostitutes, despite no evidence to this effect having been presented by the police, other than an alleged “confession” film recorded by the police themselves while I was held incommunicado and under duress at an unknown location, in solitary confinement, and without legal counsel. Broadcasting such a “confession” has no journalistic merit and is not the behaviour of a real media outlet. CGTN did not solicit comments, inputs or responses. Nor was I in any way approached to give my consent to this defamatory and inaccurate broadcast. Furthermore, my speaking has been blurred out, and instead the newscaster merely states that in the video of me speaking I am confessing to the police’s allegations, but it is merely stated by the news presenter, not me, as my voice is made (almost) inaudible.

In addition, CGTN states that the surveillance footage that it includes in the broadcast shows me visiting prostitutes. It does not name the place, which police have merely called a “club” but which, by appearance could be a massage parlour. The video does not show me visiting or soliciting a prostitute, yet the CGTN newscaster and CGTN graphics added to the film states that as a fact. Also, CGTN does not identify the type, name or location of the place where I am filmed. Nothing in that surveillance footage shows me, or indicates in any way me, soliciting prostitutes. All it shows is a lobby and a corridor. Yet, CGTN states all these things as facts.

Finally, the broadcast footage was not released at time of making, or immediately after. It was only broadcast some three months after its filming by the police. The purpose is very clear – it was broadcast to counter an international outcry over the abuses committed against me.

The broadcast does not state in what situation the recording was made (as noted above), despite the situation being well-known to CGTN and the world at large, and CGTN presents the recording as though it were filmed with my will and consent, which it was not. The broadcast is entirely unjust and unfair.

Also of importance, see answer to 7.6 below.

**Article 7.2: Broadcasters and programme makers should normally be fair in their dealings with potential contributors to programmes unless, exceptionally, it is justified to do otherwise.**

Due to my situation being well-known, CGTN was well aware that the recording they used in their broadcast was extracted under extreme duress and distress, even if one were to disregard the additional credible information on torture. I was held, as Chinese police have admitted, incommunicado, for the entire duration of my captivity.

**Article 7.3: Where a person is invited to make a contribution to a programme (except when the subject matter is trivial or their participation minor) they should normally, at an appropriate stage:**

- **be told the nature and purpose of the programme, what the programme is about and be given a clear explanation of why they were asked to contribute and when (if known) and where it is likely to be first broadcast;**

- be told what kind of contribution they are expected to make, for example live, pre-recorded, interview, discussion, edited, unedited, etc.;
- be informed about the areas of questioning and, wherever possible, the nature of other likely contributions;
- be made aware of any significant changes to the programme as it develops which might reasonably affect their original consent to participate, and which might cause material unfairness;
- be told the nature of their contractual rights and obligations and those of the programme maker and broadcaster in relation to their contribution; and
- be given clear information, if offered an opportunity to preview the programme, about whether they will be able to effect any changes to it.

CGTN did not reach out to me, and I was not asked to contribute to this broadcast, nor was I asked permission for the recording of me to be used. They had many well-known avenues to reach me, but CGTN tried none of them. Also, see answers to 7.1 and 7.2 as both apply here.

**Article 7.6: When a programme is edited, contributions should be represented fairly.**

The recording used by CGTN is pasted together from several separate clips, not a straight-through or genuine interview but an on-camera interrogation shot in separate takes. CGTN took and used this video from police hands without prior familiarity with the recordings, between or after these cuts. The allegations by police, despite me not having not been tried or convicted of the alleged offence, nor of any crime at all, actually, was falsely presented by the newscaster as fact.

CGTN states that surveillance video footage which it uses in the broadcast shows me visiting prostitutes. There is no signage or action in the footage that confirms this. It does not name the place, which police have called a “club”, but which by appearance might be a massage parlour. The video does not in any way show me visiting or soliciting a prostitute, yet the CGTN newscaster and CGTN graphics added to the film states that as a fact. CGTN does not identify the type, name or location of the place where I was filmed.

**Article 7.9: Before broadcasting a factual programme, including programmes examining past events, broadcasters should take reasonable care to satisfy themselves that:**

- material facts have not been presented, disregarded or omitted in a way that is unfair to an individual or organisation;

All answers to 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.6 apply also here. This is perhaps the most severe violation, excluding the totally false statement that I have been “tried”. Again, CGTN also blurs out my own speaking, making it nearly inaudible, and instead have the news presenter claim that I am confessing to police allegations.

**Article 7.11: If a programme alleges wrongdoing or incompetence or makes other significant allegations, those concerned should normally be given an appropriate and timely opportunity to respond.**

As shown below, CGTN has made no attempt whatsoever to reach me and the broadcast does not include any responses from me to those allegations, despite such responses being widely available and known to CGTN, as their broadcast is intended as a backlash against my own words publicly spoken just a day or so before.

## Section 8: Privacy

**Article 8.6: If the broadcast of a programme would infringe the privacy of a person or organisation, consent should be obtained before the relevant material is broadcast, unless the infringement of privacy is warranted.**

The CGTN broadcast infringed my privacy and presented falsehoods. CGTN did not seek consent from me. And importantly, at the time of recording, I was not able to give consent as I was under duress and distress, undergoing torture and held incommunicado at a secret location.

**Article 8.16: Broadcasters should not take or broadcast footage or audio of people caught up in emergencies, victims of accidents or those suffering a personal tragedy, even in a public place, where that results in an infringement of privacy, unless it is warranted or the people concerned have given consent.**

My recording was very much filmed during a situation of emergency and suffering personal tragedy. The whole purpose of CGTN's broadcast was to add to that tragedy. It was also made at a secret location, another point which was well known to CGTN as the fact of my disappearance and unknown whereabouts during my disappearance had been reported on extensively for many months before CGTN aired this broadcast.

**Article 8.17: People in a state of distress should not be put under pressure to take part in a programme or provide interviews, unless it is warranted.**

I was under extreme distress and did not voluntarily make the recording. I was not asked in any way about this news production or broadcast. It was made by police and released by CGTN to exert pressure on me, without any prior contact with me at all.

**China24**

Primetime news program that brings the most important stories from the fast-changing nation of over 1.3 billion people. The show focuses on the changing aspects of China's politics, economy and society, especially on the everyday lives of its people. With separate editions out of China and the America.

---

Schedule: Monday - Sunday  
Duration: 30 minutes, 45 minutes  
Time(GMT): 0130, 1215

---

## **b) Violations of the European Convention on Human Rights**

Concerning the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), CGTN is directly responsible for violation of article 8, which in line with the Broadcasting Code provides protections against unlawful violations of privacy.

## **c) Breach of standards complaint**

### Section 2: Harm and offence

#### **2.2 Factual programmes or items or portrayals of factual matters must not materially mislead the audience. (Note to Rule 2.2: News is regulated under Section five of the Code.)**

The broadcast does not include information, which was known to the general public and certainly to CGTN, which presents the situation in which I was forced to be filmed.

The broadcast states that I was on “trial” in August. This is a direct lie. There has been no trial. In fact, I was, according to Chinese police, placed in “administrative detention”, which is not a judicial process but an extra-judicial process. Even based on Chinese law, there cannot even theoretically be a trial in such a process, as it is decided by local police under the same process as deciding on a petty fine. No prosecutors, courts or judges are involved. Hence, this CGTN statement is a direct lie.

The broadcast states that I am guilty of soliciting prostitutes, despite no evidence being presented to that effect by the police, other than an alleged “confession” recorded by the police themselves with me while I was held incommunicado, at an unknown location, in solitary confinement.

CGTN states that the surveillance footage that it includes in the broadcast shows me visiting prostitutes. It does not name the place, which police have merely called a “club” but which, by appearance could be a massage parlour. The video does not show me visiting or soliciting a prostitute, yet the CGTN newscaster and CGTN graphics added to the film states that as a fact. Also, CGTN does not identify the type, name or location of the place where I am filmed.

The audience is thus totally misled by CGTN.

**2.3 In applying generally accepted standards broadcasters must ensure that material which may cause offence is justified by the context (see meaning of "context" below). Such material may include, but is not limited to, offensive language, violence, sex, sexual violence, humiliation, distress, violation of human dignity, discriminatory treatment or language (for example on the grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation, and marriage and civil partnership). Appropriate information should also be broadcast where it would assist in avoiding or minimising offence.**

See answer to 2.2.

### Section 3: Crime, disorder, hatred and abuse.

#### **3.1 Incitement of crime and disorder**

A portrayal of crime, or of incitement to crime, will not necessarily result in a breach of Rule 3.1. The likelihood of content inciting crime or leading to disorder will depend on the nature of the material as well as the context in which it is presented to the audience.

Significant contextual factors under Rule 3.1 may include (but are not limited to):

- the editorial purpose of the programme;
- the status or position of anyone featured in the material; and/or
- whether sufficient challenge is provided to the material.

The broadcast is made for the purpose of stating that I have committed a crime, despite no evidence and no court judgment being presented. It is also for the purpose of inciting hatred against me, with the aim of reducing my credibility. This is the real editorial purpose of the program broadcast by CGTN.

in this CGTN broadcast, there is no, absolutely no, challenge to the information which is presented as fact.

**3.3 Material which contains abusive or derogatory treatment of individuals, groups, religions or communities, must not be included in television and radio services or BBC ODPS except where it is justified by the context. (See also Rule 4.2).**

The material presented is abusive. It states as fact the untried and unconvicted allegations against me, it portrays surveillance footage as evidence even though that footage does not actually show any evidence of the accusation. It includes an incredibly degrading video “confession” by me while I was held incommunicado and filmed at a secret detention location. It was broadcast in the UK and internationally, intentionally to abuse me and make me victim.

### Section 5: Impartiality and accuracy.

**Article 5.1: That News, in whatever form, must be reported with due accuracy and presented with due impartiality.**

This broadcast holds no news value. It was released some three months after filming, for non-news purposes, namely to harm the victim’s (my) credibility.

The broadcast excludes balancing information that was known to the general public and certainly to CGTN which reveals the situation in which I was held when I was recorded.

The broadcast states that I was “tried” in August. This is a direct lie. There has been no trial. In fact, I was, according to Chinese police, placed in “administrative detention”, which is not a judicial process but an extra-judicial process, a non-judicial process. Even according to Chinese law, there cannot even theoretically be a trial, as the matter was being decided by the police under the same process as deciding on a petty fine. Hence, this statement is a direct lie.

The broadcast states that I am guilty of soliciting prostitutes, despite no evidence being presented to that effect by the police, other than an alleged “confession” filmed by the police themselves with me while I was held incommunicado, at an unknown location, and in solitary confinement, and prevented from having legal counsel.

CGTN states that surveillance video which it used in its broadcast shows me visiting prostitutes. It does not name the place, which police have merely called a “club”, but which by appearance is a massage parlour. The video does not show me visiting or soliciting a prostitute, yet the CGTN newscaster and CGTN graphics added to the film state that as a fact. Also, CGTN does not identify the type, name or location of the place where I am filmed.

The recording used by CGTN is pasted together from several separate takes. CGTN took and used this video straight from the police without prior familiarity with the recordings, in between or after these cuts. The allegations by police, despite my not having been tried or convicted of the alleged crime, were presented by CGTN as fact.

CGTN has made no attempt to reach me whatsoever, and the broadcast does not include any responses from me to those allegations, such responses being readily available and known to CGTN, as their broadcast is in direct response to my own words spoken just a day or so before.

**Article 5.2: Significant mistakes in news should normally be acknowledged and corrected on air quickly. Corrections should be appropriately scheduled.**

There has been no correction to this broadcast and I do not anticipate there will be one, given that CGTN is an organ of the Chinese Communist Party and not a genuine news outlet. There is also no complaint mechanism for me to seek redress or correction from the broadcaster. This is despite the fact that I the victim have spoken publicly about the circumstances and reasons for my detention.

**Article 5.8: Any personal interest of a reporter or presenter, which would call into question the due impartiality of the programme, must be made clear to the audience.**

CGTN wrongfully presents itself as Chinese state TV, when in fact, since 2018, it has been under the direct control of Chinese Communist Party organs, a fact which has been made public in China (in Chinese/mandarin) and abroad.

The news presenter, like CGTN as a whole, is under the direct control of the same body as the Chinese police, namely the Chinese Communist Party, and this is not noted in the broadcast.

## Appendixes

- 1/ Ofcom form Of333 (Fairness and Privacy Complaint Form)
- 2/ Download links to copies of the broadcast as video file:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=POjaAsNQy3Q>
- 3/ Attached video copy of the broadcast in question (see email submission)

### License information

#### **CGTN**

Content:

Type of Service: Editorial

Licensee: Star China Media Limited

Contact Details: Alice Tang  
Unit A, 9th Floor,  
MG Tower,  
133 Hoi Bun Road,  
KOWLOON

Telephone: +852 3996 3702

Website:

Email: [alictang@startv.com.cn](mailto:alictang@startv.com.cn)

License Number: TLC5000575BA/2