Neutral Citation Number: [2022] EWHC 482 (QB)

Case No: QB-2021-001227

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION

MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS LIST

Royal Courts of Justice

Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 10 March 2022

Before :

MR JUSTICE JOHNSON

- -

Between :

CHRIS PACKHAM CBE **Cla**

- and -

(1) DOMINIC WIGHTMAN

(2) NIGEL BEAN **Defe**

(3) PAUL READ

- -

- -

Jonathan Price and Claire Overman (instructed by Leigh Day) for the Claimant

The Defendants appeared in person

Hearing date: 15 February 2022

- -

Approved Judgment

Mr Justice Johnson:

1.
This is a trial of preliminary issues as to the meaning of articles, videos and tweets published between April 2020 and November 2021.

2.
The claimant seeks damages in defamation in respect of those publications. As required by Civil Procedure Rules Practice Direction 53B ("CPR PD 53B") paragraph 4.4(2)(a), the claimant has set out, in his Particulars of Claim, the imputations which he alleges each publication conveys in its natural and ordinary meaning. The claimant does not rely on any innuendo meaning. The defences filed by

each defendant do not comply with CPR PD 53B. There are outstanding applications to amend the defences of the first and second defendants. The defendants have provided a document which sets out their case as to the meaning of each of the publications. They have provided a separate document which identifies parts of each publication which they contend amount to expressions of opinion rather than statements of fact.

3.
On 10 November 2021 Master Dagnall directed that there would be a trial of the following preliminary issues:

(1)
The natural and ordinary meanings of the statements complained of by the claimant.

(2)
Whether the said statements, in the meanings found, are defamatory of the claimant at common law.

(3)
Whether the said statements, in the meanings found, are or contain statements of opinion within the meaning of section 3(2) Defamation Act 2013.

(4)
If in relation to any of the said statements the answer to the question in (3) above is ‘yes’, whether the statement complained of indicated, whether in general or specific terms, the basis of such opinion for the purposes of s3(3) Defamation Act 2013.

The publications

4.
The claimant seeks damages in respect of 19 separate publications. These comprise:

(1)
Nine articles that were published in an online publication, “Country Squire Magazine”.

(2)
Two videos that were uploaded and published on the “youtube.com” website.

(3)
Eight tweets, each of which contained some text and a link to one of the articles or videos. The tweets were published on Twitter from the account of Country Squire Magazine and were variously re-tweeted by one or more of the defendants.

5.
The text of each article and tweet (and the transcript of each video) is set out at appendix 1 to this judgment. There is a theme running through the publications. The theme concerns fundraising by the claimant for the Wildheart Trust (“the Trust”). The Trust runs a wildlife sanctuary on the Isle of Wight. Some of the animals at the sanctuary are tigers that had previously been owned by a circus. The publications focus on statements said to have been made by the claimant while fundraising, to the effect that the tigers had been poorly treated by the circus and had been rescued by the Trust.

Legal framework

6.

Meaning: The legal principles to be applied when determining meaning are summarised in Koutsogiannis v Random House Group Ltd [2019] EWHC 48 (QB) [2020] 4 WLR 25 per Nicklin J at [11]-[12]. The Court's task is "to determine the single natural and ordinary meaning of the words". This is "the meaning that the hypothetical reasonable reader would understand the words bear." In making that determination the Court should apply the approach identified in Koutsogiannis at [12].

7.
Fact/opinion: The principles are summarised by Nicklin J in Koutsogiannis at [16]-[18]. The ultimate question is the impact on the hypothetical reasonable reader (Koutsogiannis at [16(iii)]), in other words whether the hypothetical reasonable reader would understand the passage in question, read in context, as conveying fact or opinion. Determining whether words express an opinion, or an asserted fact, is part and parcel of determining the words' meaning. The Court should not therefore determine these two issues separately in "too linear or compartmentalised a fashion" - see Haji-Ioannou v Telegraph Media Group Ltd [2020] EWHC 2922 (QB) per Collins Rice J at [13] (and the authorities there cited).

Submissions

Claimant's submissions

8.
Mr Price, on behalf of the claimant, argues that an impressionistic approach to meaning is particularly apposite when considering tweets and videos – see Stocker v Stocker [2019] UKSC 17 [2020] AC 593 per Lord Kerr JSC at [41]-[45]. He said that some publications engage the "repetition rule" (see Koutsogiannis at [15]). For example, in the second video Mr Wightman says, "a Country Squire Magazine writer and I… accused Packham… of lying in crowd funders about some tigers they say they rescued from Spain." The repetition rule means that this does not simply bear the meaning that the earlier publication accused Mr Packham of lying. It also bears the meaning that Mr Packham did in fact lie.

9.
Each of the tweets contains a single hyperlink to an article (or video). The content of each tweet is such that the hypothetical reasonable reader who wanted to make sense of the tweet would inevitably read the linked material – see Falter v Altzmon [2018] EWHC 1728 (QB) per Nicklin J at [12]. The meanings proffered by the defendants (see appendix 2 below) are belated attempts to sanitise the publications and marginalise their defamatory sting. On a fair reading, each publication is scathing of the claimant and his dishonest content and they "are textbook examples of publications that are 'all bane and no antidote'". Insofar as the articles contain questions about the claimants' conduct, these are not neutral questions which are left unanswered. Rather, the surrounding content provides clear answers to the questions asked.

Defendants' submissions

10.
The defendants have set out meanings for each publication that differ from the claimant's meanings. In the event, Mr Wightman says that for some publications there is not much difference between the parties' claimed meanings. He calls these "score draw" publications. The defendants say that they do not contest the claimant's meanings in respect of the score draw publications. These are: the seventh article, the first video, the second video, the second article tweet, the fourth article tweet, the eighth article tweet and the further eighth article tweet. In respect of the sixth article tweet the defendants

contend that their meaning is more defamatory than that of the claimant, and they are prepared to rely on that more defamatory meaning.

11.
Several points raised by the defendants relate to their role in the publications (it was said that Mr Read had simply re-tweeted a tweet, that he had no influence over the content of the publications and that "he should not be here"), or to substantive defences that might be advanced to the claim. The defendants are frustrated at the narrow focus of the preliminary issues. Deploying a rugby analogy, they put it this way in their written argument:

"imagine the ball put into the scrum is the Claimant's 'reality' (what he said and did) in the tiger saga (we, annoyingly, are at a trial on meanings so we cannot infer at this stage to truth or facts, on which the Defendants depend for total justification). Without the ball there is no match (nor a way to determine meanings)."

12.
As to the meaning of the publications, the defendants do not shy away from their central contention that the claimant misused his role as a BBC presenter to defraud the public into making charitable donations on the false pretext that tigers had been mistreated by a circus and rescued by a zoo. They did not wish "to shirk the responsibility of the defence" in that respect. They did, however, contest Mr Price's contention that the publications were "all bane and no antidote." They rely on a schedule setting out the number of occasions words such as "fraud", "cynical", "truth", "lying", "dishonest", "crook", "false" and misled" appeared in each of the publications. They also rely on a written schedule of "mitigations/antidotes." These can be summarised as set out below.

<u>First article</u>

13.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The question mark at the end of paragraph 20 ("So no mistaking who is to blame then?")

(2)
The "reference to the need for external bodies' clarifications" at paragraphs 26 and 37, and the use of the word "appears" at paragraph 26.

<u>Second article</u>

14.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The words in paragraph 3, "hardly illegal, you'd think?" which indicate that whether the claimant has acted illegally is open to question.

(2)
The reference in paragraph 11 to the defendants having sought clarification from the Wildheart Trust.

(3)
The "reference to the need for external bodies' clarifications" at paragraphs 13, 23, 24 and 25.

(4)

The series of questions at paragraph 20 which highlight “suspicions.”

(5)
The content of paragraph 22 which “[g]ives room to Claimant for a way out, showing openness.”

Third article

15.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The “massive great question mark” that follows the single word photographic headline, “FRAUD”.

(2)
The “reference to the need for external bodies’ clarifications” at paragraphs 4, 46, 50 and 89.

(3)
The words in paragraph 22 “make up your own mind” which “open[ed] the question up to the reader”.

(4)
The content of paragraphs 41, 43, 44 and 46 which are a “[s]eries of questions rather than statements of guilt.”

Fourth article

16.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
Paragraph 4, which “[asks] the reader to look elsewhere (the Mail) to verify.”

(2)
The words “You be the judge and jury” followed by a question.

(3)
The use of questions at paragraph 9.

(4)
The links to videos at paragraphs 11 and 12, and the photographs that follow paragraph 17, which allow readers to judge for themselves.

(5)
The “reference to the need for external bodies’ clarifications” at paragraphs 28 and 29.

Fifth article

17.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The invitation to the reader at paragraphs 4-5 to read the previous articles, and other linked material, which enables the reader to make up their own mind.

(2)
The “right to reply” which is offered at paragraphs 12-14.

(3)
The reference, at paragraph 17, to outside officials which indicated that assistance was required "from professionals" before a judgement could be made as to the claimant's conduct.

Sixth article

18.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The content of paragraph 19, "Let the truth out."

(2)
The "reference to the need for external bodies' clarifications" at paragraphs 23 and 34.

(3)
The update at paragraph 35 which was added in December 2021 which referred to the Fundraising Regulator's review.

Seventh article (and first video)

19.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The reference at paragraph 11 to the fact that the evidence would appear, enabling the readers to "check for yourselves."

(2)
Paragraphs 13, 14 and 16 which are questions that "go to the heart of the suspected scam" rather than "statements".

(3)
The "reference to the need for external bodies' clarifications" at paragraph 18.

Second video

20.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The fact that the claimant had been given a right to reply which he had not exercised.

(2)
At paragraph 30 of the transcript Mr Wightman put forward two alternatives – that either Mr Packham misspoke, or he lied.

Eighth article

21.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The reference to "counter case" in Spain at paragraph 10.

(2)
The “reference to the need for external bodies’ clarifications” at paragraphs 11 and 13, and the call for a “deeper investigation” at paragraph 13.

(3)
The reference at paragraph 14 which indicates only that there are grounds for suspicion and that the “case [is] not yet made.”

Ninth article

22.
The defendants rely on:

(1)
The “reference to the need for external bodies’ clarifications” at paragraphs 11, 14 and 28.

Second article tweet

23.
The defendants rely on the question in the tweet.

Third article tweet

24.
The defendants rely on the mention of an outside judge, the Fundraising Regulator, and the BBC.

Fact / opinion

25.
The defendants also contend that parts of the publications amount to expressions of opinion rather than statements of fact. They provided marked up copies of the articles to indicate where they say the boundary lay between statements of fact and expressions of opinion.

Discussion and decision

26.
The defendants are wrong to say it is not possible to determine the meanings of the articles as a separate and preliminary issue divorced from the underlying facts and whether the defendants have a defence of truth. Meaning is often determined as a preliminary issue. A direction was made for that to happen in this case. That direction was made following a letter from Mr Wightman in which he agreed that there should be a trial of preliminary issues.

27.
The hearing bundle was prepared so that the publications appeared as the first documents in the bundle, before the statements of case. I reached a preliminary view as to the meaning of each of the publications before considering the parties’ respective cases – see Tinkler v Ferguson [2019] EWCA Civ 819 [2021] 4 WLR 27 per Longmore LJ at [9]. I considered the fact/opinion question at the same time as the meaning question.

28.
I do not rule on the meaning of the “score draw” publications. The claimant’s contention as to the meaning of those publications is not contested. Nor is it contested that the meanings are each

defamatory and that they are not (and do not contain) expressions of opinion. It follows that, for the purposes of this trial, there is no relevant issue between the parties in respect of those publications.

29.
There is also, in effect, agreement between the parties as to the meaning of the sixth article tweet. In that respect, the claimant is content to adopt the defendant's meaning, save that the second sentence may be omitted because it does not relate to the claimant.

30.
In respect of the remaining publications I have reviewed, and in some respects slightly amended, the preliminary views that I reached in the light of the parties' respective arguments.

31.
I agree with the submission of Mr Price that the use of questions in the articles is rhetorical. Where questions are raised, the content of the article provides the answer. The most striking example is the third article. The headline to the article is in the form of an image. The foreground comprises the word "fraud" in large red capitalised text, followed by a question mark. The background is an image of a tiger. The body of the article sets out the basis for the suggestion of fraud. It says the claimant said that tigers housed by the Trust had been rescued from a circus where they had been mistreated, whereas the tigers had in fact been well cared for by the circus and they had been donated to the Trust (not rescued by the Trust). The article then, at paragraph 11, asks the question whether this is "just another innocent mistake [by the claimant]." The answer is provided in the one-word paragraph 12: "No." The conclusion to the article states that the claimant has "clearly not been truthful". In isolation, the headline to the article does not state that the claimant has acted fraudulently. But when the article as a whole is read, that is what is conveyed.

32.
The same applies to the other matters on which the defendants rely as mitigating the impact of the articles. In context they do not have what the defendants describe as a mitigating effect. The questions that are raised in the articles are devices that convey, in what is intended to be an engaging and emphatic manner, that the claimant has sought to raise charitable donations by telling lies. The references to the "police" and other investigating bodies are not presented in a way that suggests the reader should keep an open mind. They again reinforce the central theme of the publications that the claimant has perpetrated a fraud on the public.

33.
Broadly, the meaning I ascribe to each publication corresponds to the meaning contended for by the claimant. There is considerable overlap between the meaning of the different publications. The essential meaning of many of them is a variation on the theme that the claimant dishonestly raised funds from the public by stating that tigers had been rescued from a circus where they had been mis-treated, whereas in fact (as the claimant knew) the tigers had been well-treated and had been donated by the circus.

34.
My conclusion as to the meaning of each of the individual publications is as follows:

(1)
First article: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham abused his privileged position as a BBC presenter by fraudulently raising funds from the public for his girlfriend’s zoo charity by falsely stating that tigers at the zoo had been mistreated by, and rescued from, a circus, when, as he knew, the tigers were well-loved family pets that had been donated to the zoo.”

(2)
Second article: This publication carries the same meaning as the first article:

“Chris Packham abused his privileged position as a BBC presenter by fraudulently raising funds from the public for his girlfriend’s zoo charity by falsely stating that tigers at the zoo had been mistreated by, and rescued from, a circus, when, as he knew, the tigers were well-loved family pets that had been donated to the zoo.”

(3)
Third article: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham fraudulently raised money from the public by repeatedly telling lies that tigers had been rescued from a circus where they had been mistreated (one tiger dying from injuries sustained at the circus), when in fact they had been donated by the circus which had treated them well.”

(4)
Fourth article: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham told many lies about tigers under the care of the Wildheart trust, in order to dupe the public, saying that tigers were rescued from unimaginable neglect and cruelty, having lived hellish lives confined within squalid beast-wagons or crammed into tiny pens where they were left to fight for scraps of food in between performances, when he knew that they had been well-treated.”

(5)
Fifth article: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham threatened defamation proceedings in respect of Country Squire Magazine’s accurate exposure of his lies, demanding that they be removed, without any proper basis for doing so.”

(6)
Sixth article: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham told blatant lies to the public to raise money for charity, saying that tigers had been rescued from ill-treatment when in fact they had been donated and had been well-treated, and when this was exposed he made legal threats without any proper basis.”

(7)
Seventh article: The meaning of this article is not in issue. It is:

“Mr Packham has dishonestly misled the public into donating to the Wildheart Trust by falsely claiming that the organisation had rescued maltreated tigers, when he knew that the tigers were not maltreated.”

(8)
First video: The meaning of this publication is not in issue. It is the same as that of the seventh article:

“Mr Packham has dishonestly misled the public into donating to the Wildheart Trust by falsely claiming that the organisation had rescued maltreated tigers, when he knew that the tigers were not maltreated.”

(9)
Second video: The meaning of this article is not in issue. It is:

“Chris Packham lied in crowd-funders that he and his girlfriend’s zoo had rescued maltreated tigers from Spain.”

(10)
Eighth article: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham lied to raise funds for the Wildheart Trust, saying that the Trust had been critical to the rescue of the tigers from ill-treatment, when as he knew the tigers had been donated to the Trust. He also lied when he said that gamekeepers were burning peat during COP26, when he knew that was untrue.”

(11)
Ninth article: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham lied to raise funds for the Wildheart Trust by claiming that tigers had suffered unimaginable cruelty and neglect at a circus and that they had been rescued by the Trust, when he knew that the tigers had been well treated. He further lied by asking for donations to feed the animals during the Covid emergency whilst dishonestly concealing the fact that the Trust was due to receive a large insurance payment, potentially £500,000.”

(12)
Second article tweet: The meaning of this tweet is not in issue. It is:

“Mr Packham was fundraising on the false basis that tigers he claimed were rescued were not rescued at all.”

(13)
Third article tweet: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham’s claim that he did not do anything wrong is untrue. He fraudulently raised funds for the Wildheart Trust, and he deserved to be dealt with by the Fundraising Regulator.”

(14)
Fourth article tweet: The meaning of this tweet is not in issue. It is:

“Mr Packham lied to the public to secure donations of many thousands of pounds.”

(15)
Fifth article tweet: This publication carries the meaning:

“Chris Packham sought to cover up his wrongdoing, threatening legal action, without a proper basis, to require Country Squire Magazine to remove articles that accurately exposed his wrongdoing.”

(16)
Sixth article tweet: The meaning of this tweet is, effectively, not in issue. It is:

“The Claimant has lied in his dodgy fundraising efforts for Wildheart.”

(17)
Eighth article tweet: The meaning of this tweet is not in issue. It is:

“The Claimant lied in crowdfunders by claiming that tigers were “rescued” when he knew they were not rescued because they were donated.”

(18)
Further eighth article tweet: The meaning of this tweet is not in issue. It is:

“The Claimant lied in crowdfunders about “rescuing” tigers.”

(19)
Ninth article tweet: This publication carries the meaning:

“The Claimant has dishonestly sought to raise funds for the Wildheart Sanctuary, saying they were desperately needed due to the pandemic, without mentioning that the charity was due to receive a £500,000 insurance payment for losses caused by the pandemic.”

35.
Each of the meanings set out in paragraph 34 above is defamatory of the claimant at common law.

36.
I accept the defendants’ contention that some parts of the publications, read in isolation, express opinions. However, those parts are ancillary to the defamatory meanings that the articles convey. Those defamatory meanings amount to asserted fact rather than expressed opinion. None of the meanings are, or contain, statements of opinion.

Next steps

37.
I will make a direction for the listing of a Case Management Conference (“CMC”).

38.
As a result of the resolution of the preliminary issues, there will need to be amendments to the statements of case. The claimant will need to re-amend his Particulars of Claim to bring his pleaded meanings into line with those found by the Court. The defendants will need to amend their defences so that they address the meanings set out in paragraph 34 above and so that they comply with CPR PD 53B. If the amendments are agreed, then the amended statements of case can be filed under CPR 17.1(2)(a). It is likely that a Reply will need to be served. To the extent that any amendments to the Defence are contentious, then the defendants will need to make an application to amend. That can be considered at the CMC. It would, in addition, be helpful if the parties could produce a list of issues for consideration at the CMC. Although there are 19 separate publications, there is considerable overlap between the meanings and there is scope for closely defining the issues between the parties, without necessarily requiring each publication to be the subject of separate consideration.

Outcome

39.
The meaning of each of the articles is set out at paragraph 34 above. Each of those meanings is defamatory of the claimant at common law. All the meanings amount to statements of fact rather than expressions of opinion.

Appendix 1: The publications

Publication 1 – First Article

1.
Without a doubt these are very stressful worrying times for the vast majority of people in the U.K. I think it's a safe bet to say everyone has been affected in some way either mentally or financially by this virus. Charities are no exception, I've read articles suggesting 48% of charities are already in difficulty as donations have dropped, and others are urging the Chancellor to intervene as fifty went bust in one day. So it really was no surprise to see Chris Packham using his privileged status as a BBC presenter to promote his girlfriend's charity and zoo, the Wildheart Foundation , on social media.

2.
I clicked on the link provided. And there was Chris Packham, smearing the circuses and asking you to give up your hard-earned money towards a bunch of rescued tigers. (There is something sick about smearing anyone at this time of national crisis, no?).

3.
You don't need reminding that Chris Packham is a staunch supporter and promoter of The League Against Cruel Sports , a charity with a somewhat dubious history given that it uses "Spike Stocker" AKA Terry Hill as a hunt monitor. Regular readers of Country Squire will know he was instrumental in illegally staging fake scenarios to paint UK circuses with faked videos – perverting the course of justice, no less.

4.
Watch Video At: https://youtu.be/OQF4IR8Gvzs

5.
The left wing used its various mouthpieces in the media to try to ban circuses. The Circus Guild took the unprecedented step of not talking to the press as everything they said was getting twisted to support the "progressive" agenda of animal rights. Labour, who were in charge at the time, jumped on the animal rights bandwagon and stood by watching as a native minority was sent a letter bomb, daily hate mail containing death threats, razor blades and dog excrement. The gutless politicians of both main political parties did nothing.

6.
So, what about those rescued tigers?

7.
There were six tigers claimed to be "rescued" at the zoo on the Isle of Wight. One died in December 2019, it was claimed from injuries sustained while in the circus a full five years previously. We will come to this one later as it's the most infamous. Still, the five-year time span should already set off alarm bells on your bullshit monitor.

8.
Here are a couple of related headlines:

Daily Mirror:

"Rescued from circus hell"

“Five tigers saved from circus hell thanks to Chris Packham and Mirror readers”

9.
They were not actually rescued. We investigated.

10.
There was no Spanish police operation swooping at dawn with animal rescue services. The tigers were actually donated. In an agreement with a rehoming centre they were voluntarily handed over into their care for nothing, instead of being sold off for 2000-3000 euros each. They were well-loved family pets as well as performing animals and could be found sometimes in the homes of the circus folk.

11.
Watch Video At: https://youtu.be/U-14zwCqi K c

12.
The rehoming centre found some excuses, such as the size of the exercise yard. They presented a thin tiger claiming it was underfed – all rather embarrassing, as well-fed tigers can be clearly seen wandering around in the background in their evidence photos.

13.
That’s an old trick used by antis, show the oldest animal as the example. On that basis I could complain to the welfare services my grandmother is old, wrinkly and bent double.

14.
And now onto the best known tiger tale of them all – Simi the Tiger – she became famous in 2015 as her situation was raised in the House of Commons by Andrew Turner MP (Con) at Prime Minister Cameron’s Question Time. This caused considerable embarrassment to the Prime Minister as once again the left-wing press leapt on the opportunity to press him for a ban on wild animals in circuses.

15.
Turner asked:

“The Isle of Wight zoo is having difficulty importing a tiger. She was cruelly treated in a circus and has now been kept in isolation for nearly two years, despite Belgium being wholly free from rabies.”

16.
He later issued a press statement:

“Simi the tiger has been in inadequate, temporary housing for far too long after being badly abused”

17.
After five years at her place of “rescue ”, the Wildheart Foundation Zoo on the Isle of Wight, Simi then died in December 2019, and the left wing press let the UK public know exactly who was to blame:

18.
BBC News Website:

“A tiger rescued by Isle of Wight Zoo has died from injuries suffered during her time in a circus”

19.
County Press:

“The zoo said today: “It is with great sadness we must report our beautiful tigress Simi passed away last week after a short illness related to injuries sustained in her previous life as a circus performer.”

20.
So no mistaking who is to blame then?

21.
Well, think again.

22.
I contacted an animal organisation in Germany to convey my suspicions, not least because I know they take great pride in the way they train both lions and tigers. They have scientific studies to back up their excellent welfare standards. What came back again was more bad news for Chris Packham and his “Rescues”. This tiger rescue nonsense is a bleeding-heart ruse.

23.
As far back as 2014, a full year before Simi`s rescue is brought to the attention of parliament, the Köllner family had won a court case over Simi and the seizure was ruled unlawful. It was even described in a German newspaper as “A resounding slap in the face for the public prosecutor’s office”. The news stories in the UK about Simi are biased nonsense misleading the public. Andrew Turner wasted valuable parliamentary time simply because he did not do his research and should now apologise. Simi was not the only exotic animal seized at the time and her condition was never in any doubt according to the multitude of vets that routinely inspected her.

24.
From the court notes:

“None of the numerous veterinarians who had regularly inspected the circus had previously identified the deficiencies found on the day of the removal”

“Witnesses – all veterinarians – testified that the cats of prey showed quite normal behaviour, formed a “homogeneous group”, and even had a pleasingly large space. Only the tail wound of the lioness in question and her delay in healing were occasionally mentioned. Nevertheless, no veterinarian saw reason to order a visit

to the vet”

25.
The owner was cleared of cruelty over the lioness’s tail in 2016. The seizure was ruled unlawful two years previous and the family are currently locked in a six-figure compensation battle as the German authorities sold off the animals for around 100 euros each before the matter came to court. That’s how Chris Packham and his girlfriend ended up with Simi – effectively she was wrongly taken by the German authorities and not “rescued” by the Wildheart Foundation or Chris Packham at all.

26.
I shall be writing to the Charity Commission and the police to investigate this bleeding- heart scam, as it appears well-cared for animals from the continent are being brought into this country because of stories whipped up in the left wing press. Selling the public a pack of lies about circus cruelty and “rescues” is fraudulent when the public are being asked to part with their hard-earned cash for lies.

27.

The BBC should once again look at Packham's position with the BBC. It is one thing using public money to build Packham up. It is quite different when a presenter uses his privileged position to get involved in promoting fake stories which are designed to loosen purse strings.

Publication 2 – Second Article

1.
[image]

2.
BY NIGEL BEAN

3.
Back in March Chris Packham used his privileged status as a BBC presenter to promote his girlfriend's charity and zoo, the Wildheart Trust , across social media. Nepotistic but hardly illegal, you'd think? There was Packham, smearing the circuses and asking the public to give up their hard-earned money via crowdfunders for these half dozen 'rescued' tigers:

4.
Watch Video At: https://youtu.be/OQF4IR8Gvzs

5.
Country Squire Magazine covered the story back in the Spring.

So, what about those rescued tigers? There were six tigers claimed tobe rescued at the zoo on the Isle of Wight. One died in December 2019, it was claimed from injuries sustained while in the circus a full five years previously. We will come to this one later as it's the most infamous. Still, the five-year time span should already set off alarm bells on your bullshit monitor.

6.
A couple of the headlines from the Daily Mirror at the time read:

"Rescued from circus hell"

"Five tigers saved from circus hell thanks to Chris Packham and Mirror readers"

7.
More links to articles promoting the Tiger rescues:

https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/five-tigers-saved-circus-hell-13618975

https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/rescued-circus-hell-how-you-12662676

https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/tigers-rescued-mirror-readers-enjoy-13777899

8.
We investigated further. We were shocked to discover that the tigers were not actually rescued. There was no Spanish police operation swooping at dawn alongside animal rescue services. These tigers were donated. In an agreement with a rehoming centre they were voluntarily handed over into their care for nothing. They were well-loved family pets as well as performing animals and could be found sometimes in the homes of the circus folk who cared so well for them.

9.

We contacted an animal organisation in Germany – where other tigers were “rescued from” – to convey our suspicions, not least because we know they take great pride in the way they train both lions and tigers. They have scientific studies to back up their excellent welfare standards. What came back again was more bad news for the Wildheart Trust ‘rescues’.

10.
From court notes:

“None of the numerous veterinarians who had regularly inspected the circus had previously identified the deficiencies found on the day of the removal”

“Witnesses – all veterinarians – testified that the cats of prey showed quite normal behaviour, formed a “homogeneous group”, and even had a pleasingly large space. Only the tail wound of the lioness in question and her delay in healing were occasionally mentioned. Nevertheless, no veterinarian saw reason to order a visit to the vet”

11.
So we contacted the Wildheart Trust directly with our worries that there had been a fraud perpetrated by officials from their charity and this is what they had to say:

The Wildheart Trust is opposed to the use of wild animals in circuses and we believe there is a mountain of evidence that the rearing, training and husbandry of such animals hugely compromises their welfare. Having reviewed the video footage along with testimonials from the rescue organisation involved in the rescue, we feel the view that these animals endure horrific conditions throughout the course of their lives is wholly justified.

12.
Interesting to note in the Wildheart Trust’s misdirecting response that they admit to being ideologically opposed to the use of wild animals in circuses but fail to address the lie that they were ‘rescued’, merely doubling down on it by claiming that the ‘rescue’ organisation involved was executing a rescue. If someone is giving away a horse and you want it, you cannot run a crowdfunder to generate piles of cash for yourself claiming that you are ‘rescuing’ the horse – that is fraud.

13.
Now further shocking evidence has come to light that brings the UK police into proceedings as Packham raised a lot of cash for the Wildheart Trust (see graph of their income below):

14.
[image]

15.
We recently obtained a conversation between a circus worker and the original owners of the tigers at the circus. It turns out animal rights nutters (the same common and garden class warrior variety as Packham) had pressed the weak Spanish authorities into stopping circuses using land for their animals so in the end they had nowhere to house them so were forced to DONATE them to a rehoming centre.

16.
The circus owner’s wife then complained that her husband revisited the rehoming centre to find the tigers had been looked after but were thinner.

17.

The bombshell landed when she commented “We’ve heard the Isle of Wight (referring to Wildheart Trust, which is based in the Isle of Wight)…. they were saying that they’d been badly treated in the circus, but as you know, that isn’t true.”

[image]

18.
So we examined Spanish news sites and translated the stories about the donation of the tigers. The story as related by the circus owner’s wife turned out to be the truth and was backed up by a lawyer handling the transfer:

19.
“Raquel López, DeAnimals lawyer, explains that “from the circus they contacted me to help them find a good home for their animals, since they did not want them to end up euthanized, in another circus or in a bad place. I know that the circus family had taken very good care of the animals, and that they understood that it is time to take a step forward and for the animals to have a better life in a sanctuary. After solving legal procedures, to formally donate the animals to a sanctuary.”

El Circo Wonderland dona sus animales salvajes a un centro de rescate de Villena

http://www.murciaconfidencial.com/2017/09/el-circo-wonderland-dona-siete-tigres-y.html

http://www.murciaconfidencial.com/2017/09/el-circo-wonderland-dona-siete-tigres-y.html

20.
So what on earth is Packham’s position now? Note that on the Charity Commission website the Wildheart Trust of which Packham is a trustee alongside his girlfriend has staff costs of a quarter of a million quid or thereabouts compared to vet costs of about twenty grand. Presumably much of the crowdfunded cash has already been spent? The Wildheart Trust has now to come up with the truth. Was the Mirror journalist in on it? Did the Mirror journalist get a backhander?

21.
[image]

22.
Packham will likely claim that he was conned by Spanish animal rights extremists who claimed the tigers were rescued. But that is not what we hear from them in Spain. The Wildheart Trust will have to return donated cash to those duped by the crowdfunder. Or will Packham apologise 1) to the public and 2) to BBC bosses for defrauding members of the public in what is nothing short of a scam? How then with new BBC Director General Tim Davie react? Is Davie all blather?

23.
We reiterate:

The police need to investigate these irregularities built on false premises which raised many thousands of pounds from the public. Packham is supposed to be from the “Gold Standard” BBC yet all the data here points to a scam. If that is not the case then let’s see the results of a thorough police investigation. We are here to assist with a (growing) file of evidence.

24.
The BBC should once again look at Packham’s role with the BBC . It is one thing using public money to build Packham up. It is quite different when a presenter uses his privileged position to get involved

in promoting fake stories which are designed to loosen the purse strings of the British public – especially when his girlfriend is the beneficiary. It's not as if the BBC rules have not already been broken by Packham – just this month indeed.

25.
We have already found some angry donors. Were you duped into donating? Please get in touch using the contact form on this website if you were a victim or contact Action Fraud on 0300 123 2040. The Charity Commission also ought to know – naturally, we have forewarned them.

Publication 3 – Third Article

1.
[image]

2.
BY NIGEL BEAN

3.
Following on from our article about him last weekend, on Monday the 8th December the clearly rattled BBC TV wildlife presenter and balaclava wearer Chris Packham deigned to address his "trolls" on video and attempted to defend himself via social media, referencing the integrity of the group Wild Justice and the charity of which he is a trustee, The Wildheart Trust – a zoo on the Isle of Wight run by his current partner, the CEO of Wildheart, Charlotte Corney.

A statement regarding my fundraising efforts for Wild Justice and The Wildheart Trust .@DailyMailUK pic.twitter.com/ia7Sk2WwSG

— Chris Packham (@ChrisGPackham) December 7, 2020

4.
No doubt Packham knows all about trolls – his "phalanx" of supporters have been trolling and threatening Country Squire Magazine all week. Yoking a troll army is hardly a good look for a prominent BBC TV presenter. And no, we will not keep quiet about what the trolls' intwepid hewo has been up to. Indeed, soon no doubt – one way or the other – the truth shall be aired in court.

5.
[image]

6.
In his Twitter video address above, despite engaging in fundraising activities for it, Packham apologises for referring to Wild Justice as a charity when the organisation has never been listed as a charity. That rarest of apologies is nonetheless insufficient for the significant harm that Packham has done to public perception; not only to the reputation of decent and law-abiding circus owners generally, but also to his own brand and especially that of his paymaster, the BBC.

7.
Worse, in the course of his apology – scrutinised in detail by his BBC bosses, so we have been told – Packham repeated claims that the tigers housed by the Wildheart Trust had been rescued when it was widely reported throughout Spain that these tigers had been donated. (For your interest, the Oxford Dictionary definition of the verb donate is "to give money, food, clothes, etc to somebody/something, especially a charity").

8.
[image]

9.
So we decided to investigate further.

10.
What emerged left us speechless:

In 2016 the Spanish circus folk that owned some of what became Isle of Wight Zoo tigers went to Gijon in Asturias but were not allowed to work while they had their animals on the ground. So they donated their camels to a zoo and moved their tigers to a circus that were still permitted to use them. After the circus season had finished they went to bring the tigers back to their winter quarters but were refused permission by the local council. They then tried to take the tigers to Valencia over Christmas but were again refused permission. The Seprona (Spain's Nature Protection Service) became involved and recommended a 'holding centre' until the circus folk could take their animals back. This is the same place shown in the BBC documentary Inside out and linked to in Packham's tweet above.

11.
By all accounts, from all the relevant witnesses at the time, the circus people handed the tigers over in excellent condition to the holding centre, however on a visit two months later the owner and his nephew became concerned when they could see the tigers had lost weight and conditioning, and seemed poorly. They realised this recommended holding centre were not coping looking after the tigers and, as always wanting what was best for their animals, they immediately looked around for a new home for them and found the sanctuary which Packham would use later to obtain the tigers for Isle of Wight Zoo (Wildheart Trust).

12.
The sanctuary the circus folk found would only take the tigers on if they were to hand them over for good and, considering the constant hassle they were getting from animal rights nutters at the time, this course of action was agreed. Representatives from the sanctuary then turned up at the holding centre knowing full well it was just a holding centre and shot the video giving the viewer the impression it was their circus accommodation being filmed. It wasn't. The holding centre openly admit as much. They knew full well why they were being asked to take on the tigers and where they had come from previously.

13.
So for the record here are the same well-cared for tigers looking healthy in the circus' travelling quarters in a clean environment forming a happy and homogenous group. This is hugely different to what was portrayed in Packham's video and the story aired by Inside Out on the BBC.

14.
[image]

15.
[image]

16.
[image]

17.
[image]

18.
In Spain, the press correctly and unanimously reported the tigers as donated and lawyers went on record saying the circus tigers were ‘well cared for’. Yet over here in the UK the tigers were portrayed to the public – for purposes of raising donations – as ‘mistreated’, as ‘abused’ and as ‘rescued’.

19.
So just another innocent mistake then by Packham and his “charities“?

20.
No.

21.
Meet Simi the smoking gun (pictured in the featured image for this article). Another tiger – this time belonging to a German circus – that also went the Wildheart route to Isle of Wight zoo.

22.
Using Packham’s own words, “I will leave you to make up your own mind” as to whether deceit has been at play here…

23.
The Background: SIMI

24.
There was a police raid on a German circus in May 2013. On that day, from 6.35 a.m. onwards, sixty-six police officers secured the circus grounds and forbid any of the circus folk present from leaving their caravans. Later in court, one of the policemen on the witness stand described this strategy as wanting to ‘freeze’ the situation. The aim of the operation was to confiscate the elephant cow ‘Gitana’ without incident. Preparations had been made beforehand and a court order had been obtained.

25.
On the day of the search, Gitana was anaesthetised by a specialist veterinarian and transported away. Afterwards, the public prosecutor’s office and the veterinarian discussed the possibility of inspecting the other animals as well. As a result the defendant’s dog, two tigers – one called ‘Simi’ and the other ‘Julia’ – were taken away along with two lions ‘without a warrant’ and later sold ‘in an emergency’. It was noted at the time that one of the lions had an injured tail.

26.
However, a year later, in August 2014, the three judges of the 7th Criminal Chamber of the Regional Court in Kiel judged that the German authorities had taken away the animals illegally from the Circus. This was reported at the time in Germany as (translated):

“a resounding slap in the face for the public prosecutor’s office”.

27.
Game set and match to the circus then?

28.
Well no, as previously stated, the tiger ‘Julia’ had already been sold off to the Woodside Wildlife Park in Lincolnshire for £250,000 and donations were already being collected under the false premise that

‘Julia’ along with another male tiger she got paired with called ‘Tango’ were both badly treated in a German circus. Only ‘Tango’ came from a French circus and had been removed on mere safety grounds alone. The Daily Mail did not even bother waiting for the court case in Germany to be heard before publishing this factually incorrect pile of tosh:

29.
https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2596972/Tango-Esso-tiger-saved-death-British- wildlife-park-abused-German-circus.html

•
Tango appeared in a series of adverts for the fuel giant in the 1990s

•
He and his partner Julia then went to a circus where they were mistreated

•
They were rescued by Lincolnshire Wildlife Park which paid £250,000 to save them

30.
So the circus family, even after winning their case, were told, to their utter amazement, “your animals are not coming back”. They did not know where they were. And they still had a final court appearance to attend and prepare for in relation to their lion’s damaged tail.

31.
Now enter Chris Packham’s girlfriend Charlotte Corney from her Isle of Wight zoo – remembering the German circus family have already been cleared over Simi and the confiscation has already been ruled illegal. This is the sequence of events that followed:

32.
16th September 2015

33.
Charlotte Corney, Director of the Isle of Wight zoo and girlfriend of BBC presenter Chris Packham, makes a move for Simi but has problems getting her through customs so contacts her local MP Andrew Turner for help.

Twitter melts – and not in a good way

– after Andrew Turner asks about

Tigers in most-watched PMQs (Update

2 : Video)

34.
Andrew Turner then raises the issue in Parliament at PMQ – “The Isle of Wight zoo is having difficulty importing a tiger. She was cruelly treated in a circus and has now been kept in isolation for nearly two years, despite Belgium being wholly free from rabies. Will my right hon. Friend assist in breaking through this bureaucratic logjam?”

[image] Charlotte Corney (on the left)

35.

Charlotte Corney incorrectly advised Andrew Turner ‘Simi’ was cruelly treated in the German circus although the circus owner had been cleared the previous year when the confiscation was ruled illegal:

https://www.dailyecho.co.uk/news/13763924.isle-of-wight-mp-andrew-turner-raises-plight- of-tiger-simi-during-pmqs

36.
14th January 2016

The German circus go back to court and are cleared of any wrongdoing in relation to the lion’s tail having already been cleared of cruelty to the tigers and all other animals under their care in 2014. Vets tell the court they inspected the animals routinely and never found a problem and the circus owner can expect “a six figure pay out for damages”.

37.
https://www.ln-online.de/Lokales/Segeberg/Verfahren-eingestellt-Entschaedigung-fuer-Zirkusfamilie

38.
“None of the numerous veterinarians who had regularly inspected the circus had previously identified the deficiencies found on the day of the removal”

“On the contrary: Witnesses – all veterinarians – testified that the cats of prey showed quite normal behaviour, formed a “homogeneous group”, and even had a pleasingly large space. Only the tail wound of the lioness in question and her delay in healing were occasionally mentioned. Nevertheless, no veterinarian saw reason to order a visit to the vet”

39.
19th January, 2016

More false allegations of circus mistreatment from The Sun emerge featuring Packham’s girlfriend, Charlotte Corney.

Simi the tiger finally=safe in Britain two years after being rescued from cruel German circus

“Simi the tiger finally safe in Britain two years after being rescued from cruel

German circus”

40.
4th February 2016

And still more false accusations by Charlotte Corney – this time on radio telling folk “Simi was subject to a rough ride over welfare and cruel training methods”. At 19:37 on this podcast:

https://www.vectisradio.com/tag/simi-the-tiger

41.
What “rough ride over welfare and cruel training methods” is Corney talking about? How can Corney claim that? Why should anyone for one minute think that an animal’s welfare is better at a zoo in the Isle of Wight than at a German circus whose welfare standards were deemed impeccable by multiple vets and witnesses? Could this be anti-circus ideology weaponised to raise funds from gullible members of the British public, perhaps? Where’s the integrity in that?

42.

12th December 2019

When Simi dies in December 2019 there is an announcement in the press. Unsurprisingly the BBC cover the story and get a quote from Corney's Isle of Wight zoo. Despite German vets routinely inspecting her up to when she was seized six years previously and testifying in court – "that the cats of prey showed quite normal behaviour, formed a "homogeneous group", and even had a pleasingly large space" – Corney's zoo continues to propagate the lie that Simi has died from injuries sustained while in a circus.

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-hampshire-50761485

43.
What are the chances that Simi could only have died in the UK from injuries sustained while in the German circus six years previously when vets had testified there had been no harm done to Simi at all while in the circus and that the tiger's welfare standards had been exemplary?

44.
"Isle of Wight rescued tiger, Simi, dies of circus injuries" is both duplicitous and propagandist.

Is it not the truth that a blinkered animal rights ideologue – Corney – pushed this narrative simply to smear circuses to which she is ideologically opposed? Also to collect donations from bleeding heart, gullible, animal-loving Brits who, because of his BBC status, believe her boyfriend Packham's every word? Is this not abuse of human beings who are ready to believe that rescuing tigers from circuses and transporting them back to their 'forever home' (words used by Packham while fundraising) into their zoo is the right thing to be donating towards?

45.
Of course the claim that all circuses are cruel is patently false. If Corney's Zoo or the journalists pushing her and Packham's story had consulted with a real expert on wild animals in circuses – someone like Professor Ted Friend – they would not be facing the music as they do now.

46.
Professor Friend studied circus animals for over twenty years and has nine peer reviewed studies on their welfare – including studies on tigers – under his belt and in a recent webchat he explained how he prefers circuses to zoos when it comes to animal welfare. How does that research fit in with Packham and Corney's 'forever home'? Where was that side of the story mentioned in the crowd funders associated with the tigers? How does that fundraising strategy conform in any way with Charity Commission fundraising legislation, especially related to crowdfunding and the truth?

Not only do Packham and Corney not have the backing of academics that studied wild animals in circuses, the UK Government failed to pay any attention to these experts when they pushed through with their wild animal circus ban in 2020, a ban which – with his media profile boosted by, and built on the back of, the BBC – Packham pushed and celebrated.

47.
Worse still, there is a shameful and previously untold human story here:

Over the six years that Packham and Corney were smearing circuses, the owners involved, who absolutely adored their animals, were not informed as to what had happened to their beloved animals. The German circus family only found out within the last month about what happened to their tigers. They had no idea where they had gone. They had no idea the issue had been raised in Westminster in

parliament or even that one of their tigers was used in a campaign to raise pot loads of money, let alone played a part in obtaining a UK legislative ban on the use of wild animals in circuses. They were flabbergasted when told and became very agitated indeed.

48.
Packham and his girlfriend did not bother once validating the stories they were pushing out via the UK press, despite representing a charity (and misrepresenting a company as a charity). What typical animal rights nuts – not giving a damn about humans. We obligingly passed all the press falsehoods to the German circus family and the last we heard from them they were busily consulting with their lawyers – disgusted that, in spite of their innocence declared by prosecutors in a German court, there were such high profile individuals in England defaming them.

“Ah but where is the evidence?” we hear Packham’s trolls and zealots crying.

49.
We have reams of it. Witness testimony, court documents, journalist notes and records even from antis themselves. We have started collecting complaints from those who were hoodwinked into making donations and are asking those who were involved to now go ahead and contact the police. Some of the people who we have spoken to who donated are in their nineties….. now let that sink in.

50.
As for the evidence we are holding some back, which we have furnished the authorities with. For starters just look at the shocking lies that are publicly accessible – in articles, tweets and the spiels of crowdfunders – that were told to raise funds from gullible British readers. There are dozens of lies which were told that the public can check for themselves:

51.
ON SIMI:

Simi the tiger finally=safe in Britain two years after being rescued from cruel German circus

52.
“Simi the tiger finally safe in Britain two years after being rescued from cruel German circus”

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-hampshire-50761485

53.
‘Dies of circus injuries’

https://www.bbc.com/news/av/uk-england-hampshire-35348445

54.
‘Seized on welfare grounds’

https://www.countypress.co.uk/news/18097601.isle-wight-zoo-mourns-former-circus-tiger- simi—-famed-plight-raised-house-commons

55.
“It is with great sadness we must report our beautiful tigress Simi passed away last week after a short illness related to injuries sustained in her previous life as a circus performer”

Beloved IW Zoo tiger Simi passes away

56.
“It is with great sadness that we must report that our beautiful tigress Simi passed away last week after a short illness related to injuries sustained in her previous life as a Circus performer”

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-england-hampshire-41471654

57.
“A tiger, whose plight was raised at Prime Ministers Questions when she was rescued from a travelling circus”

https://www.islandecho.co.uk/isle-wight-zoos-simi-recovers-well-keyhole-surgery

58.
“Dan Forster of The Mobile Vet was approached to spay Simi, who was rescued from a travelling circus in Germany 4 years ago”

https://isleofwightzoo.com/animals/tigers

59.
“Simi passed away after a short illness related to injuries sustained in her previous life as a Circus performer”

https://www.newsbreak.com/news/1473024250644/isle-of-wight-rescued-tiger-simi-dies- of-circus-injuries

60.
“A tiger rescued by Isle of Wight Zoo has died from injuries suffered during her time in a circus”

https://www.islandecho.co.uk/isle-of-wight-zoos-simi-passes-away-after-short-illness

61.
“Simi died last week as a result of a short illness, which the zoo says was related to her previous life as a circus performer in Germany”

https://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/606150/Cameron-bitten-pledge-help-German- big-cat-allowing-circus-animal-cruelty

62.
“Cameron bitten by pledge to help German big cat while allowing circus animal cruelty here”

https://www.crowdfunder.co.uk/heartsfortigers

63.
“Whether they have been abandoned by private owners (who no longer want them after they outgrow the cute and cuddly phase) or have been subjected to cruelty or bad welfare in circuses”

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-34269175

64.
“She said the eight-year-old tiger was seized on welfare grounds in Germany two years ago and is being held in isolation at a Belgian animal welfare centre”

Twitter melts – and not in a good way=– after Andrew Turner asks about Tigers in most-watched PMQs (Update 2 : Video)

65.
“Simi, the tiger has been in inadequate, temporary housing for far too long after being badly abused”

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-hampshire-35134311

66.
“She was firstly cruelly treated by a circus and has now been kept in isolation for two years, despite Belgium being wholly free of rabies.”

“Simi rescued from a German circus”

67.
“Simi is most definitely my favourite! This beautiful tiger was rescued from a European circus only 12 weeks before I met her. When she arrived she was very thin and had not been treated well. In her short time at the zoo she had started to settle and is much happier – it is believed Simi has never seen grass before her arrival at the zoo. She is a little wobbly on her back legs but it doesn’t appear to be causing her any pain. It is possible that the unsteady ness may be as a result of muscle wastage from her time in restricted enclosures at the circus”

68.
ON TANGO & JULIA:

https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2596972/Tango-Esso-tiger-saved-death-British- wildlife-park-abused-German-circus.html

69.
“Mistreated: Eighteen-year-old Tango had been earmarked for destruction in Belgium along with his partner Julia after the two tigers were seized from a German circus last year”

https://www.gallowaygazette.co.uk/lifestyle/britains-oldest-tiger-star-esso-tv-ads-dies- aged-22-868817

70.
“After the adverts ended in the 1990s Tango was sold to a German circus which mistreated him. He and his partner Julia, eight, were due to be put down in Belgium until the wildlife park raised £250,000 and brought them to the UK in 2014”

https://www.thedodo.com/esso-tiger-tango-death-2003279295.html

71.
“Sadly, Tango’s life only became more difficult before it got better. He was shuffled into a German circus, where he and his partner, Julia, were both allegedly mistreated. Belgian and German authorities eventually intervened, rescuing Tango and Julia, along with two lions from the circus in 2014.”

72.
https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/wildlife/10744896/Esso-tiger-saved-from-death- by-wildlife-park.html

73.
“Eighteen-year-old Tango had been earmarked for destruction in Belgium along with his partner Julia after the two tigers were seized from a German circus last year where they were mistreated.”

https://www.itv.com/news/2016-09-12/last-esso-advert-tiger-tango-dies-in-uk-aged-22

74.
“Only two years ago, Tango was rescued from a German circus that had been mistreating him as it toured Europe.….Julia, an eight-year-old mate, was brought back with Tango in 2014. She remains at the park”

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-lincolnshire-37332183

75.
“Tango worked in a German circus with his partner Julia until they were seized by Belgian and German authorities in late 2013, after reports they were being mistreated”

https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/famous-esso-advert-tiger-tango-8815368

76.
“After the adverts ended in the 1990s Tango was sold to a German circus which mistreated him. He and his partner Julia, eight, were due to be put down in Belgium until the wildlife park raised £250,000 and brought them to the UK in 2014.”

77.
Watch Video At: https://youtu.be/6uI-0IUSkbk

78.
“Tango and Julia were moved to a circus in Germany where they are believed to have been mistreated”

https://www.standard.co.uk/news/uk/esso-advert-tiger-tango-dies-aged-22-a3342586.html

79.
“After starring in the ads, he appeared in a German circus but had to be rescued over claims of mistreatment. He and his partner Julia were moved into Lincolnshire’s Woodside Wildlife Park back in 2014 after a £250,000 rescue operation”

Esso’s tiger saved

80.
“Officials learned he had been abused and took him into care with rescued tigress Julia, eight.”

https://uk.finance.yahoo.com/news/esso-advert-tiger-tank-tango-155452966.html?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAEF14IitIwsJPZY4UgSpW7D43H9gIiQ_Nhmhl28KFyj8TahfwAyhe8Ejz9sTkDubaBf8bvujJtMcMqIIQfoI6WItAVUJzYjNHnYgLply5fwpDG-4kM8vivrmto0mAoO_Mss5RF3rcFGDFu5aXUcZRVR0oIYrGNOqDBjhRNTA8gD2

81.
“The park rescued Tango from death in 2014 after a six-month campaign raised £250,000 from the public to prevent the animal and his female tiger partner, Julia, being destroyed by the Belgian authorities. The two tigers had been seized from a circus in Germany where they were said to have been mistreated”

Tango, The Oldest Tiger In England, Has Just Passed Away

82.

“I can only guess and wonder what has gone on in his previous life but it wasn’t fabulous,” adds Neil Mumby. The two felines were gravely neglected in the German circus for many years, until the Belgian and German authorities intervened to save them in 2014, reports the BBC”

http://home.bt.com/news/uk-news/esso-tiger-saved-by-wildlife-park-11363890403247

83.
“Tango starred in TV ads for petrol giant Esso, whose slogan was “Put a tiger in your tank”, before going to the circus in Germany, where he was mistreated along with Julia”

http://zoonewsdigest.blogspot.com/2014/04/the-esso-tiger-saved-from-death.html

84.
“Eighteen-year-old Tango had been earmarked for destruction in Belgium along with his partner Julia after the two tigers were seized from a German circus last year where they were mistreated”

https://www.southyorkshiretimes.co.uk/news/britains-oldest-tiger-star-esso-tv-ads-dies- aged-22-58827

85.
“The park rescued Tango from death in 2014 after a six-month campaign raised £250,000 from the public to prevent the animal and his female tiger partner, Julia, being destroyed by the Belgian authorities. The two tigers had been seized from a circus in Germany where they were said to have been mistreated”

86.
What a load of lies!!!!!!!!!! What a lot of money raised!!!!!!!!

87.
IN CONCLUSION

88.
Chris Packham and his partner Charlotte Corney have clearly not been truthful with the British public. Money has been raised on the back of their truth-bending and they now need to be held to account.

89.
Oddly enough The Fundraising Regulator wrote to us on the very day that Chris Packham went public on Twitter calling us trolls. The good news is that the regulator have now begun an official investigation into the Wildheart Trust. We also urge the police to take this case very seriously indeed. Here is a bigot clearly using a publicly-funded perch to promulgate deceit which the donating public in their innocence have fallen for.

90.
[image]

91.
In the meantime, we recommend that the British Public be very wary indeed of whatever Chris Packham says. Let alone think of donating any money to the organisations he belongs to and fundraises for.

92.
We demand, as licence fee payers, that Packham is immediately suspended from his BBC contracts. Until the air is cleared, Packham cannot be trusted to be maintaining the Gold Standard that Tim Davie’s BBC supposedly aspires to. What is the difference between what seems to have gone on here

and the alleged deceitfulness of BBC journalist Martin Bashir? When can it be right for the BBC to be used as the power behind deceitful fundraising for an ideological cause that has been hijacked by animal rights extremists and which most of the public don't give a damn about? Why did BBC Inside Out collude with the rescue centre in question? Was there influence exerted by Chris Packham?

93.
We shall update as and when this story progresses. In the meantime we have consulted our lawyers, expecting a successful and interesting skirmish ahead. We are right and we are very confident indeed that justice shall prevail.

94.
If You have further information that will assist in any of these matters, please use the contact form here or, if the information is relating to a crime, please go directly to the relevant authorities via the appropriate channels. Thank you.

95.
Update December 2021: Extraordinarily, the Fundraising Regulator still claim, after external review, there has been no breach by Packham's charity although the magazine welcomes their recognition of Wildheart Trust's (now Wildheart Sanctuary's) lies via Packham in this particular crowdfunder. This investigation by the Fundraising Regulator was related to just one crowdfunder. The others involve different complainants, and we shall report back on the Fundraising Regulator's findings on those when we have them. The Fundraising Regulator's findings can be found here. Note the small print:

96.
[image]

97.
[image]

98.
[image]

Publication 4 – The Fourth Article

1.
[image]

2.
BY NIGEL BEAN

3.
Over recent weeks readers will have followed Country Squire Magazine's exposé after exposé on Chris Packham and his girlfriend Charlotte Corney, founder of the Wildheart Trust – related to tigers in Spain and Germany brought to the big cat sanctuary at their zoo on the Isle of Wight.

4.
The revelations hit the pages of the Daily Mail last weekend. The Fundraising Regulator are now investigating the Wildheart Trust. It is clear this charity – and their trustee Chris Packham – have told lie after lie about the "rescued tigers" under their care in order to dupe the charitable British public. Moreover Isle of Wight zoo has taken in ticket money from the paying public, some of whom travelled from afar to visit these "rescued" tigers.

5.
This week some new data came to light which we feel readers ought to see with their own eyes. You be judge and jury. Put aside the whole debate about circuses – which is a misdirection in this case – and please sit back and look objectively at the evidence we present to you and make up your own minds. Were the Spanish tigers that feature in this new evidence “maltreated“ by the circus family they were prized from?

6.
Let’s go back to last Spring when Packham and Corney were raising money for the Spanish tigers which by then had already been transported from Spain to their Isle of Wight zoo.

7.
The text of their Wildheart Trust Crowdfunder appeal could not be any clearer:

“Over the last few years we’ve welcomed five adorable tigers (Mondo, Girona, Antonella, Zoppa and Natasha) and two gentle giant lions (Vigo and Khuma) into our big cat sanctuary. While at the mercy of travelling circuses in Spain these defenceless animals were the victims of unimaginable neglect and cruelty living hellish lives confined within squalid beast-wagons or crammed into tiny pens where they were left to fight for scraps of food in between performances.“

8.
The accompanying Daily Mirror article – with the BBC’s Chris Packham all over it – talked of:

“A lifetime of abuse. Before the five tigers were rescued, they were living in squalid, cramped cages and forced to do tricks for crowds at the circus. They were liberated by Animal Advocacy for Protection, an international animal welfare organisation, who rehabilitated the big cats at their impressive centre in Spain before they found their forever home in the UK.“

9.
So how in your mind’s eye do you picture the “cruel” Macaggi Circus family who owned and “maltreated” these tigers? Cruella de Vils ? Like the merciless ringmaster in Dumbo , right?

10.
Here is Mr Macaggi visiting his tigers at AAP Primadomus – the Spanish animal centre where the Macaggis were told they could visit their beloved tigers whenever they wanted. Listen for the loving growl of the tigers – known as ‘chuffing’, a sign of affection and friendliness – as they are approached by Mr Macaggi:

11.
[video]

12.
[video]

13.
Poor Mr Macaggi.

14.
One day Macaggi called to arrange another visit to his beloved tigers at AAP Primadomus but found his tigers had disappeared. He was not told where they had been taken to. He was not told about Wildheart’s intervention nor about their defamatory fundraising campaigns over in England which were blackening his name and ripping to shreds his reputation. He was understandably distraught.

The Macaggis had been led to believe the tigers would be kept at AAP indefinitely and could visit them whenever they wanted. They only discovered that the tigers had been moved to the Isle of Wight when a female family member travelling with a circus troupe by chance visited the Isle of Wight Zoo and discovered “mistreated” tigers saved from a “cruel” circus in Spain by a well known BBC presenter. It was then she was stunned to see her family’s tigers – Mr Macaggi was furious by all accounts.

15.
Remember, the Wildheart Trust stated that these tigers:

“fought for scraps of food between performances. (They were) living hellish lives confined within squalid beast-wagons or crammed into tiny pens.”

16.
[image]

17.
What follows are ten photographs taken of the tigers when under the care of the Macaggis. Do the tigers not look healthy and happy in their circus home? Do they look malnourished or the victims of cruelty? Do they seem to be crammed into pens? Ask yourself, why would anyone make up such a tall tale then place it in a crowdfunder spiel, except to dupe potential donors?

18.
[image]

19.
[image]

20.
[image]

21.
[image]

22.
[image]

23.
[image]

24.
[image]

25.
[image]

26.
[image]

27.
[image]

28.

Following an extensive investigation by our journalists, this magazine hereby states that considerable monies have to date been raised by the Wildheart Trust under false pretences and should be returned to donors forthwith. The Charity Commission and the police need to continue to investigate the multiple discrepancies we and the Daily Mail have highlighted, talking with Mondo Marketing who ran the PR campaign associated with the tigers.

29.
Meanwhile, why has the BBC still not suspended Chris Packham? Do it now. Or the BBC - having been warned multiple times, with warnings recorded – is complicit in this tawdry Packham/Corney scam and will be forced into a hugely embarrassing apology later on down the road when the full details of these matters are aired in court.

30.
Happy Christmas to you all.

Publication 5 – The Fifth Article

1.
[image]

2.
CSM EDITORIAL

3.
Yesterday afternoon, the Editor of this magazine received a legal threat via BBC 'Wildlife Personality' Chris Packham's lawyers, Leigh Day , in relation to what Packham is claiming to be defamatory material contained in these four Country Squire Magazine articles:

4.
The four articles are well worth a read, especially now Packham – like some kind of tinpot dictator – is demanding they be immediately removed. They expose a story of tigers transported from Europe to a zoo on the Isle of Wight – tigers which were claimed to be 'maltreated' and 'rescued' by Packham and his associates in their crowdfunding blurb – points which the owners and experts vehemently and factually dispute.

5.
The letter sent by Packham's lawyers to the Editor can be reviewed – unedited and in full as received, for all to read just as it should be – here:

6.
Letter-of-Claim-Mr-Dominic-Wightman-19.03.21Download

The Editor has been fully briefed on the truth of these tiger-related matters. He was meticulous in checking and double-checking every detail contained in these articles before allowing them to be published, as were the Daily Mail. As those who know him are well aware, the Editor is not one to accept threats from dime store hucksters, whether they have a history of violence or possess a CBE. Certainly, the Editor does not have a fondness for extremist political activists who have built their careers on the back of forced licence fee payers, most of whom, frankly, are appalled by fringe and ridiculous views. Indeed he wonders why on earth a national broadcaster sucking from the public teat is involved with them at all.

7.

Chris Packham may be so delusional and cocooned as to believe that a legal threat – in this case via some tank-chasers – will in some way change the course of history. Jonathan Aitken thought the same. Mr Packham has no idea about the army of witnesses (and enemies) he will now drag to the fore. The BBC will now be put in yet another terribly embarrassing position – the new BBC Director General Tim Davie has been warned twice directly by the Editor about continuing Chris Packham's contracts given the growing bank of negative data against him.

8.
There are two points worth dwelling on here:

9.
Why the legal threat now? This is likely because the underfunded, tightrope- walking Fundraising Regulator , who have been investigating Packham and associates, will – in coming weeks – fail to be brave enough to strike a blow against the Wildheart Trust, run by Packham and his girlfriend Charlotte Corney. This will be in part because the original complaint was put together by a member of the public without professional assistance and in part because of legal threats their financial controllers will be baulking at. Presuming, as seems likely, the Fundraising Regulator reaches an impasse and lets the Wildheart Trust off the hook, a new complaint shall now be put together more professionally and formally which will include many hours of new witness statements and expert evidence – this will also include a formal simultaneous denunciation via the relevant services to the UK and Spanish police.

Absence exposes the truth. Look at the articles about Packham and Corney published recently by Country Squire Magazine that the legal threat does not refer to: Pinocchio Packham Strikes Again, BBC Should Now Suspend Packham, and the exposé about Corney's Zoo car park cash cow in Yet More Packham Porkies.

10.
One of the errors in Packham's lawyers' letter – immediately below – should be addressed for the record now:

Country Squire purports to be a serious online publication, albeit one with a clear political agenda, targeted at a particular section of the British public

11.
Country Squire Magazine, as the About Page of the magazine has made patently clear for years, 'has a simple mission statement: to be an online publication which provides a platform for voices from the overlooked Great British Countryside. We hope to live up to that mission.'

12.
As a platform we have always made clear that we relish receiving right to reply articles and letters. In the past these have included responses from, for example, prominent Rewilding activists who disagreed with articles written by Country Squire Magazine writers. Free Speech is sacrosanct and different points of view are welcomed. The magazine – save being anti-muppets – hardly has a political agenda and has attracted writers from a myriad of political persuasions over the years.

13.
Chris Packham – like all the anti-hunt crowd – has always had an opportunity to use Country Squire Magazine as a platform to make his points of view heard. We have invited his fellow antis time and again to engage as grown-ups peacefully on our platform yet repeatedly they have failed to take up

the opportunity – so they have failed to state their case. The Editor has stated multiple times he has never been hunting in his life. Yet certainly, Country Squire Magazine houses quite a few articles which defend the right to hunt – it would be great if it covered anti-hunt pieces too, so that the ongoing debate over hunting got discussed in a civilised manner rather than descending into the current nonsense of points-scoring and shenanigans which waste so much police time.

14.
So we at Country Squire Magazine believe that the grown-up way is to use right to reply – and in the case of Chris Packham, even a post-lockdown public meeting should he require it – to get to the bottom of the tiger importing scheme. The truth is rarely pure and never simple – let's hear Packham's side of the tiger tale in his own words. Then let the public decide whether he is dodgy or not. The offer stands.

15.
Have either options ever been taken up by Packham?

Nah.

16.
Ever suggested by Packham?

Nope.

Straight to the lawyers.

17.
Whether in a public meeting or in a courtroom, Mr Chris Packham CBE, the truth will out. Choose your medicine wisely

"In a time of deceit telling the truth is a revolutionary act." George Orwell

18.
For those with information on Chris Packham or related more generally to the tiger imports or Wildheart Trust that they wish to divulge – confidentially of course and anonymously if necessary – please feel free to use the contact page of this magazine. Many thanks to those who have already sent in information. Thanks also to those Packham supporters who got in touch with fake news about Packham and Corney – sorry to disappoint you but we did not fall for your fabrications, as we triple check every detail we publish in this magazine and quickly saw through your lies.

Publication 6 – The Sixth Article

1.
[image]

2.
CSM EDITORIAL

3.
This week, after months of waiting and false starts, our rural affairs writer Nigel Bean received letters (published a few paragraphs below) back from the Fundraising Regulator in respect to Chris Packham and his charity the Wildheart Trust . As regular readers will know full well, the magazine has covered the difference between 'rescuing' and 'rehoming' tigers and has exposed their blatant lying in crowdfunders about tigers being maltreated:

4.
Packham even threatened Bean and the Editor with a defamation case which you can read about here.

5.
In summary, what a chocolate teapot the Fundraising Regulator turns out to be! It is risible that their investigator spent months knocking up a whitewash of a summary before mentioning she's off to work somewhere else. As a former policeman we showed her summary to commented:

"I thought they would be too afraid of upsetting the apple cart. All this cowardice does is empower the likes of Packham"

6.
Here is the Fundraising Regulator's letter addressed to Nigel Bean:

[image]

7.
Here is the summary of their findings:

8.
2021-05-27-14004-Final-investigation-decision-for-issue-to-partiesDownload

The following passage particularly stands out:

"76. It is open to Mr Bean to disagree with the charity's position, based on his own interpretation of the facts and available research. But the charity's assertions, based on its view of the facts and research, although arguably expressed rather sweepingly with a touch of hyperbole, were not misleading or likely to mislead in relation to the fundraising ask."

9.
Hyperbole????!!!!!! Jesus wept. Strategic lies are not hyperbole!

10.
[image]

11.
Strategic lies on crowdfunders are something else altogether.

[image]

12.
Packham even admitted himself the tigers were not rescued. Check out these two videos where in the first video Packham claims the tigers are rescued:

13.
Then Packham publicly backtracks on the 'rescuing' claims in a second video:

14.
The tigers were never maltreated by their previous owner and were never 'physically broken'. Nigel Bean even showed the regulator the vet reports showing they were routinely inspected, as was their environment, around once a month. Each time they were given the all-clear.

15.

There was never any evidence to prove that “while at the mercy of travelling circuses in Spain these defenceless animals were the victims of unimaginable neglect and cruelty living hellish lives confined within squalid beast-wagons or crammed into tiny pens where they were left to fight for scraps of food in between performances”, as Wildheart claimed. That was made-up nonsense. Pure fabrication.

16.
So where does the Packham story stand?

17.
The Editor is not for turning. He has refused to take the Packham exposés down in spite of Packham’s lawyers sending over legal threats. Since the stories were published, more evidence has come to light which reinforces the revelations about these tiger crowdfunds. The Editor shall address magazine readers by video on Tuesday. There’s a lot going on. He’ll update readers on as much as he is permitted to by lawyers and officials.

18.
Just because the Fundraising Regulator is a gutless and under-funded chocolate teapot of an organisation does not mean that Packham or Wildheart can get away with what they have done. Nor shall the BBC get away with turning a blind eye and continuing to contract Packham across multiple programmes. The fact that the Wildheart Trust has now changed its name to the Wildheart Animal Sanctuary in the light of all this bad publicity shows just how much Packham and his charity colleagues are on the defensive. It will take more than a name change to get out of this one.

19.
Let the truth out.

20.
[image]

21.
These tigers were DONATIONS and were never maltreated. They were happy animals – victims of anti-circus activists.

22.
[image]

23.
Claims by the Wildheart Trust that the tigers were rescued is a figment of their imagination. Why don’t they come clean and apologise for their dodgy fundraising campaign that duped so many rather than obfuscating and making yet more stuff up to justify their maltreatment and rescue lies?

24.
The Spanish press reported that the circus family contacted a lawyer – “from the circus they contacted me to help them find a good home for their animals”

El Circo Wonderland dona sus animales salvajes a un centro de rescate de Villena

25.
Raquel López, DeAnimals lawyer, explains that:

“from the circus they contacted me to help them find a good home for their animals, since they did not want them to end up euthanised, in another circus or in a bad place. I know that the circus family had

taken very good care of the animals, and that they understood that it is time to take a step forward and for the animals to have a better life in a sanctuary. After solving legal procedures, to formally donate the animals to a sanctuary, the circus made the largest donation made in Spain of felines to a sanctuary, delivering seven tigers and a lion”

26.
http://www.murciaconfidencial.com/2017/09/el-circo-wonderland-dona-siete-tigres-y.html

27.
Circus Wonderland DONATES seven tigers and a lion to the ‘Primadomus’ Foundation:

https://www.practicaespanol.com/en/a-circus-donates-a-lion-and-seven-tigers-and- promises-not-to-use-more-wild-animals/

28.
7 tigers DONATED by circus:

https://www.laopiniondemurcia.es/comunidad/2017/09/21/circo-wonderland-dona-siete-tigres-31830495.amp.html

29.
A circus DONATES a lion and seven tigers

30.
Circus Wonderland DONATES seven tigers and a lion to the largest rescue centre for exotic animals:

El Circo Wonderland dona sus animales salvajes a un centro de rescate de Villena

31.
The Wonderland Circus DONATES its wild animals to a rescue centre in Villena:

https://amp-compromiso.atresmedia.com/hazte-eco/noticias/circo-dona-siete-tigres-leon-promete-volver-usar-animales_2017092259c4db540cf2c760c102e34f.html

32.
A circus DONATES seven tigers and a lion and promises not to use animals again:

https://www.lne.es/vida-y-estilo/gente/2017/09/22/circo-dona-leon-siete-tigres-19211789.amp.html

33.
The Wildheart Trust is in the wrong here and everyone knows it.

34.
Come clean. Admit you added sizzle to the sausage to raise more money. Fess up. Do the honourable thing before this situation goes up a few gears and perhaps threatens the very future of the tigers and other animals you rehomed.

35.
Update December 2021: Extraordinarily, the Fundraising Regulator still claim, after external review, there has been no code breach by Packham’s charity although the magazine welcomes their recognition of Wildheart Trust’s (now Wildheart Sanctuary’s) lies via Packham in this particular crowdfunder. This investigation by the Fundraising Regulator was related to just one crowdfunder. The others involve different complainants, and we shall report back on the Fundraising Regulator’s

findings on those when we have them. The Fundraising Regulator's findings can be found here. Note the small print:

36.
[image]

37.
[image]

38.
[image]

Publication 7 – Seventh Article

1.
[image]

2.
The Editor of Country Squire Magazine has made the following statement on Chris Packham and the Wildheart Trust (now known as the Wildheart Animal Sanctuary):

3.
[image] Watch Video At: https://youtu.be/Mz_TamSnEgU

4.
Text of the Statement Follows:

5.
Good Afternoon,

6.
I have a statement to make.

7.
My name is Dominic Wightman.

8.
I am the Editor of Country Squire Magazine. Along with colleagues I have been threatened with legal action for defamation by Chris Packham – a wildlife presenter you may know from CBBC's Really Wild Show . The legal threat was made several weeks ago, and one wonders whether Packham has since lost his bottle.

9.
I have been asked by Packham's lawyers to remove some articles from our magazine website which he doesn't take kindly to, even to apologise for publishing them. I am refusing to do so because – and I've had the articles verified by numerous parties, including distinguished experts – the evidence in those articles, related to tigers which Packham claims in crowdfunders were maltreated and rescued, shows they were never maltreated, and they were rehomed NEVER rescued.

10.
Yet Packham, knowing this, yoking his BBC-built celebrity, as he has done in the past to raise large sums of money from the British public, went on with others amidst a fanfare of misleading publicity to crowdfund many thousands of pounds for his girlfriend's zoo which houses these tigers and charges

the public a lot of ticket money to see them. Risibly, Packham is still claiming to this day that the tigers were maltreated and rescued despite the easily accessible truth that says otherwise. Packham's girlfriend's zoo is run by a charity called the Wildheart Trust which she CEOs, which cynically changed its name in April to The Wildheart Animal Sanctuary when this bad press broke on them in our magazine and in the Daily Mail .

11.
These are stories well worth reading and go to the heart of how remote the BBC has become from the people, especially from countrysiders, allowing its high-paid presenter activists to still get away with so much, hiding in plain sight and dissembling the truth before our very eyes, despite the lessons that should have been learnt from Savile. I shall publish all the verified evidence in detail on the magazine over coming days so the British public and BBC licence fee payers – as well as those who paid their hard-earned money into the crowdfunders – can decide for themselves. It's hardly rocket science – if an animal is donated to me and I then crowdfund thousands to 'rescue' it and claim maltreatment of the animal in the past that I know full well did not happen, then that's deception of the most obvious kind.

12.
The licence-fee-paying British public should expect Packham to provide answers to the following 5 questions at once:

13.
Question 1. Are Packham and Wildheart able to prove that the tigers the Trust owns were ever "left to fight for scraps [sic] of food between performances"? If not, why did they make this claim while crowdfunding?

14.
Question 2. Packham, You and your partner Charlotte Corney visited the tigers before they moved to England. They were being held at AAP Primadomus in Villena, Spain. In a promo video made on the day of transfer an AAP Primadomus representative clearly states the truth, that the tigers were donated to them. You used this video in your crowdfunder. The solicitor involved in the transfer clearly states the tigers were donated. So why did you lie and say you were rescuing the tigers? You were merely rehoming donated tigers were you not?

15.
Question 3. The previous owner of the tigers donated them to AAP on the understanding he could visit them whenever he wanted. Do you not think on reflection it was highly deceitful not to let him know the tigers had been moved? For him – an old man – to discover from a relative his beloved tigers had been relocated to your girlfriend's zoo in another country under the fraudulent banners of rescue and mistreatment? At what point did you know about the professional judgements which showed unanimously the tigers had never been maltreated while under the care of the previous owner? What was your personal involvement in the Mirror's "Rescued from Hell" campaign? When will you be apologising to the previous owner?

16.
Question 4. The monies crowdfunded by Wildheart for the tigers project should by law receive a separate allocation heading in the charity's accounts. Where is that separate allocation heading? What is the status of those monies received and spent? This specific project allocation heading does not appear in the Wildheart charity's accounts. As well as being illegal, is this not blatant obfuscation?

17.
Question 5. Amidst the publicity generated by our articles, a lady has come forward who was attacked in a car park by you, Packham. She was just an ordinary member of the public so you may have forgotten her – you reacted after her trolley accidentally tapped your car. Why have you never sought her out and apologised to her? What about your past and present colleagues who say you have a vicious and fiery temper and have attacked and bullied them in the past? Have you sought anger management? Is it really OK to blame your obvious nastiness on Asperger's when in reality you're just a narcissistic little bully?

18.
With the kind help of colleagues we have now put all the data collected on this Packham case into one dossier. This dossier has now been handed over to the police. We have requested that a full investigation be undertaken into Packham, his girlfriend and his colleagues at the Wildheart Charity, which benefitted from these crowdfunders, and who now own the tigers in question at their zoo on the Isle of Wight. Furthermore, as well as submitting a highly detailed complaint to Charity Commission investigators, we have ensured that other esteemed bodies and charities related to Packham have been kept abreast of developments, as well as the original owners of the tigers who Packham has repeatedly and cruelly defamed. We are compiling a new complaint for the Fundraising Regulator after the investigator looking at the previous complaint made by our writer Nigel Bean whitewashed a response and then conveniently upped and left the body. I have also written to the honours forfeiture committee and the Prime Minister suggesting Packham's CBE be removed. I have sent the articles, along with an evidence pack, to Tim Davie, Director General of the BBC, requesting that Packham be dismissed from all BBC programmes forthwith. Pinocchio Packham has lied very publicly in the past – but this time he has crossed a line which no BBC employee or contractor should be permitted to cross, however narcissistic or damaged they might claim to be. We expect a full and open investigation from the BBC and hope they have learnt their lessons from past cover-ups.

19.
I fully stand by the claims of these articles and reiterate the essence of them here – that Packham is a charlatan and not fit to benefit from BBC licence fee payers, some of whom, especially here in rural areas, struggle to make licence fee payments at all; licence fee payments which are still, even in 2021, in the era of media organisations brave enough to embrace the market like Netflix, Amazon and GB News, forced upon them by the law of the land.

20.
I would also like to point out that, although I am not a trained journalist like Carole Cadwalladr or Martin Bashir, I have always been meticulous in my role as Editor of this magazine and that suggesting otherwise, as Packham's tank-chasing and politically activist lawyers, Leigh Day, have intimated, is clear defamation of my editorship. I shall leave fabricating and smearing to those whose moral relativism and penchant for trolling seem to be characteristics shared by hypocritical class warriors like the multi-millionaire, Packham, who seem to think that expensive court threats will somehow prevent publication of truths that are inconvenient to them. Packham, confess and apologise now.

21.
Thank you very much indeed.

22.

If You would like to get in touch with Country Squire Magazine about anything in this statement or because You have information that may be pertinent then please use the contact form above or using this link. All information received will be treated in utmost confidence. Anonymous tip-offs are also welcomed. The response so far has been fantastic. Cheers.

23.
[image]

Publication 8 – The First Video

1.
Good Afternoon, I have a statement to make.

2.
My name is Dominic Wightman. I am the Editor of Country Squire Magazine. Along with colleagues I have been threatened with legal action for defamation by Chris Packham – a wildlife presenter you may know from CBBC's Really Wild Show. The legal threat was made several weeks ago, and one wonders whether Packham has since lost his bottle.

3.
I have been asked by Packham's lawyers to remove some articles from our magazine website which he doesn't take kindly to, even to apologise for publishing them. I am refusing to do so because – and I've had the articles verified by numerous parties, including distinguished experts – the evidence in those articles, related to tigers which Packham claims in crowd funders were maltreated and rescued, shows they were never maltreated, and they were rehomed never rescued.

4.
Yet Packham, knowing this, yoking his BBC-built celebrity, as he has done in the past to raise large sums of money from the British public, went on with others amidst a fanfare of misleading publicity to crowdfund many thousands of pounds for his girlfriend's zoo which houses these tigers and charges the public a lot of ticket money to go see them. Risibly, Packham is still claiming to this day that the tigers were maltreated and rescued despite the easily accessible truth that says otherwise. Packham's girlfriend's zoo is run by a charity called the Wildheart Trust which she CEOs, which cynically changed its name in April to The Wildheart Animal Sanctuary when this bad press broke on them in our magazine and in the Daily Mail.

5.
These are stories well worth reading and go to the heart of how remote the BBC has become from the people, especially from countryside-ers, allowing its high-paid presenter activists to still get away with so much, hiding in plain sight and dissembling the truth before our very eyes, despite the lessons that should have been learnt from Savile. I shall publish all the verified evidence in detail on the magazine over coming days so the British public and BBC licence fee payers – as well as those who paid their hard-earned money into the crowd funders – can decide for themselves. It's hardly rocket science – if an animal is donated to me and I then crowdfund thousands to 'rescue' it and claim maltreatment of the animal in the past that I know full well did not happen, then that's deception of the most obvious kind.

6.
The licence-fee-paying British public should expect Packham to provide answers to the following 5 questions at once:

7.
Question 1. Are Packham and Wildheart able to prove that the tigers the Trust owns were ever “left to fight for scraps of food between performances”? If not, why did they make this claim while crowdfunding?

8.
Question 2. Packham, you and your partner Charlotte Corney visited the tigers before they moved to England. They were being held at AAP Primadomus in Villena, Spain. In a promo video made on the day of transfer an AAP Primadomus representative clearly states the truth, that the tigers were donated to them. You used this video in your crowd funder. The solicitor involved in the transfer clearly states the tigers were donated. So why did you lie and say you were rescuing the tigers? You were merely rehoming donated tigers were you not?

9.
Question 3. The previous owner of the tigers donated them to AAP on the understanding he could visit them whenever he wanted. Do you not think on reflection it was highly deceitful not to let him know the tigers had been moved? For him – an old man – to discover from a relative his beloved tigers had been relocated to your girlfriend’s zoo in another country, far away from Spain, under the fraudulent banners of rescue and mistreatment? At what point did you know about the professional judgements which showed unanimously the tigers had never been maltreated while under the care of the previous owner? What was your personal involvement in the Mirror’s “Rescued from Hell” campaign? When will you be apologising to the previous owner?

10.
Question 4. The monies crowdfunded by Wildheart for the tigers project should by law receive a separate allocation heading in the charity’s accounts. Where is that separate allocation heading? What is the status of those monies received and spent? This specific project allocation heading does not appear in the Wildheart charity’s accounts. As well as being illegal, is this not blatant obfuscation?

11.
Question 5. Amidst the publicity generated by our articles, a lady has come forward who was attacked in a car park by you, Mr Packham. She was just an ordinary member of the public so you may have forgotten her – you reacted after her trolley accidentally tapped your car. Why have you never sought her out and apologised to her? What about your past and present colleagues who say you have a vicious and fiery temper and have bullied them in the past? Have you sought anger management? Is it really OK to blame your obvious nastiness on Asperger’s when in reality you’re just a little bully?

12.
With the kind help of colleagues we have now put all the data collected on this Packham case into one dossier. This dossier has now been handed over to the police. We have requested that a full investigation be undertaken into Packham, his girlfriend and his colleagues at the Wildheart Charity, which benefitted from these crowdfunders, and who now own the tigers in question at their zoo on the Isle of Wight. Furthermore, as well as submitting a highly detailed complaint to Charity Commission investigators, we have ensured that other esteemed bodies and charities related to Packham have been kept abreast of developments, as well as the original owners of the tigers who Packham has repeatedly and cruelly defamed.

13.
We are compiling a new complaint for the Fundraising Regulator, a chocolate teapot of an organisation, after the investigator looking at the previous complaint made by our writer Nigel Bean

whitewashed a response and then conveniently upped and left the body. I have also written to the honours forfeiture committee and the Prime Minister suggesting Packham's CBE be removed. I have sent the articles, along with an evidence pack, to Tim Davie, Director General of the BBC, requesting that Packham be dismissed from all BBC programmes forthwith. Mr Packham has lied very publicly in the past – unbefitting of a BBC contractor - but this time he has crossed a line which no BBC employee or contractor should be permitted to cross, however narcissistic or damaged they might claim to be. We expect a full and open investigation from the BBC and hope they have learnt their lessons from past cover-ups.

14.
I fully stand by the claims of these articles and reiterate the essence of them here – that Packham has behaved like a charlatan and is not fit to benefit from BBC licence fee payers, some of whom, especially here in rural areas, struggle to make licence fee payments at all; licence fee payments which are still, even in 2021, in the era of media organisations brave enough to embrace the market like Netflix, Amazon and GB News, forced upon them by the law of the land.

15.
I would also like to point out that, although I am not a trained journalist like Carole Cadwalladr or Martin Bashir, I have always been meticulous in my role as editor of this magazine and that suggesting otherwise, as Packham's tank-chasing and politically activist lawyers, Leigh Day, have intimated, is clear defamation of my editorship. I shall leave fabricating and smearing to those whose moral relativism and penchant for trolling seem to be characteristics shared by hypocritical class warriors like the multi-millionaire, Packham, who seem to think that expensive court threats will somehow prevent publication of truths that are inconvenient to them. Packham, confess and apologise now.

16.
Thank you very much indeed.

<u>Publication 9 – The Second Video</u>

1.
William: Dominic, thanks for welcoming me here to your home to conduct this interview.

2.
Dominic Wightman: It's a great privilege to be interviewed by you William, thank you very much for coming.

3.
William: So the BBC's Chris Packham is threatening you with legal action for some of the articles you published in Country Squire Magazine. Without getting into any further legal issues, can you summarise why Mr Packham is so rattled and has gone after you?

4.
Dominic Wightman: Sure. So, a Country Squire Magazine writer and I in various articles accused Packham and his girlfriend's zoo of lying in crowd funders about some tigers they say they rescued from Spain. They claim these tigers were maltreated. They were not. They made that up and nor were they rescued. So, Packham's characteristically had a hissy fit and has sent a bunch of threatening letters from his lawyers saying we must take down the articles as they hurt his feelings. We won't. We published Packham's legal threat much to his lawyer's annoyance soon after receiving it, and since

then I have been stalked, trolled, smeared by obsessive fringe animal rights wing nut Packham supporters and a bunch of myopic Extinction Rebellion writhing nymph lunatics as well. And I have also been generally thanked and patted on the back by sound Countrysiders for exposing the truth about Packham.

5. William: Do you understand Packham's reasons for his legal threats?

6. Dominic Wightman: Absolutely. But on this tigers crowd funding issue I am uncompromising. I think it was Churchill who said that courage is what it takes to stand up and speak. Courage is also what it takes to sit down and listen. And I've really listened to Packham's lawyer's complaints, and after, you know, what has been deep reflection, I am not for turning. The articles stay. When we received the letters from his lawyers, I was very careful to make sure we had not overstepped the mark, had not strayed into illicit defamation in any way, and that we had been absolutely meticulous in our investigations. I was sure then and I am sure now that at no point was there any overstepping of the mark in what we reported and that the accusations we were putting to Packham were sound and civilised, not incorrect and certainly not unlawful in any way.

7. William: How has the countryside response been?

8. Dominic Wightman: I have had offers of assistance from lots of brilliant people and they're all, you know, wishing me and the other writer the very best of luck. I am flattered. Packham is not a popular person in the countryside. You may have noticed. The BBC also has a terrible reputation in rural areas there days, that its fast needs to sort out. Thousands of people in Facebook groups and united using other social media are lined up again Packham and have been for a long while now. Certainly, before I stumbled into this space. I'm just surprised that the BBC hasn't noticed and hasn't changed tack to meet the demands of its rural licence fee payers.

9. William: Have you had offers for crowdfunding the legal case?

10. Dominic Wightman: Yes, as well as plenty of other offers of financial support but we've turned every single one of them down. If Packham is, you know, dumb enough to go to court where I'll put him and his girlfriend on the stand, you know Johnathan Aitken style, then we may have our legal people set up a crowd funder, but I would prefer to stick with our position which is one of truth and stay on the moral high ground as it were by not agreeing to crowd funding at this stage.

11. William: Have the offers been made from countryside organisations and bodies?

12. Dominic Wightman: No, so we've stayed away from involving them at all.

These offers are from members for the public, even, you know, even a mole man from Wales offered to send us some money and he admitted he was not a wealthy chap, like many of the people who put money into the tiger crowd funders ironically in the first place. The response has been, you know, really touching and it's not just countrysiders. Packham has plenty of enemies who seem to be wanting to contribute, but we are saying no money please, not needed yet, we are just staying away from that whole, aspect.

13. William: The animal rights extremists, who have send you abuse, can I ask what kind of abuse they have sent you?

14. Dominic Wightman: Sure. So, it's the usual you know, kind of, spiteful malicious messaged, tosh, written by Neanderthals and brainwashed cowards, who value you know animal and birds lives above those of human beings. Mostly badly informed nonsense. Stuff about, me fighting Packham to get cash

from crowd funding, which kind of shows their mindset as they do so rely on crowd funders to pay their rent and buy their balaclavas and bottles of green ink. They clearly don't know I've turned down all private donations and crowd funding offers and it was Packham of course who started these legal proceedings in the first place anyway, not me. He's the one who looked for the fight, not me. And other nonsensical rubbish about how I wanted fame from fighting a BBC celebrity, you know (*laughs*) as if I give a monkeys about fame or BBC celebrities. I have far better things to be getting on with than clashing with BBC celebrities. And to be blunt, I mean if that were my strategy, I would have chosen an A List celebrity not some C list celebrity to lock horns with.

15. William: I saw one rant by a well-known animal rights crazy saying you were obsessed with Chris Packham.

16. Dominic Wightman: That's a standard busted BBC presenter misdirection play. You know, try to make out that those who have exposed them are somehow, you know, trolls or violent stalkers or something. I don't really look like the obsessive type and I can assure you I am not. I have not been violent in my life I don't think except on a Rugby pitch. I certainly never stalked anyone. I have never met the man and I don't have much interest in him to be honest, close to zero. I always thought he was a bit of a plonker really, especially when he was on CBBC when I was a child. I used to switch over to watch 'Dogtanian and the Three Muskehounds'. I would not have got vocal about him at all if he had not threatened to sue me and tried to bully me and my writers for telling the truth. Certainly, the magazine and I are focused on exposing the truth about BBC funded charlatans such as Packham, who sit on a publicly funded pedestal, and seem to abuse BBC impartiality, you know, willy nilly these days, which has to stop.

17. William: In the same rant there was something about you going bankrupt four times, which seemed like quite an achievement.

18. Dominic Wightman: Yeah, that's more tripe. It's true I did go bust once, at the time of the crash over thirteen years ago now, and you know mea culpa, it wasn't for huge amounts but I did. At the time my work lost some direction after a close relative died suddenly. But no I have not gone bust since or before, and I am extremely fortunate to have successfully rebounded from that time. It was quite a tough time looking back, it did me a lot of good because I had a privileged start in life and I think such experiences they help ground you and they certainly, they toughen you up.

19. William: And there is talk about you moving home a lot.

20. Dominic Wightman: Yeah I've read that twaddle too. It's anything to distract from their false prophet Packham and his dodgy crowd funders, I guess. I mean their smears are not very imaginative. I am well used to being smeared by crazies. I could write a book about it. I mean I've had some loser far left stalkers on my back for a decade, so I'm very careful about never showing too much information online. They have no idea where I live. I also emit a load of chaff to confuse the hell out of them, which companies house you know, charity commission, the police, they all know about. That's just life, living with stalkers, 21st century nutters. The police are back involved after sort of recent activity spikes so best we don't talk too much about this latest crop of loons that the Packham threat has unfortunately accrued.

21. William: You are willing to put your family through the pressures of defending yourself against Packham and his army of trolls?

22. Dominic Wightman: Absolutely. We have got good security in place, we have had it for a while now, and we all have our computers and phones and cars checked regularly. Most of his trolls are anti-hunt sabs I believe and since I am not a hunter I think they are somewhat confused as to how to label me. I relish that, being sort of kryptonite to them. I can expose them without getting bogged down by the burden of having the whole moral question of hunting on my back. There aren't many of them, they just make a lot of noise.

23. William: Do you think things are changing, that landowners and farmers and game keepers are back in the argument?

24. Dominic Wightman: The countrysiders supporting me are sound, salt of the earth, really hard working and decent lovely people. And I think for far too long all we've heard from the BBC is the voice of extremists like Packham and others who don't have a clue how to manage the countryside and have never farmed in their lives. My advice is don't listen to the dooms cultists, the fear mongers. You know watch Clarkson's Farm on Amazon, that breath of fresh air, listen to Lord Botham. It's the farmers, the gamekeepers, the Gillies, other land managers who have had huge success with conservation and who strive towards sustainability. These people must have their voices heard and be congratulated and recognised. Theirs is a noble cause to fight for, to be alongside them is a great honour. As for the animal rights chuggers, too many, not all of them but too many are parasites and certainly not the saints they pretend to be. Our articles on the magazine illuminated this discrepancy. I think you have to ask yourself, you know, who's the side that is coming up with the fake material? Who is lying to try and win the argument? As well as skewing polls. It's the animal rights nuts. And then you will see, who is on the side of light versus darkness? Take a look at groups with Wild Justice which should be renamed 'Wild Injustice' and the dodgy characters behind that. I mean look at the tone of their blogs and the size of their charity filled bellies.

25. William: At the start of June you very publicly gave Packham five questions to answer, did he answer them?

26. Dominic Wightman: Nah. He just sent through another legal threat. It really doesn't look very good for him does it? I mean, he's being very badly advised. He could have avoided yet more people discovering the truth about him, but he's just pushed more and more people to read the articles. Then again he is using dodgy old Phil Shiner's colleagues as no win no fee lawyers rather than employing a decent firm. If he thinks legal threats will somehow bully me into submission, you know, he is more of a plonker than he looks. If his supporters think that killing the messenger through smears is also going to work, they really have no idea. You know, I have the hide of an elephant and I am absolutely enjoying this tussle, really enjoying this tussle so far. The more smears the more crap these people throw at me the more I chuckle, you know, the more I know I'm winning.

27. William: You have a history of exposing and taking down bullies I see. You

do not care about Packham's BBC backing?

28. Dominic Wightman: My father always taught me more in reference to Rugby than anything else, the bigger they are the harder they fall. Terrorists, innately cowards, that goes for the extremist breed of feed mongering eco- chuggers animal rights people too. I think it was Edmund Burke who spoke of conservatives having an ability to perceive truth, argue for justice and combine a disposition to preserve with an ability to improve and that is just beautiful. Burke's definition of conservatism, and it still holds true, even more so in the 21st Century. I am a small c conservative through to my bones, and I refuse to be brushed aside when I expose the truth, just as countryside people, who represent 1

in 5 of BBC licence fee payers, need to club together, they need to find the courage to make themselves heard and demand more realistic and less fringe countryside representation from the BBC, which they are after all key shareholders in. The BBC, it needs to be reminded it is owned by the people.

29. William: You have said that you don't believe that people as high profile as Packham or say Greta Thunberg can use the excuse of Asperger's for their errors.

30. Dominic Wightman: I said something along those lines, we are all on the

spectrum I didn't say quite that, but what is funny to me is that Team Packham has no idea, they have not asked, where on the spectrum I stand personally, yet they have already played the Asperger's card and no I don't buy it. Gamekeepers have been committing suicide because of the pressure on them, you know, the pressure put on them every single week in the media by the likes of Packham and some of these RSPB people and so forth. Let's just distil this whole argument, the Packham argument, down to one thing. You either misspoke on a crowd funder, so apologise and resign from all BBC and other roles funded by the public, or you lied, so face the police. It has got absolutely bugger all to do with Asperger's.

31. William: You mentioned you do not hunt, but I understand that you are a keen fisherman.

32. Dominic Wightman: Yeah, I have been fly fishing a lot since I had a metal plate put in my leg five years ago after a Rugby injury. I fish because I can't run anymore. So, yeah, it's an absolutely brilliant sport. It improves my concentration, patience, I can teach my children how to fish and you know I get time to think and plan while fishing which is brilliant and there's a real happiness I've found in the sport. Also, as soon as I pick up my fishing bag my dogs go absolutely crazy, they love it. They love our fishing expeditions most of all and we ended up in some of the most beautiful parts of the country.

33. William: If this does end up going to court and you had to take one book into court with you what would it be?

34. Dominic Wightman: Well the Bible will already be present and that is a heavy book to fight of any extinction rebellion loons or animal rights nuts with. So, I'll choose, something capitalist, maybe 'Winning' I think it's called by Jack Welch. Maybe 'Autism's False Prophets' by Paul Offit, I think he's the author, which ahs got a great title but it's contents are so dull. I don't know, possibly 'Reach for the Sky' Douglas Bader. Anything by von Hayek. There is a biography I love which is about one of my heroes Douglas Jardine, maybe I'll take that.

35. William: Thank you Dom, good to talk, Best of British Luck to you

36. Dominic Wightman: Thank you William, thank you very much.

<u>Publication 10 – Eighth Article</u>

1.
[image]

2.
CSM EDITORIAL

3.

Now it’s there in black and white for the whole world to see. The BBC’s Chris Packham lied in crowdfunders about his girlfriend’s Isle of Wight zoo charity The Wildheart Trust (now renamed the Wildheart Sanctuary) rescuing tigers. This magazine exposed the Truth in the following articles:

4.
Packham found himself under all sorts of pressure, backtracked on video and then sued this magazine’s rural affairs correspondent Nigel Bean and the Editor with a defamation case which you can read about here. But we stuck to our guns, refused to submit to Packham and his army of fellow animal rights bullies and trolls despite personal threats of violence and daily abuse since the original articles were published. Nigel complained to the Fundraising Regulator about Packham and Wildheart who brought in an external reviewer to look again at the case after a bodged decision by a previous investigator who then promptly left the regulator.

5.
The external reviewer’s choice of words last week cannot be clearer about how the tigers were handed over voluntarily by their owner to AAP, a big cat sanctuary in Spain. Worse still, Wildheart and its trustee Packham and CEO, his girlfriend Charlotte Corney, knew all about it BEFORE the investigated crowdfunder which raised many tens of thousands of pounds from the British Public:

6.
[image]

7.
The external reviewer is scathing on Packham and Wildheart’s lies about being a critical partner in a rescue enterprise:

8.
[image]

9.
So what happens next?

10.
The defamation proceedings are approaching ‘preliminary hearing’ stage likely to happen sometime in 2022. The Editor has made clear he wants to go straight to the main trial and put Packham and Corney on the stand where they will be under oath and we will find out all kinds of things about the tigers, eagle videos, dead crow notes, zoo sackings and burned-out Landies. Meanwhile the original Spanish owners of the tigers are fuming at Packham’s smearing of them. A counter case is being built in Europe with which to sue Packham and Wildheart for defaming them. The Fundraising Regulator will advise Wildheart of charity fundraising rules – it lacks the oomph to do much more than that.

11.
The BBC should seriously look again now at why they dare continue with Packham’s services. They know full well by now the Asperger’s ‘victim’ card is no longer a get out of jail free card – it’s been used so many times by this crook who happily speaks to packed halls of animal rights wingnuts. His turn-off-turn-on tears should not permit this bully to wreck others’ lives.

12.
In any other walk of life where the public pays the bills, such lies in fundraising activities would result in immediate cessation of contract. Again the BBC waits for the car crash rather than damage limiting before the crisis escalates. Meanwhile those fighting to expose Packham suffer daily threats (including

death threats) and abuse from Packham supporters, some of whom have done jail time for violent law-breaking in the name of animal rights.

13.
Packham should cease his BBC activities forthwith. A deeper and independent investigation should now be launched by the BBC. Also, national lotteries including the Dutch Postcode Lottery – who have paid thousands to Packham's loony activist group Wild Justice which they are using to pay lawyers to sue ideological opponents with – should be informed and warned by their respective regulators. Why has the UK Government given Wild Justice a grant of £50,000?

14.
Those with further information on Wildheart, Wild Justice, Chris Packham, the Isle of Wight Zoo or associated others can contact our editorial team in confidence here. Thank you so much to those brave zoo whistleblowers who have come forward so far.

15.
Chris Packham is a liar and a lot worse. His girlfriend Corney could not run a bath. Expect to hear much more from this magazine about Packham and his cronies over coming weeks. We shall not be silenced by this dime store huckster whose celebrity and influence the BBC is wholly to blame for.

16.
Meanwhile, the Scottish Gamekeepers Association have this to say about Chris Packham and the anti grouse moor group Revive this week:

Chris Packham was on Twitter this week claiming gamekeepers were burning peat during Cop26. That statement was a lie and it was a knowing lie. Trying to put people on the dole and ditching centuries of indigenous knowledge seems to be ticketed entertainment for Revive. I just hope they are enjoying themselves because it's shameful. The next time Scotland needs a million deer managed for biodiversity or requires community help to extinguish climate damaging wildfires, such as Morayshire in 2019, the gamekeepers can stand down. We look forward to Revive and their paid lobbyists riding to the rescue from Edinburgh and England and getting their hands dirty at the fire-front instead of talking working people in remote Scotland out of their jobs and homes."

17.
Resign, Packham. Now. You're an absolute disgrace. Why the hell are we paying for this crook through the BBC which We Licence Fee payers own ? He's wrecking lives and his ideological stance is doing great damage to the Great British Countryside. Let us continue to fight back. The win is just round the corner, Dear Readers and Friends.

<u>Publication 11 – Article 9</u>

1.
[image]

2.
BY NIGEL BEAN

3.
As our regular readers will be well aware, the Editor of this magazine and I are in the middle of a legal dispute with the BBC's Chris Packham and his charity the Wildheart Trust, now cynically

renamed the Wildheart Sanctuary, which runs the Isle of Wight zoo. Well, when this charity recently reported their financials to the Charity Commission, we uncovered yet more shenanigans.

4.
Let's first briefly recap on what has happened so far:

5.
We complained that at the start of the coronavirus pandemic, Chris Packham fronted a dishonest appeal to raise funds for the Wildheart Trust. Packham appeared in a video at the top of the appeal page:

6.
https://www.crowdfunder.co.uk/wildheart-trust

7.
Packham claimed on video that he and his charity 'rescued' animals, principally big cats from European circuses. The appeal went on to state in the text of the 'unimaginable cruelty and neglect the tigers had suffered while at the circus' (all lies – this never happened):

"While at the mercy of travelling circuses in Spain these defenseless animals were the victims of unimaginable neglect and cruelty living hellish lives confined within squalid beast-wagons or crammed into tiny pens where they were left to fight for scrapes of food in between performances"

8.
It was also noted from press reports a solitary tiger the Isle of Wight zoo had taken on from Germany had recently died in their care (late 2019) and mistreatment at the circus in a previous life was suggested in the press as the likely cause.

9.
So, naturally, we investigated the claims. Just as we have looked under every stone related to Packham and Wildheart since the legal action initiated (the Editor shall return shortly with the final nail in the coffin of Chris Smollet Packham dodgy career).

10.
It turned out the solitary tiger called Simi had been illegally confiscated by German authorities and vets had testified in court of her living in a pleasing large space within a friendly homogeneous group of big cats. The five Spanish tigers they had acquired from a circus in Valencia had been voluntarily handed over to a rescue centre after much negotiation involving a Spanish animal rights lawyer who had been tasked by the circus to find the best possible home for their beloved tigers – the circus family had considered them part of the family.

11.
So we complained to the Fundraising Regulator over this one particular fundraising appeal.

12.
Originally the regulator refused to uphold our complaint about this solitary crowdfunder even though it broke their guidelines. Instead they plumped for a very polite way of saying porkies were evident in the appeal request:

"The Fundraising Regulator acknowledged that some of the charity's assertions were arguably expressed rather sweepingly with a touch of hyperbole"

13.
The investigator responsible for this report then hurriedly left the Fundraising Regulator.

14.
We were sickened with this cover-up but did not give up. We wrote back with additional evidence supporting our complaint and said basically, this is bullshit, please re-investigate. They refused, so we requested an External Reviewer to be appointed by the regulator on the basis the regulator's previous investigator had been manifestly unreasonable in her judgements.

15.
The Fundraising Regulator agreed and contracted an External Reviewer who was a breath of fresh air – a grown-up who wanted to find the truth. He was curious and showed integrity in his approach whereas the previous investigator from the Fundraising Regulator we felt previously withheld important facts that should have relayed into findings and seemed blindsided by Chris Packham's celebrity.

16.
The External Reviewer agreed with us, the Charity did not rescue the tigers from a Spanish Circus and they should not be asking for more money to 'rescue' more animals in the future or accrediting AAP (a Spanish animal sanctuary) as their 'partner':

"I reach that finding while expressing reservations about the charity's claim to rescue animals from Spanish circuses. A small element of the ask here was for money to "rescue more [circus animals] in the future". I find that claim un-evidenced as well as contrary to the charity's own crediting of a partner agency for rescues. I therefore ask the charity, through this consideration, to reflect on how it communicates its role in rescue operations"

17.
And let's recall…. who was making the claim on behalf of Wildheart in their fundraising appeal – "rescue more [circus animals] in the future"?

18.
None other than BBC Wildlife Presenter Christopher Gary Packham – Trustee of Wildheart, whose partner Charlotte Corney was CEO of the charity (Wildheart the charity had taken on the failing Isle of Wight zoo from Corney's family). A man STILL backed by the BBC to this day.

19.
And now on to the further shenanigans…..

20.
Since the fundraising complaint, something interesting turned up in Wildheart's accounts, and we feel we should share this information with the British public who are continuing to get partial truth and lies from Wildheart. We believe this new information shows Isle of Wight zoo is run by liars and shysters and Wildheart Sanctuary should be struck off as a charity for repeatedly failing to go out of their way to act honestly in crowdfunders, in the spirit of the Fundraising Regulator's rules.

21.
The coronavirus appeal video we complained about with Chris Packham asking for donations to feed animals in a time of crisis was posted four days after an insurance policy that the charity's trustees would have known about if they were responsible trustees kicked in guaranteeing Wildheart a percentage of their lost revenue for one year only.

22.
[image]

23.
The honest approach would have been to inform the public of the potential £500k insurance pay out BEFORE embarking on their Coronavirus zoo appeal.

24.
Looking at the income generated over the Covid period (below) it would appear Wildheart and Isle of Wight zoo have done very nicely out of the situation, thank you very much.

25.
[image]

26.
[image]

27.
What do the Editor and I want out of this continuing struggle?

Victory.

For the Truth. For the Public.

28.
But we also want to see the Fundraising Regulator and the Government set a new standard for fundraising, particularly focused on lying animal rights ideologues and those who claim to be ‘rescuing’ animals when clearly that is not what they are doing at all. We want to see an end to the deception whereby shysters raise funds by pulling heart strings - hiding often extremist animal rights ideology behind the irresistible cuddliness of innocent creatures.

29.
Whether it is animal rights sabs crowdfunding for cars that do not exist, animal rights loons crowdfunding for sheep sanctuaries which do not exist, or zoos run by BBC celebrities crowdfunding on the back of rescues and cruelty that never happened, we need to see a change in the law. As soon as possible.

30.
Why can’t charities be honest with the British Public?

“We are possibly getting an injection of £500k from a Covid insurance policy but in the meantime we need funds” – that would have been the honest approach.

31.
Chris Packham is dishonest. But I’ll let our fearless warrior king of an Editor have the final word on that in coming days…

32.
Please watch this space. Have a very Happy Christmas.

<u>Publication 12 – Second Article Tweet</u>

1.

We now know for certain that Chris Packham’s “rescued tigers” for the Wildheart Trust were NOT rescued. Judges, lawyers, Spanish Antis & previous owners have confirmed so in writing. So why’s Packham engaged in crowdfunding saying they were? #csm #Packham

[image]

2.
Heat Turns Up on Chris Packham

BY NIGEL BEAN Back in March Chris Packham used his privileged status as a BBC presenter to promote his girlfriend’s charity and zoo, the Wildheart Trust,…

7:16 AM . Nov 28, 2020 . Twitter Web App

Publication 13 – Third Article Tweet

1.
After CSM's revelations last week about Chris Packham, he made a public apology claiming no wrongdoing. Few believe him. The Fundraising Regulator has now launched an investigation into Packham's Wildheart Trust. With good reason. #csm @LongstopHill

[image]

2.
countrysquire.co.uk

Fundraising Regulator Probes Wildheart & Chris Packham

BY NIGEL BEAN Following on from our article about him last weekend, on Monday the 8th December the clearly rattled BBC TV wildlife presenter and …

6:09 AM . Dec 12, 2020 . Twitter Web App

3.
The @BBC need to suspend Chris Packham immediately while this probe is undertaken. The public cannot have confidence in a word he says. The BBC needs to act NOW #TimDavie @ChtyCommission @AboutTheBBC

Publication 14 – Fourth Article Tweet

1.
Chris Packham drops deeper in doo-doo as video footage emerges showing he & the Wildheart Trust, of which he is a trustee, bare-faced lied in crowdfunders which raised many 1000's of £££ from the charitable British Public. @LongstopHill @PaulReadGB #csm

[image]

2.
countrysquire.co.uk

Damning Video Footage Nails Packham

BY NIGEL BEAN Over recent weeks readers will have followed Country Squire Magazine’s exposé after exposé on Chris Packham and his girlfriend Charlotte …

6:50 AM . Dec 23, 2020 . Twitter Web App

Publication 15 - Fifth Article Tweet

1.
Chris Packham threatens Country Squire's Editor with legal action and tells him to take down a bunch of incriminating articles, or else. The Editor's response? 'Grow up, Packham! Let's hear the TRUTH!' @LeighDay_Law #csm #FreeSpeech #Packham

[image]

2.
countrysquire.co.uk

Packham Targets CSM Editor

CSM EDITORIAL Yesterday afternoon, the Editor of this magazine received a legal threat via BBC ‘Wildlife Personality’ Chris Packham’s lawyers, Leigh Day, in relation…

5:58 AM . Mar 20, 2021 . Twitter Web App

Publication 16 – Sixth Article Tweet

1.
Gutless! A BLANCMANGE of a response received by @LongstopHill from @FundrRegulator on Packham & Wildheart's dodgy crowdfunders. What's the point of these chocolate teapot regulators when they dismiss blatant fundraising LIES as mere 'hyperbole'? #csm

2.
[image]

3.
countrysquire.co.uk

Fundraising Regulator Bottles on Packham

CSM EDITORIAL This week, after months of waiting and false starts, our rural affairs writer Nigel Bean received letters (published a few paragraphs below)…

6:40 AM . May 29, 2021 . Twitter Web App

Publication 17 – Eighth Article Tweet

1.
BREAKING & OFFICIAL: Chris Packham & his girlfriend's crumbling Isle of Wight zoo, the Wildheart Sanctuary, knew BEFORE their tiger 'rescue' crowdfunders that the tigers WERE DONATED. Sack Packham, BBC. NOW. #csm #bbc @TNLUK @NadineDorries @metpoliceuk

2.
[image]

3.
countrysquire.co.uk

It’s Official: Packham’s Wildheart Charity Lied about ‘Rescuing’ Tigers

CSM EDITORIAL Now it’s there in black and white for the whole world to see. The BBC’s Chris Packham lied in crowdfunders about his girlfriend’s Isle of Wight zoo…

6:34 AM . Nove 15, 2021 . Twitter Web App

Publication 18 – Further Eighth Article Tweet

1.
#nickknowles replaced by BBC on DIY SOS after appearing in a Shreddies ad. Yet the BBC continues with LIAR Chris Packham's contract even after lying in crowdfunders - the lives of many licence fee paying countrysiders wrecked by him. Wake up @bbcpress NOW.

2.
[image]

3.
countrysquire.co.uk

It’s Official: Packham’s Wildheart Charity Lied about ‘Rescuing’ Tigers

CSM EDITORIAL Now it’s there in black and white for the whole world to see. The BBC’s Chris Packham lied in crowdfunders about his girlfriend’s Isle of Wight zoo…

5.59 AM . Nov, 19, 2021 . Twitter Web App

Publication 19 – Ninth Article Tweet

1.
GROUNDHOG DAY. Chris Packham's charity Wildheart Sanctuary which runs the Isle of Wight Zoo fails to mention a pandemic insurance policy paying out £500k before launching a 'desperate' Covid crowdfunder for the Zoo. Dishonest. Public deserves better. #csm

2.
[image]

3.
countrysquire.co.uk

Isle of Wight Zoo’s Covid Appeal

BY NIGEL BEAN As our regular readers will be well aware, the Editor of this magazine and I are in the middle of a legal dispute with the BBC’s Chris Packham…

8:45AM . Dec 18, 2021 . Twitter Web App

Appendix 2: Schedule of rival meanings

Article	**Claimant’s meaning**	**Defendants’ meaning**
(1) First article	Mr Packham has defrauded the public into donating money to the Wildheart Trust by falsely claiming that the organisation had	The Claimant has been involved in some suspicious fundraising for Isle of Wight Zoo/Wildheart Trust who have a history of dishonesty in their previous promotions related to the import of big cats. There were six tigers claimed to be “rescued” at the zoo on the Isle

	rescued emotionally and physically broken tigers from European circuses, when he knew that, in truth, the tigers had not been rescued and indeed had received excellent care from the circuses.	of Wight, but it turns out they were not rescued despite the Claimant's claims in this fundraising video for the zoo: https://www.youtube.com/ watch?v = OQF4IR8Gvzs&feature= emb_logo. The Truth is they were well-loved family pets as well as performing animals. The Claimant is not judged in this article – instead the article states the author will be writing to the Charity Commission and the police to investigate this 'bleeding-heart scam', as it appears well-cared for animals from the continent are being brought into this country because of stories whipped up in the 'left wing' press which are blatantly untrue. That this phenomenon needs investigating by the relevant law-enforcing authorities.
(2) Second article	Mr Packham has defrauded the public into donating money to the Wildheart Trust by falsely claiming that the organisation had rescued emotionally and physically broken tigers from European circuses, when he knew that, in truth, the tigers had not been rescued and indeed had received excellent care from the circuses.	More evidence casts suspicion on the Wildheart Trust whose written response is ideological. "So what on earth is Packham's position now?" asks this article. A repeated demand for the police to investigate is made. As if public interest were not obvious – a BBC employee turned contractor using their BBC-built public position to promote his girlfriend's zoo and ask the public for cash for that zoo – the article asks the public to write in if, like other donors who have come forward already, they also feel they have been duped by Wildheart and the Claimant.
(3) Third article	Mr Packham has cynically set out to defraud the public into donating to the Wildheart Trust by repeatedly pushing out via the UK media the false story that the Trust had rescued tigers that had been mistreated and abused by circuses, despite knowing the truth, which was that the tigers had not been rescued or mistreated at all, and had left the circuses in excellent condition.	Covers the Spanish press coverage showing the tigers were clearly donated and not rescued, contrasting the Spanish coverage against Inside Out's lies and propaganda, as well as British press coverage including the Claimant's skewed quotes. This article also highlights the excellent, inspected condition the tigers were in when they were under the control of the circuses and how just because tigers are kept in a circus does not mean that they are maltreated – to think in such a way one would have to be ideologically possessed and dismiss out of hand those esteemed experts who claim that big cats are better off in circuses than zoos. The article argues that, with good reason given the ongoing build-up of evidence, the Claimant and his partner Charlotte Corney have clearly not been truthful with the British public and therefore the word fraud with a question mark is a fitting article image, asking the question that has to be asked given the accumulating facts. Money has been raised on the back

		of their (Claimant and Corney's) truth-bending and they now need to come clean and tell the Truth.
(4) Fourth article	Mr Packham has cynically duped the public into donating to the Wildheart Trust, by lying to them that tigers and lions in the organisation's care were rescued from unimaginable neglect and cruelty at the hands of circuses, when he knew the truth, which was that the animals had suffered no neglect or cruelty and were in fact well cared for by the circuses.	Simply asks the reader to think objectively and asks if they feel, based on video evidence of the tigers' previous circus owner, Mr Macaggi, visiting his donated tigers at AAP Primadomus, that he is the villain portrayed by the British press stories in which the Claimant has direct quotes, or in the Wildheart fundraisers the Claimant takes part in. It concludes evidence has now stacked up to such an extent that there are multiple discrepancies in the Claimant's accounts and statements and "that considerable monies have to date been raised by the Wildheart Trust under false pretences and should be returned to donors forthwith".
(5) Fifth article	By making baseless threats of legal action against the editor of Country Squire Magazine and the Fundraising Regulator, Mr Packham is seeking to cover up the findings of Country Squire Magazine's investigations into him, which expose that he has defrauded the public into donating money to the Wildheart Trust by falsely claiming that the organisation had rescued maltreated tigers from European circuses, when he knew that, in truth, the tigers had not been rescued or maltreated.	Is written by Defendant 1 and offers the Claimant a right to reply while publishing the Claimant's legal threat in full. It points out the articles which, interestingly, are related to the Claimant which are not targeted by his lawyers. It clarifies that Defendant 1 believes the Truth was published, asks the Claimant to clarify where he disagrees, and confirms that he, Defendant 1, as Editor is not for turning, believing that he published the Truth.
(6) Sixth article	Mr Packham has evaded accountability for blatantly and repeatedly lying to the public that the Wildheart Trust has rescued and rehomed maltreated and physically broken tigers, in order to defraud them into	Covers the Fundraising Regulator's risible original "hyperbole" response to the Claimant and Wildheart's crowdfunding untruths. The article covers the Spanish press articles of the time. The article requests Wildheart to 'fess up' and notes that Wildheart Trust has now changed its name to the Wildheart Animal Sanctuary in the light of all this bad publicity showing

	donating money to the organisation, when he knew that, in truth, the tigers had not been rescued or maltreated and in fact had received perfectly proper care whilst with the circuses.	just how much the Claimant and his charity colleagues are on the defensive.
(7) Seventh article	Mr Packham has dishonestly misled the public into donating to the Wildheart Trust by falsely claiming that the organisation had rescued maltreated tigers, when he knew that the tigers were not maltreated.	Asks the Claimant via video and in a written version on Country Squire Magazine five pertinent questions related to his fundraising for Wildheart. Defendant 1 mentions the licence-fee-paying British public before asking these questions, highlighting his public interest angle. Defendant 1 states his belief that the Claimant is a charlatan.
(8) First video	The content of the first video is almost identical to the seventh article. The claimant and defendants say that it bears the same meaning as that they respectively attribute to the seventh article.	
(9) Second video	Mr Packham lied in crowd-funders that he and his girlfriend's zoo had rescued maltreated tigers from Spain.	Is an audio interview featuring Defendant 1 and in it he clarifies that, having investigated the Claimant's defamation claims, and thought long and hard about them, he is not for turning and believes that he published the Truth.
(10) Eighth article	Mr Packham: (1) has finally been exposed as a crook and a liar who dishonestly misled the public into donating money to the Wildheart Trust by falsely claiming that the organisation had rescued tigers, when in reality he knew that it was false to describe the tigers as "rescued" because they had been donated voluntarily by	Confirms and publishes the Fundraising Regulator's External Reviewer's judgement that the Claimant knew full well the tigers were handed over to AAP and therefore lied in crowdfunders and across multiple media about his girlfriend's Isle of Wight zoo charity The Wildheart Trust (now conveniently renamed the Wildheart Sanctuary) rescuing tigers. That the External Reviewer's overall judgement was improved but still limp. This article then reinforces the Claimant's widespread public image as a liar by referring to a recent lie – a knowing lie – of his during the COP26 talks in which he claimed gamekeepers were burning peat.

	their owners to a sanctuary; and (2) has also dishonestly claimed that gamekeepers were burning peat during COP 26 when he knew that was a lie.	
(11) Ninth article	Mr Packham: (1) has dishonestly misled the public into donating to the Wildheart Trust by falsely claiming that the organisation had rescued maltreated tigers, when he knew that the tigers were not maltreated; and (2) has lied to the public by asking for donations to feed the organisation's animals in a time of crisis while failing to inform them that the organisation benefitted from guaranteed insurance payout of up to £500,000.	Is a recap of the magazine's reporting on the Claimant's dishonesty and an update of his retaliation via lawyer activists. This is followed by a new revelation showing that the coronavirus appeal video the author complained about with the Claimant asking for donations to feed animals in a time of crisis was posted four days after an insurance policy that the charity's trustees, including the Claimant, would have known about if they were responsible trustees, kicked in guaranteeing Wildheart a percentage of their lost revenue.
(12) Second article tweet	Mr Packham was fundraising on the false basis that tigers he claimed were rescued were not rescued at all.	Confirms that the Claimant/Wildheart's tigers were not rescued based on evidence received by Country Squire Magazine and asks why is the Claimant engaged in crowdfunding saying they were?
(13) Third article tweet	Mr Packham's protestations that he has done nothing wrong are false, and he will be rightly punished for fraudulent fundraising by the Fundraising Regulator.	Announces the Fundraising regulator is investigating Wildheart and that the Claimant's backtracking video - admitting to no rescue - does not let him off the hook.
(14) Fourth article tweet	Mr Packham lied to the public to secure donations of many thousands of pounds.	Announces the discovery of video footage casting further suspicions on Wildheart and the Claimant's version of events as related in crowdfunders.
(15)	Mr Packham has made a baseless and unjustified threat of legal action to	Asks the Claimant for the Truth and mentions the legal threat by the Claimant against Defendant 1.

Fifth article tweet	silence CSM whilst knowing that CSM has only published the incriminating truth about his misconduct.	
(16) Sixth article tweet	Mr Packham has blatantly lied in his fundraising efforts for the Wildheart Trust.	The Claimant has lied in his dodgy fundraising efforts for Wildheart. The Fundraising Regulator's original findings are gutless and a cop-out.
(17) Eighth article tweet	The Claimant lied in crowdfunders by claiming that tigers were "rescued" when he knew they were not rescued because they were donated.	Resonates the External Reviewer's findings then calls on the Claimant to be sacked by the BBC for his dishonesty.
(18) Further eight article tweet	The Claimant lied in crowdfunders about "rescuing" tigers.	Highlights the BBC's double standards. Why should TV Presenter Nick Knowles be replaced for appearing in a Shreddies ad and the Claimant isn't taken off his programmes when he's lied while fundraising and continues to cause misery for many licence fee paying countrysiders.
(19) Ninth article tweet	The Claimant has yet again acted dishonestly, this time by launching a crowdfunder for his charity which misled the public by falsely describing the charity as "desperate" when in fact the Claimant knew – and deliberately concealed – that the charity was about to receive a huge insurance payout.	Refers to the Covid insurance policy and how it was not mentioned before the Claimant launched a 'desperate' Covid crowdfunder for Wildheart. This omission was dishonest.