

**BROADCASTING**



**RADIO RETURN** Sir Terry

**Lazy Wogan snubs telly comeback**

By MARK JEFFERIES  
SIR Terry Wogan has pulled the plug on a return to prime-time TV, saying it's too much hassle. The broadcaster, 71, revealed that telly bosses were eager for him to host a new chat show. But Sir Terry said: "I know what I am, I'm lazy. I've had approaches to do a talk show on TV but I'd 'e it - all the research, the slap, all the stress. Television is a stressed medium. Radio just gently gets inside your head." Sir Terry quit his popular morning show, which attracted eight million listeners, in December to move into semi-retirement. He returns with his new Radio 2 show, Weekend Wogan, this Sunday.

**CORRIE**



**POPULAR** Maggie Jones

**Blanche is back for a last blast**

EXCLUSIVE by BRIAN ROBERTS  
LATE Corrie star Maggie Jones will be giving battleaxe Blanche one last 'd-tongued blast from ond the grave. n the show, Blanche is currently in Portugal, from where she writes her final put-down for daughter Deirdre and son-in-law Ken Barlow's party in the pub. In a card Blanche says: "I considered surprising you by flying back for your party. But then I remembered some of your previous anniversary parties and couldn't imagine it'd be worth the bother. Besides, it's 83°F here and we have a pool." The popular actress died in December aged 75. Her character will be written out later this year.



**HAT'S MY BOY**  
Ange and Brad looked like the perfect couple once again

**BRAD AND ANGE'S SUPER BOWL DATE**

By DANIELLE GUSMAROLI  
danielle.gusmaroli@mirror.co.uk

**IT was a show of unity that could have featured in one of their films.**

Arms around each other and swapping kisses, Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie quashed rumours of a multi-million dollar split as they watched American Football's top event. As they cosied up at the Super Bowl in Miami - the first time they have been spotted together in more than a month - Brad, 46,

couldn't have been more attentive to Ange, 34. "She was giggling and they looked like they were having a fun time," said an onlooker. "Split? It looked more like a date." In fact beanie-hatted Brad had Super Bowled his missus over... Lawyers for the couple last night said they were not splitting and announced they are suing a down-market Sunday paper.

**JUDI JAMES**

TV body language expert

THESE poses are very intimate, very hot and very sexual. They remind me of a pair of teenagers in the early stages of love who can't keep their hands off each other. There's a lot of playfulness and giggling and this level of touchy-feelness is rarely performed by a couple trying to mask a split. These shots suggest Brad is dominating a bit more - he is the one who is instigating the sexual touches. If you can't stand the sight of each other you would find what Brad is doing to Angelina here unbearable. She'd smack him away. Very often when you get a fiery, passionate partnership there's a fair amount of brinkmanship. A lot of these types of couples will lock themselves away for a weekend and stay in bed.

**3am AT THE SUPERBOWL**  
see pages 12&13

**PCC ADJUDICATION**

Ms Danni Minogue complained to the Press Complaints Commission through Hackford Jones PR that an article headlined "Look who's Xpecting!", published in the Daily Mirror on 9 January 2010, intruded into her private life in breach of Clause 3 (Privacy) of the Editors' Code of Practice. The complaint was upheld. The article reported that Ms Minogue was expecting a baby with her boyfriend, Kris Smith. The complainant's representative said that she had not yet had

her twelve-week scan at the time of publication, and the newspaper had known this. Nonetheless, it had gone ahead to publish the story which represented a gross intrusion into her private life. The newspaper said that it was aware of the general 'first scan' rule in regard to pregnancy. However, the news of the pregnancy had been in the public domain before publication, appearing on the Faded Youth blog and on the Sydney Morning Herald website the previous day. In those circumstances, the news had

already ceased to be private. The newspaper argued that information is either "in" or "not in" the public domain; it cannot be partially in the public domain. Nonetheless, the newspaper was happy to publish an apology to the complainant, as a gesture of goodwill. Adjudication: The Commission's case law on this matter is absolutely clear: "as a matter of common sense newspapers and magazines should not reveal news of an individual's pregnancy without consent before the 12-week scan, unless the information is known to such an extent that it would be perverse not to refer to it". This is because this scan can reveal complications relating to the health of the baby and the viability of the pregnancy. For the newspaper to justify publication on this occasion, it would have to argue that the references in the Sydney Morning Herald and online - which were, in any event, speculative - made it "perverse" for it not to have referred to the pregnancy. This was manifestly an untenable argument and was rejected by the Commission.

The Code specifically requires the Commission to have regard to the "extent" to which the information has previously appeared. This was no more than common sense: otherwise, any reference online would represent automatic justification for a newspaper to publish otherwise intrusive material. On this occasion, the Commission considered that the article constituted a regrettable lapse in editorial judgement at the newspaper. It had no hesitation in upholding the complaint.