# DEFENCES FOR DEFAMATION: ITS STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

By

Fatimah Zahrah bt Ramli (2003345317) Nurliyana Bt. Rosalan (2003345516) Rozanna Bt. Abd. Hadi (2003345594) Siti Baqiuratul Zahraa' Bt. Mohamed Rahim (2003345635)

Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the degree of Bachelor in Legal Studies (Hons)

Universiti Teknologi MARA Faculty of Law

April 2006

The students confirm that the work submitted is their own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Alhamdulillah, we have finally completed our project paper which is to be submitted in partial fulfilment of bachelor legal studies. This research would not have been completed if it is not from the help of the following people. Firstly, we would like to thank Puan Fatimahtuzzahra' Dzulkifli, our supervisor, for her constant guidance and support in completing this research. We would not have been able to complete this task if it is without her encouragement and patience in reviewing our project paper. We are also indebted to Puan Norha Abu Hanifah and Puan Nor Aisyah Chua Abdullah who have helped in selecting the topic is very much appreciated. Next, we would also like to extend our appreciation to the staffs of Tan Sri Ahmad Ibrahim University of Malaya law library and International Islamic University law library for their guidance in searching for books and other materials that are necessary for this research. Finally, not forgetting, we would like to thank our family and friends for their understanding and continuous support in completing this task.

#### **ABSTRACT**

The tort of defamation is principally designed to protect interest in reputation from untrue statements. There are a number of important and extremely complex defences to defamation, and the complexity reflects the difficulty in satisfying the desire to balance the need for freedom of speech against the need to protect the reputation of the individual. The defences that are discussed in this research are the unintentional defamation, justification, fair comment and privilege. These defences will be considered in detail and careful note should be made in particular circumstances in which each may apply. A defence is said to be effective if the defendant can put a bar against any legal proceedings in defamation instituted by the plaintiff. Meanwhile, a defence is said to be ineffective if the plaintiff can successfully claim for remedies from the defendant. Hence, in corresponding with the objective of this research, these defences will be examined as to their strengths and weaknesses. This is to find out whether these defences are effective or not either in theory or in practice.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement		
Abstract		
Table of Contents List of Cases		
List of C		vi ix
LIST OF SI	atutes	IX
CHAP	TER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.0	General Introduction	1
1.1	Problem Statement	2
1.2	Objectives	2 2 3 3 4
1.3	Significance of the Research	3
1.4	Limitation of the Research	3
1.5	Methodology	4
CHAP	ΓER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.0	Literature Review	5
CHAPT	TER THREE: GENERAL OVERVIEW OF DEFAMAT	ION
3.0	Definition of Defamation	13
3.1	Types of Defamation	16
3.2	Elements of Defamation	18
3.3	Defences for Defamation	25
СНАРТ	TER FOUR: THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSE	s OI
CHAP	THE DEFENCES	s Oi
4.0	Introduction	46
4.1	Unintentional Defamation	46
	4.1.1 Strengths of Unintentional Defamation	46
	4.1.2 Weaknesses of Unintentional Defamation	50
4.2	Justification	65
	4.2.1 Strengths of the defence of Justification	66
4.2	4.2.2 Weaknesses of the defence of Justification	74
4.3	Fair Comment 4.3.1 Weaknesses of fair comment	81
1.1		81 85
4.4	Privilege 4.4.1 Strengths of privilege	86
	4.4.1.1 Absolute privilege	86
	4.4.1.1 Absolute privilege 4.4.1.2 Qualified privilege	95
	4.4.2 Weaknesses of privilege	104
	4.4.3 Malice	109
		,

### CHAPTER FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.0	Introduction	112
5.1	Recommendations	112
	5.1.1 Unintentional defamation defence	112
	5.1.2 Justification	116
	5.1.3 Fair comment	121
	5.1.4 Privilege	124
5.2	Conclusion	125
Bibliography		129