

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
KING'S BENCH DIVISION  
MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS LIST

Claim No: [to be assigned by the Court]

**BETWEEN:**

Prince Andrew  
(Litigant in Person)  
Claimant

-and-

Andrew Lownie  
Defendant

**INTERESTED PARTY (ON NOTICE):**

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)

**PARTICULARS OF CLAIM**

**A. INTRODUCTION**

The Claimant, acting as a litigant in person, brings this claim for defamation and malicious falsehood arising from (i) the publication of a commercial biography authored by the Defendant titled *The Rise and Fall of the House of York* ("the Book"), and (ii) its republication and amplification by the BBC in an online article dated 8 August 2025 entitled "Prince Andrew book seals his fate for any return" ("the BBC Article").

The publications complained of present the Book's narrative as a conclusive determination of the Claimant's reputation, employing verdict-like language implying finality equivalent to a judicial outcome.

The Claimant has suffered serious harm to his reputation within the meaning of section 1 of the Defamation Act 2013.

**B. THE PARTIES**

The Claimant is Prince Andrew, a member of the Royal Family and a public figure. He brings this claim as a litigant in person.

The Defendant is Andrew Lownie, a professional author and biographer who derives income from the sale and promotion of his books.

The BBC is a public service broadcaster funded by the television licence fee.

**C. ADDRESS FOR SERVICE**

The Claimant's address for service is: [Insert address], or such other address as the Court may direct.

## **D. THE PUBLICATIONS COMPLAINED OF**

In August 2025, the Defendant published the Book, a commercial biography of the Claimant and Sarah, Duchess of York.

On 8 August 2025, the BBC published the BBC Article reviewing and promoting the Book. The words complained of include:

- a. The headline: "Prince Andrew book seals his fate for any return."
- b. "This book appears to seal the fate of Andrew if he was ever hoping to be reinstated officially into the working royals".
- c. Descriptions of the Book as an "unrelentingly unflattering portrait" which "depicts him as arrogant, self-seeking and in denial" regarding alleged associations.

The BBC Article achieved significant online circulation, materially amplifying the Defendant's narrative.

## **E. NATURAL AND ORDINARY MEANING**

The words complained of, in their natural and ordinary meaning, meant and were understood to mean:

- a. That the Claimant's reputation is irreparably damaged and his disgrace conclusively established by the matters set out in the Book;
- b. That the Book provides definitive proof of adverse allegations against the Claimant, rendering any return to public life impossible;
- c. That no further judicial process or fair hearing is necessary in relation to those allegations.

Alternatively, by innuendo, to readers aware of the Claimant's denials and the absence of criminal convictions or adverse judicial findings.

## **F. FALSITY AND SERIOUS HARM**

The imputations are false. The Claimant has not been convicted of any offence, and allegations remain unproven in any court.

The publications have caused, or are likely to cause, serious harm to the Claimant's reputation, including intensified public opprobrium and prejudice following their release in 2025.

## **G. CAUSES OF ACTION**

### **Count I — Defamation (Against the Defendant)**

The Defendant is responsible as author for the defamatory content of the Book, including where such content was republished or endorsed.

### **Count II — Defamation by Republication (Defendant; BBC on Notice)**

The BBC's publication constituted republication of defamatory material from the Book. The Defendant is liable as originator.

The BBC Article is not protected as honest opinion, as the headline and framing assert finality as fact, not evaluative comment.

### **Count III — Malicious Falsehood (Against the Defendant)**

The Defendant published the Book knowing, or recklessly indifferent to, the falsity of certain allegations, intending to maximise commercial gain through controversy.

The Claimant has suffered pecuniary loss and further reputational damage.

### **H. DAMAGE**

The Claimant has suffered serious reputational harm, distress, and embarrassment, aggravated by the scale of publication and the involvement of a publicly funded broadcaster.

### **I. RELIEF SOUGHT**

The Claimant seeks:

- a. Damages, including aggravated damages;
- b. An injunction restraining further publication of the words complained of, including verdict-style assertions of finality;
- c. An order for publication of a summary of any judgment;
- d. An order for correction and/or retraction by the BBC;
- e. Costs;
- f. Interest pursuant to section 35A of the Senior Courts Act 1981.

### **STATEMENT OF TRUTH**

I believe that the facts stated in these Particulars of Claim are true. I am duly authorised to sign this statement.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Prince Andrew

Date: [Insert date]