

NOTICE OF FILING

Details of Filing

Document Lodged:	Outline of Submissions
Court of Filing	FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA (FCA)
Date of Lodgment:	21/05/2025 11:44:07 AM AEST
Date Accepted for Filing:	21/05/2025 11:44:07 AM AEST
File Number:	NSD701/2024
File Title:	BRUCE LEHRMANN v NETWORK TEN PTY LIMITED ACN 052 515 250 & ANOR
Registry:	NEW SOUTH WALES REGISTRY - FEDERAL COURT OF AUSTRALIA



Sia Lagos

Registrar

Important Information

This Notice has been inserted as the first page of the document which has been accepted for electronic filing. It is now taken to be part of that document for the purposes of the proceeding in the Court and contains important information for all parties to that proceeding. It must be included in the document served on each of those parties.

The date of the filing of the document is determined pursuant to the Court's Rules.



No. NSD701 of 2024

Federal Court of Australia

District Registry: New South Wales

Division: General

BRUCE LEHRMANN

Appellant

NETWORK TEN PTY LTD AND LISA WILKINSON

Respondents

Appellant's Reply to Second Respondent's Submissions to Notice of Contention

1. The Second Respondent ("Ms Wilkinson") filed a Notice of Contention 19 June 2024. Ms Wilkinson makes the complaint that His Honour adopted an erroneous approach to fact finding and taking matters outside the scope of the relevant inquiry, Mr Lehrmann does not agree His Honour erred in rejecting her defence under s30 of the *Defamation Act* 2005 (NSW) ("Act") and Ms Wilkinson contends that his Honour erred in finding that her conduct in giving the Logies speech aggravated damages. Mr Lehrmann responds as follows.

Reasonableness must be tested as between the publisher and the person defamed

2. In Ms Wilkinson's Notice of Contention at Ground 2(b), she claims that His Honour erred generally in taking account into matters outside the scope of the relevant inquiry having accepted the respondent's construction of s30 at Judgment [919] to [921] and at Ground 2(c), and that His Honour adopted an erroneous approach to fact finding in Judgment at [763]-[766] in respect of unchallenged testimonial evidence in suggesting that evidence could be rejected without a denial of procedural fairness in circumstances other than when the evidence was inherently incredible, and therefore rejected unchallenged testimonial evidence from the second respondent and others that supported the **reasonableness** of her conduct.
3. Mr Lehrmann accepts His Honour's construction of section 30 of his Judgment TJ[919] – [921] and His Honour was correct to reject evidence that Ms Wilkinson relied upon to support the 'reasonableness' of her conduct when she was reliant upon the reasonableness of the conduct of others in respect of judging the reasonableness of her own conduct pursuant to section 30(1)(c) *Defamation Act* 2005 ("the Act"), that the conduct of the defendant in publishing that matter is reasonable in the circumstances.
4. Mr Lehrmann submits the question of '**reasonableness**' must be tested as the conduct between Ms Wilkinson (the publisher) and Mr Lehrmann (the person defamed). The

question of ‘reasonableness’ must not be tested as between the relevant employees and Ms Wilkinson. Therefore, it is justified to reject ‘unchallenged testimonial evidence’ from the second respondent and others that asserts the reasonableness of her conduct is satisfied for the purpose of satisfying s.30(1)(c) of the Act.

5. Mr Lehrmann submits it was correct for his Honour to find at TJ [935] ...*the conduct of Network Ten and Ms Wilkinson in publishing the matter in its character of conveying the defamatory imputations of rape fell short of the standard of reasonableness.*
6. It is no contest that Ms Wilkinson admits she is a publisher. From [50] of Ms Wilkinson’s submissions, she complains that his Honour failed to have regard to and to take into account Ms Wilkinson’s reliance on the processes as set out in her summarised body of evidence and that he failed to take into account that ‘receiving’, ‘relying upon’ and ‘following the advice of a group of persons’ whom she considered at the time to be ‘competent’ and ‘experienced legal advisors’ is a hallmark of **reasonableness** for a journalist. She further complains that His Honour found that the content of the advice and the processes taken place between the lawyers and the producers (employers of Channel Ten) was not relevant to Wilkinson’s s30 defence. Mr Lehrmann submits that His Honour was correct in making such finding.
7. Ms Wilkinson asserts ‘**reasonableness**’ is satisfied between the advice, conduct and processes between herself and her employer and other employees instead of the proper position of ‘reasonableness’ is to be tested between herself and Mr Lehrmann, not a test between herself and relevant employees of the publisher, effectively passing the buck onto the first respondent’s employees to satisfy her obligation of reasonableness, eg as an experienced and celebrated journalist, in acting reasonably, Ms Wilkinson should have conducted her own fact checking and to contact Mr Lehrmann directly affording him the opportunity to respond to the serious and damning allegations of rape. Especially in circumstances Mr Lehrmann was admitted to North Shore Hospital with suicidal ideation the day after the broadcast 16 February 2021.

The Authority

8. The authority in support of this proposition is in *John Fairfax Publications Pty Ltd v Zunter* [2006] NSWCA 227 at [30]:

The question of reasonableness must be tested as between the publisher and the person defamed, not as between the relevant employees and the publisher. The publisher must prove that it acted reasonably in relation to the person defamed despite publishing false and defamatory matter about him. A publisher who publishes serious allegations as fact without having checked with the person concerned is taking the

risk that they cannot be justified. In that event, outside the limits of reasonableness, it is the publisher who bears the risk, not the person defamed.

9. At [51] of Ms Wilkinson's submissions at TJ [51] her conduct to be determined in respect of reasonableness is as follows:

(a) *Wilkinson gave evidence that she was aware that producer Angus Llewellyn was liaising with the Network Ten legal team "at every stage of the investigation leading up to an including the broadcast": Wilkinson Aff [89].*

(b) *Angus Llewellyn gave evidence that he usually worked closely with the legal team to seek legal advice and carry out legal checks and that was an important part of the production process right up until broadcast: Llewellyn Aff [47].*

(c) *Llewellyn gave further evidence that the legal team was more involved in the Broadcast than other stories – from the start and throughout the production: Llewellyn Aff [58].*

(d) *Llewellyn gave evidence that from 26 January to 15 February 2021 he spoke to senior lawyer Myles Farley "almost every day for the purposes of obtaining his legal advice in relation to the [Broadcast]": Llewellyn Aff [95].*

(e) *Llewellyn detailed specific incidences of seeking and obtaining such legal advice, including creating and using a WhatsApp chat group with senior in-house lawyers Tasha Smithies and Mr Farley for that purpose: Llewellyn Aff [154]; [205]; [225]; [242]; [253]; [262]; [272]; [278]; [312]; [315]; [334]; [359]; [369]; [371]; [397]; [401].*

(f) *Sarah Thornton (who was not cross-examined) gave evidence that she received legal advice about the Broadcast and reported it to Network Ten CEO Beverley McGarvey: Thornton Aff [40]-[41]; [65]; [68].*

(g) *Supervising producer Laurie Binnie (also not cross-examined) gave evidence that it was her role to liaise with the in-house lawyers and to seek and consider pre-publication legal advice: Binne Aff [18(d)].*

(h) *Chris Bendall referred to the use of independent fact-checkers and lawyers used by the Project and a meeting in which he received legal advice from Mr Farley: Bendall Aff [19]; [26]; [58].*

(i) *Craig Campbell (also not cross-examined) gave extensive evidence about his use and involvement of lawyers: Campbell Aff [25]; [27]; [30]; [42].*

(j) *Peter Meakin gave evidence that the production team took legal advice on how far they could go without being guilty of identifying Mr Lehrmann: T195.4-38.12*

At [52] of Ms Wilkinson's submissions Further, as to the nature of that advice (TJ[950]):

(a) *Wilkinson gave unambiguous evidence that the Network Ten lawyers were involved at every stage and that in her experience they were very conservative and highly experienced.*

(b) *Mr Llewellyn gave evidence that the legal team, fact checking team and heads of Department reviewed all stories and that he usually worked closely with the legal team to seek legal advice and carry out legal checks.*

(c) *Peter Meakin gave evidence that he was aware that the in-house lawyers were involved from very early on and throughout the production process until the publication of the Broadcast.*

(d) *Sarah Thornton gave evidence about legal advice throughout the production process, including as late as the day of Broadcast noting that Network Ten's lawyers "were heavily involved in the story from the very start of the process".*

(e) *Craig Campbell gave evidence that he "went to great lengths to ensure Network Ten's in-house lawyers were involved with the development of the story".*

(f) Further, Mr Campbell said that the lawyers' views about the credibility of the woman making the allegation would be an important part in the preparation and production of the story: Campbell Aff [25]. This accorded with Wilkinson's evidence (at [100]-[102]) that Ms Smithies watched the interview of Ms Higgins as it took place and immediately told Wilkinson that she considered Ms Higgins to be "credible": Wilkinson Aff [100]-[102].

(g) Mr Bendall confirmed that it was part of his role to ensure that "all necessary rights of reply, fact-checking and legal processes have been complied with". He explained the legal process undertaken for the Broadcast in detail: Bendall Aff [115]-[127].

(h) The unchallenged evidence from multiple witnesses was that extensive legal advice was sought and obtained throughout the production process by various eminently experienced and professional television production operatives. That advice was provided by highly experienced media lawyers who were intimately involved in the production process.

10. Further, Ms Wilkinson's defence pleads

15.53. Wilkinson is not a lawyer and is not familiar with the specifics of defamation law.

15.54. Wilkinson at all relevant times understood that Network 10 employed an expert legal team with experience in pre-publication advice, including defamation and contempt.

15.55. Wilkinson was informed and understood that the matters would be thoroughly checked by Network 10 lawyers prior to broadcast.

15.56. Wilkinson was informed and understood that the matters were reviewed by more than one lawyer, a number of times prior to broadcast.

15.57. Wilkinson understood that any legal change or request that was necessary in relation to the matters would have been notified by the lawyers to her producer Llewellyn and any necessary changes, additions or further enquiries made as a result. 15.58. Wilkinson would have complied with any and all advices or requests made by the Network 10 lawyers to alter the matters or to make further enquiries or additions to them.

15.59. Wilkinson did not receive any request or advice by Network 10 lawyers prior to the broadcast of the matters in relation to the allegations against Lehrmann in the final version broadcast.

15.54. Wilkinson at all relevant times understood that Network 10 employed an expert legal team with experience in pre-publication advice, including defamation and contempt.

11. In determining reasonableness, Hunt J in *Morgan v John Fairfax Media & Sons Ltd*

(1991) 23 NSWLR 374 stated that the more serious the allegation made about the plaintiff the greater care prior to publication is expected from the defendant. In the circumstances of a very serious allegation of rape against Mr Lehrmann it was arguably incumbent on Ms Wilkinson to personally, directly make her own enquiries and not leave it to employees to make the necessary enquiries and investigations on her own behalf, to satisfy herself that she has taken greater care to fact check the allegations and to properly notify Mr Lehrmann of the rape allegation against him, notwithstanding Ten and Ms Wilkinson commenced investigating Ms Higgins' side of the story around 19 or 20 January 2021, immediately upon Mr Sharaz bringing the story to them¹. Ms Wilkinson never contacted Mr Lehrmann, the first time any contact was made, was from the

¹ TT line 15 page 30

producer, Mr Llewellyn at about 2.45 pm on the afternoon of Friday, 12 February, with a deadline of 10 am on Monday. There was no consideration as to whether the email went to an email junk folder or lost in the email abyss or had even reached Mr Lehrmann, there was no email receipts put into evidence. Mr Lehrmann's Counsel at trial submitted that Mr Llewellyn used two email addresses. These had also been sourced from Mr Sharaz. One was a Hotmail address. The other was an address for a workplace that Mr Llewellyn knew Mr Lehrmann had left more than six months before. When Mr Sharaz sourced these two email addresses for Mr Llewellyn, he said in a message train: *Don't ask me how I got them*².

12. In Ms Wilkinson's submissions at [8], she refers to His Honour correctly directing himself (at TJ922 CA p356) that in respect of the defence of justification a publisher can publish untrue material but still act reasonably and the need to guard against judging a publisher by unrealistic standards, adopting a counsel of perfection, or adopting hindsight bias. Ms Wilkinson complains:

'It would be unrealistic to expect a journalist to be held to account as though they were a judge, a prosecutor or even a police officer making a decision to charge. News and current affair journalists operate in an environment whereby their sources and information are weighed and used depending on the nature of the allegations, the identity of the sources, their belief in the truth and their attempts to obtain a response from the person accused'.

13. Ms Wilkinson sets out her exemplary and admirable CV in her defence and in her affidavit. Ms Wilkinson is arguably one of Australia's most experienced and impressive journalists. As a sophisticated journalist she would be *au fait* with her obligations to obey journalist standards in adopting the MEEA Code of Ethics. Journalists have a greater responsibility to scrutinise and check the accuracy of their sources especially in circumstances they receive 'exclusives' and enjoy such privileges for example Journalist privilege relating to identity of informant pursuant to section pursuant to section 126K *Evidence Act 1995* (NSW). It is inferred especially for an experienced journalist to have this ethos installed and adopt the MEEA Code of Ethics, namely

*Journalists will educate themselves about ethics and apply the following standards: Report and interpret honestly, striving for accuracy, fairness and disclosure of all essential facts. Do not suppress relevant available facts, or give distorting emphasis. Do your utmost to give a fair opportunity for reply.*³

14. In Ms Wilkinson's CV⁴, she was honoured to present the prestigious Andrew Olle lecture, in the world of social media and the rush to be the first with the news, Ms Wilkinson

² TT line 36 page 30

³ <https://www.meea.org/download/meaa-code-of-ethics/>

⁴ 15.2(a) of Ms Wilkinson's defence: CB page 43

acknowledged in her Andrew Olle lecture speech: “*Fact-checking, accuracy and official confirmations – the bread and butter of our training as journalists – became casualties of the adrenalin rush to be first with the news – even if, in some cases, it turned out to be wrong*”.⁵ His Honour correctly stated at TJ [933]

The assessment of reasonableness has, implicit within it, the identification of values against which conduct is measured. Some assistance is derived from the non-exclusive s 30(3) factors, but one cannot ignore other norms or values one would expect to inform the conduct of responsible and reasonable journalism. Despite the resistance of the respondents to the notion, the usefulness of the Code is that it provides, among other things, a pointer as to what might be expected of a journalist.

15. **Lehrmann not named** Ms Wilkinson submits in her submissions at [16] that the decision made not to name Mr Lehrmann in the Broadcast was a key factor in the consideration of their *reasonableness*, aware that the publishers at News Limited would not be naming Mr Lehrmann in the Maiden article and complains at [19] that it was an error to fail to assess Wilkinson’s conduct in the context of an unnamed perpetrator who, on the factual findings was only reasonably identifiable by a small group of persons occurring in the broad context of the Maiden article made 10 hours earlier, making it a ‘significant public interest’, which was not considered by His Honour in assessing Ms Wilkinson’s reasonableness.
16. Ms Wilkinson pleaded common law qualified privilege in her defence at [16] that she had an interest in conveying the information in the matter to persons who reasonably identified Mr Lehrmann, having conducted the interview with Higgins and the investigation of the allegations (as pleaded in [15] of her defence), does not accord with her submission of asserting reasonableness by not naming Mr Lehrmann in the program when pleading common law qualified privilege does negate an intention to identify Mr Lehrmann in the programme.
17. At [14] of Ms Wilkison’s submissions she complains that the primary judge made no reference to the s30 defence and, it would appear, did not take this factor into account in the consideration of that defence at all. At TJ [54] Whether the identification was correct is relevant to the question of reasonableness. As Bryson JA (with whom Mason P and Tobias JA agreed) observed in *Gardener v Nationwide News Pty Ltd* [2007] NSWCA 10 (at [47]), any purpose for establishing that identification was reasonable is well satisfied if it can be shown the identification was correct: see also *Steele v Mirror Newspapers Ltd* [1974] 2 NSWLR 348 (at 371–374 per Samuels JA).

⁵ <https://womensagenda.com.au/latest/lisa-wilkinson-presents-andrew-olle-lecture/>

Despite the pleadings, the contest in this case is not, however, whether at least one person identified Mr Lehrmann, so as to perfect the cause of action. Instead, what is really in dispute is the extent of identification: that is, the persons (or classes of persons) who reasonably identified Mr Lehrmann, which is relevant to damages and the defence of common law qualified privilege.

18. Mr Lehrmann does not agree with Ms Wilkinson's assertion it was a factor to consider on assessing reasonableness, that in effect she should be commended for not naming Mr Lehrmann in the program is viewed as disingenuous, and viewed as a crafted strategy to maximise the ratings of a story, to achieve an exciting air of mystery akin to a 'whodunnit', a common phrase used to ask who committed a crime with the effect of provoking a greater public interest to 'create chatter' a 'buzz', placing the primary focus on the identity of the alleged perpetrator, arguably highlighting the sensationalism of a complex plot-driven story involving political scandal cover up of a rape in Parliament. The program (visual and audio medium) is far more epic and dramatic than an online print article. Although Mr Lehrmann was not specifically named in the program, a sophisticated journalist would be aware when providing enough indication as to the identity of Mr Lehrmann is teasing the viewer and inviting greater public engagement and promotion of the story. Mr Lehrmann was identified in the Programme as the alleged perpetrator of to the extent of: (line references are to the aide-memoire to Exhibit 1):
- (a) he was a "senior male advisor" to Senator Reynolds: lines 7-8
 - (b) he had previously worked for her in the Home Affairs portfolio: line 10
 - (c) he attended a drinks event with Ms Higgins and other contacts and colleagues in Defence on 22 March 2019: lines 11-13
 - (d) the senior male colleague was called into a meeting with Fiona Brown on the following Tuesday, after which he started packing up his things: lines 52-55
 - (e) after leaving Senator Reynolds' employment, the senior male advisor obtained a good job in Sydney: lines 156-157.
19. In the trial several witnesses gave evidence of discussions, gossip and rumours about the identity of the perpetrator, both before the Programme went to air or after the broadcast⁶. The fact that a high level of viewer engagement of gossip and rumour was taking place demonstrates the point made by Simpson JA in *Pedavoli* at [78], that in a controversial case such as this, recipients will likely make efforts to find out the identity of the unnamed subject (noting also the continuing publication of the Programme via the 10 Play and YouTube platforms). As a result of such discussions, people who did not already

⁶ Affidavit of Karly Abbott (27.07.2023) at [12]; corrected at Tcpt 37.5, Tcpt 47.19-48.1. Affidavit of David McDonald (27.07.2023) at [5], [7], [9], Affidavit of Kathleen Quinn (28.07.2023) at [5]-[6] Tcpt 112.3-13, Nicole Hamer Tcpt 1064.5, 1066.3, 1065.41-45, 1066.6., Austin Wenke Tcpt 1125.11-45, 1126.7-22, Nikita Irvine Tcpt 1207.23-36

know or believe that Mr Lehrmann was the alleged culprit, or the facts on which that identification was based, are likely to have learned about it, by googling sleuths, and the circle of people with the knowledge necessary to identify him in the Programme would have expanded accordingly. It also appears that there was a greater concern to exclude the potential to inadvertently identify the wrong person as opposed to be concerned with, to ensure Mr Lehrmann was not inadvertently identified. There with sufficient detail given to exclude other males who worked in Linda Reynolds' office at the relevant time⁷, thus as a matter of deduction, making it easier to identify Mr Lehrmann in the program.

Presumed falsity of entire matter and Credit not a factor, approach to fact finding

20. Ms Wilkinson submits at [21] of her submissions that His Honour erred in approaching the question of reasonableness for s30 from “*the premise the rape allegation was not true*”: TJ[922], CA p356. That error carried through to the incorrect conclusion that the respondents were unreasonable because they “*started from the premise that what Ms Higgins said about her allegations was true*”: TJ[936(8)], CA p362. The “harder hitting” the comments, the greater the care required to establish the truth of the facts on which they are based: *Austin* at 317G. In *Austin* at 318D the Privy Council observed:

There will of course be cases in which despite all reasonable care the journalist gets the facts wrong, but a member of the public is at least entitled to expect that a journalist will take reasonable care to get his facts right before he launches an attack upon him in a daily newspaper. If on inquiry it is found that the facts are not true and that reasonable care has not been taken to establish them courts should be very slow to hold that the newspaper is protected by statutory qualified privilege. The public deserve to be protected against irresponsible journalism.

“Legalling” – Would you run a red light if your lawyer told you that you could do it?

21. Ms Wilkinson's defence under sub-heading Legalling at 15.3⁸ pleads *inter alia* she is not a lawyer and relied upon the advice of lawyers in respect of the program This raises the question was it reasonable to rely upon legal advice when in the face of it is plainly wrong, which raises the proposition, if a lawyer tells you that you can run a red light, would you do it? With respect to Ms Wilkinson, a sophisticated highly intelligent and experienced journalist, it appears disingenuous to claim that she would follow the advice of lawyers notwithstanding it was obviously bad advice.
22. At TJ [1046(3)] Ms Wilkinson's “unchallenged evidence” is that she was asked by Network Ten through Ms Thornton to give the speech in early June and she “was placed

⁷ Affidavit of Angus Llewellyn (21.09.2023) at [167(a)] Tcpt 1655.42

⁸ Court Book page 50

- in an invidious position of balancing her concerns (raised first in her email on 3 June 2022) with her obligations to comply as an employee with directions from her employer” and she relied “*on the advice given to her by her employer’s lawyers and the judgment of those to whom she reported*”.
23. Ms Wilkinson’s affidavit of 2 February 2024 at [6b] states: “*If Ms Smithies, after seeing the video footage used to introduce the nomination of The Project for the Logie Award, had told me not to give the Logies speech, I would have followed her legal advice and not given the speech.*”
24. After the judgment was delivered in this matter, the first Respondent filed an affidavit affirmed 26 April 2024 by Stuart Macaulay Thomas, VP Legal and Corporate Affairs for the First Respondent. He made an apology that the legal advice in respect to the Logies Speech was wrong and involved a serious mistake:
- 13. However, the current proceeding has illustrated, and the Court's findings make clear, that Network Ten failed in relation to its approach and advice in relation to Lisa Wilkinson's speech at the TV Week Logies Awards on 19 June 2022 (Logies Speech).*
- 14. Network Ten accepts his Honour’s finding that the Logies Speech could have undermined Mr Lehrmann’s right to a fair trial and that it follows that the legal advice given in relation to the Logies Speech involved a serious mistake.*
- 15. On behalf of Network Ten, I offer a sincere and unreserved apology for Network Ten's role in the approval of the Logies Speech and the consequences that ensued.*
25. **Notification of Lehrmann/request for comment** At [55] of Wilkinson’s submissions: “The primary judge erred in finding that the respondents’ conduct in seeking comment from the appellant “*were pointers*” as to why Wilkinson’s conduct fell short of reasonableness: TJ[936(6)- (7)],[963]. The limited finding implicitly acknowledges that Wilkinson did not have an active role in seeking comment from Mr Lehrmann.
26. At [56] of Wilkinson’s submissions, Wilkinson submits that the evidence of the executive producer, Mr Bendell directly corroborated her uncontested evidence that she was not part of the decision as to when requests for comment were sent or the timing of the Broadcast but does admit she is a broadcaster.
27. Ms Wilkinson’s defence at [15.66] under subheading ‘Timing’ *It was necessary that the matters be published expeditiously because the toxic environment in Parliament House towards women was a topic of significant public interest and concerned governmental and political matters.* Under the subheading ‘Fact Checking’ at [15.41] *The investigation resulting in the matters was ongoing for four weeks and at [15.42] Wilkinson was told and believed that each of the allegations in the matters was fact checked by producer Llewellyn and other employees of Network 10 prior to first broadcast.* As previously stated in Zunter: *The question of reasonableness must be tested as between the publisher*

and the person defamed, not as between the relevant employees and the publisher, it was not reasonable for Ms Wilkinson to leave such fundamental enquiries and obligations at the hands of others.

28. **Logies speech – Ground 3** - The second respondent submits that His Honour erred in finding at Judgment [1052], that Ms Wilkinson’s conduct in giving the Logies speech to be improper and unjustifiable. Mr Lehrmann contends that His Honour was correct to make this finding. His Honour also stated at [1052] that Ms Wilkinson had less culpability than those encouraging her to make the speech. Ms Wilkinson at least had the insight to seek advice and might not be expected to have the objectivity of others within Network Ten given the fact that she had, as Ms Smithies noted, become part of the story. Ms Wilkinson has denied full responsibility of the speech in that her individual conduct was giving the speech as an employee on behalf of her employer⁹. On 26 April 2024, the Respondent’s filed affidavits Justin Healy Quill, Stuart Macaulay Thomas, and Tasha Tania Smithies¹⁰ in respect of reflection and apology over the Logies speech.
29. However most recently on 9 May 2025, Ms Wilkison is reported by the Daily Mail¹¹, TV Tonight¹² and Sky News¹³ in her address to an audience at the Taree NSW Book festival, promoted as “Evening with Lisa Wilkinson”. It is reported that Ms Wilkinson acknowledges taking part of the blame in delivering the Logie Speech. She said: *Three women who run Channel Ten all read that speech. When s*** hit the fan I said: I'm on the front page of every newspaper in the country right now, I am being destroyed. I will take some of the blame because I said those words, but they are the words you asked me to say. You (the Ten women) know the legal position I am in. You approved it. I went to the legal department three times, including up to the afternoon of the Logies before I got on that stage. You've got to take some of the blame. I was told: Oh we couldn't do that. That will only make it worse. And as the weeks went on and I said: This is getting worse, not for you, no-one's mentioned the role that any of you have played. And it was three women. I don't know if you're aware that even though we've won the legal case - and the judge did declare that Bruce Lehrmann is a rapist - Bruce Lehrmann has appealed that finding. And so the case, the appeal, is back in court in August ... I don't know what's going to happen. And as personally, financially and professionally hard as the last few years have been for me, I will never regret putting the Brittany Higgins story to air. It has changed our country. It has exposed truths that desperately needed to be exposed, and as the toxic culture wars, the cheap headlines and the uninformed commentators have begun to fall away, I know the legacy that this story is continuing to deliver for so many women and survivors of sexual assault around this country, and I'm so proud to have been a part of that.*

Zali Burrows, Solicitor for the Appellant, 21 May 2025

⁹ Ms Wilkinson’s defence at [113]

¹⁰ Affidavits of Justin Healy Quill, Stuart Macaulay Thomas, and Tasha Tania Smithies each dated 26 April 2024

¹¹ <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-14697875/Lisa-Wilkinson-Channel-Ten-taree.html>

¹² <https://tvtonight.com.au/2025/05/lisa-wilkinson-theres-a-lot-of-mainstream-media-im-quite-disgusted-by.html>

¹³ <https://www.skynews.com.au/lifestyle/celebrity-life/lisa-wilkinson-cryptically-blames-three-women-at-channel-ten-for-logies-speech-fallout-and-reveals-surprise-career-move-during-public-appearance/news-story/4f6580d1cd5bec22d58661a781568ca0>