

06-REPORT FOR THE ICO

Cross-Platform Dissemination of Unlawful Personal Data, Search-Engine Removals, and Publisher-Triggered Re-Indexing Events (2022–2026)

Version B – Full Narrative (4–6 pages)

Prepared by: Riccardo Gresta

Date: 6th June 2026

1. Executive Overview

This report documents the unlawful dissemination of my personal data originating from an inaccurate and unverified press release issued by East Sussex County Council (ESCC) in December 2022. The data was subsequently replicated across multiple publishers — including ITV, The Argus, Sussex Express, What's On In Brighton, and BourneFree Live — and then indexed by Google, Bing, and several other minor search engines.

Between April and June 2026, I obtained multiple GDPR removals from Google and initiated a parallel removal process with Microsoft Bing. During this period, several URLs previously delisted under GDPR unexpectedly reappeared in Google Search. My forensic analysis demonstrates that these reappearances were caused by publisher-side technical actions, not by any failure of Google's propagation systems.

The report also shows that ESCC failed to comply with Article 19 UK GDPR, which requires controllers to notify third parties of rectification or erasure. As a result, the burden of mitigation fell entirely on search engines and individual publishers.

2. Background: ESCC as the Origin of the Dissemination Chain

The ESCC press release:

- contained judicial data and special category health data,
- was factually inaccurate,
- was not verified,
- was republished verbatim by multiple media outlets,
- and triggered a multi-year chain of dissemination.

ESCC never notified any third party of the inaccuracies, nor did it request removal or correction. This omission is central to the ongoing persistence of the data.

3. Google's GDPR Removal Actions (April–June 2026)

3.1 Initial Removal – 1 April 2026

Google granted my GDPR removal request and delisted all URLs from:

- ITV and ITV on Facebook
- Sussex Express
- The Argus
- WhatsoninBrighton
- BourneFree Live

Google confirmed:

“We will remove these URLs from search results for queries relating to your name... in your country and in other European versions of Google Search.”

Google replied in Italian, despite my English-language request, because:

- the request was processed through Google Italy S.r.l. (Milan),
- under the territorial competence of the Garante Privacy,
- within the same judicial district as the Public Prosecutor's Office of Pavia, where my criminal complaint is filed.

3.2 First Reappearance – 11 May 2026 (The Argus)

On 11 May 2026, a snippet from The Argus reappeared in Google Italy for the query “riccardo gresta eastbourne” leading to the original article.

I notified Google immediately.

Google did not claim propagation delay.

Google did not ask me to wait.

Google did not treat it as a temporary glitch.

Instead, Google removed the resurfaced URL within hours, confirming:

“We will remove these URLs... in your country and in other European versions of Google Search.”

This behaviour is incompatible with a propagation issue and consistent with a publisher-triggered re-indexing event.

3.3 Second Reappearance – 31 May 2026 (ITV + Facebook)

Two URLs resurfaced:

1. ITV topic-hub page showing the original snippet
2. Facebook post linking to the ITV article

I followed Google's exact reporting procedure.

Google again removed both URLs on 1 June 2026, confirming that the reappearance was treated as newly surfaced content, not as a failure of the original removal.

4. Why the URLs Reappeared: Forensic Interpretation

4.1 ITV CMS Migration (2026)

My forensic comparison of the ITV source code (2022 vs 2026) shows:

- ITV migrated to a Next.js-based CMS
- regenerated topic-hub pages
- altered internal navigation
- introduced a faulty canonical tag
- created new URL patterns
- re-served the article without any editorial review

The 2026 version retained:

- the same headline
- the same meta description
- the same Open Graph metadata
- the same JSON-LD (including the 2022 date)
- the same health and judicial data

This confirms that ITV re-served the article, not revised it.

Such migrations often generate:

- new endpoints
- new hub pages
- new internal linking structures
- new freshness signals

These can unintentionally trigger re-indexing, even for content previously delisted under GDPR.

4.2 The Argus – Hyper-Replicative SEO Architecture

The Argus uses an aggressive SEO structure:

- daily archives
- category pages
- tag pages
- AMP versions
- CDN variants
- automated mirrors
- “related articles” pages

This creates 10–15 indexable URLs for a single article.

When Google removes one URL, parent pages may still regenerate snippets.

This phenomenon is known as:

Residual Indexing via Parent Pages

It explains why The Argus snippet reappeared on 11 May 2026.

4.3 My Hypothesis: Publishers Believed the Removal Was a “Bluff”

Given the timing, it is plausible that:

- ITV and The Argus saw that Google had removed their URLs
- ITV and The Argus likely interpreted the sudden disappearance of their URLs from Google not as a formal GDPR removal, but as a temporary indexing fluctuation. As a result, they considered my notification (“Google has blocked you and Bing is about to block you”) more likely to reflect a transient technical anomaly than a binding legal action, and therefore allowed their systems to regenerate the pages or manually refreshed their content.

This would explain:

- the ITV topic-hub regeneration
- the Argus archive regeneration
- the reappearance of URLs only on Google (not Bing)
- the need for Google to manually re-remove the URLs twice

This hypothesis is consistent with:

- the timing of ITV’s CMS migration
- the Argus SEO architecture
- the behaviour of publishers who fear loss of visibility

5. Bing's GDPR Removal Process (15 May 2026)

Bing confirmed:

“Our engineering team is working on your case... due to the complexity of the issue we need more time.”

Bing's slower response is explained by its decentralised index, which propagates removals more slowly than Google's centralised system.

This is why:

- The Argus and ITV reappeared only on Google,
- because Bing had not yet completed the initial removal,
- and therefore the re-indexing event never reached Bing.

Bing Italy, like Google Italy, is based in Milan, under the same judicial district as the Pavia Prosecutor's Office.

5.1 Bing UK Re-Indexing Event (6 June 2026)

As of 6 June 2026, the ITV Facebook post exhibits a divergent indexing pattern across Bing's regional clusters. In the UK (English-language) index, the post reappears for complex queries such as “Riccardo Gresta Eastbourne”, where the term “Eastbourne” is displayed with a strikethrough — a known Bing indicator of a term that has been declassified or partially suppressed within the query-processing layer. More critically, the same URL has now resurfaced even for simple name-only queries (“Riccardo Gresta”), despite having been fully suppressed for this query type across all regions until 5 June 2026.

In contrast, the Italian-language Bing index continues to block the URL for simple-name queries, where the post does not appear at all and remains visible only for complex or highly specific queries, consistent with a fading or partial-suppression phase.

This cross-regional discrepancy confirms that Meta's failure to remove or restrict the Facebook post has allowed the unlawful content to remain fully indexable, enabling a fresh re-indexing event in the UK cluster while the Italian cluster still reflects the earlier suppression state.

5.2 Interaction Between Media Actions and the Limits of Lawful Technical Mitigation

As already noted in my previous communications, I have so far implemented only elementary and widely-known SEO mitigation measures, deliberately limited in scope to avoid generating secondary effects on the high-authority media domains that replicated the original ESCC material. These measures have reduced — but cannot eliminate — the algorithmic impact created by the 2022 publication.

It is relevant to observe that the actions taken by the media — including CMS migrations, archive regeneration, automated SEO processes, and the re-serving of unchanged content — are typically regarded as standard industry practices. If such actions were to be interpreted as non-unlawful within this context, then, by the same principle of parity and consistency, **any future technical interventions I may be forced to consider would likewise fall within the boundaries of lawful and ethically acceptable SEO practice.** They would simply mirror, in a proportionate and symmetrical manner, the ongoing algorithmic effects produced by the media's own systems.

This asymmetry underscores a structural issue: if the underlying inaccuracies are not corrected at source, the burden of mitigation inevitably shifts onto the individual whose data has been

disseminated. In such circumstances, it becomes essential to recognise that only the removal of the original content and the publication of a corrective article — carrying opposite and verifiable signals and disseminated through the same SEO-replicative structures — can restore informational balance without requiring further technical escalation on my part.

6. WhatsoinBrighton – Evidence of Intentional Removal

My manual searches show:

- 0 results for “Blue Badge”
- entire sections removed
- the .NET domain shut down
- the .COM domain cleaned of all Blue Badge content

This indicates:

- intentional removal
- recognition of risk
- not a technical accident

This is consistent with the hard-removal methodology previously applied by ESCC.

7. Regulatory Significance

7.1 ESCC’s Article 19 Failure

ESCC never:

- notified ITV
- notified The Argus
- notified Sussex Express
- notified WhatsoinBrighton
- notified Facebook
- notified Google
- notified Bing

This is a direct breach of Article 19 UK GDPR.

7.2 Search Engines as External Mitigators

All mitigation was performed by:

- Google — which fully completed the removal process
- Bing — which is close to completion
- Meta — which provided no cooperation whatsoever in relation to the ITV Facebook post. In contrast to Google and Bing, Meta failed to take any action or offer any meaningful explanation. This lack of engagement prompted the Irish Data Protection Commission to open a formal investigation specifically triggered by Meta’s inaction on the post.

- individual publishers (PressReader, What’s On in Brighton)

ESCC did nothing.

7.3 Cross-Border Regulatory Involvement

The case now involves:

- ICO (ESCC as controller)
- Garante Privacy (Google/Bing Italy)

- Irish DPC (Meta EU establishment)
- Pavia Prosecutor's Office (criminal complaint)

This confirms the multi-jurisdictional impact of ESCC's unlawful publication.

8. Final Conclusion

Between April and June 2026:

- Google removed the URLs three times
- Bing escalated the case to engineering
- ITV re-served the article during a CMS migration
- The Argus regenerated parent pages
- WhatsoninBrighton removed entire sections
- Meta is under investigation by the Irish DPC
- ESCC took no action

The evidence demonstrates that:

The persistence and re-emergence of unlawful ESCC-derived data is a structural consequence of publisher behaviour and ESCC's failure to notify third parties, not a failure of search engines.

This constitutes a clear and ongoing violation of Article 5(1)(d), Article 5(1)(c), and Article 19 UK GDPR.

9. Language of Google and Bing Replies – Evidence of Territorial Competence and Judicial Cooperation

Although all my GDPR removal requests were submitted in English, both Google and Microsoft Bing consistently replied in Italian. This linguistic choice is not incidental: it reflects the fact that both companies process GDPR-related requests through their Italian establishments, which are headquartered in Milan.

Google Italy S.r.l. and Microsoft/Bing Italy S.r.l. fall under the jurisdiction of the Milan Court of Appeal, the same judicial district as the Public Prosecutor's Office of Pavia, where my criminal complaint concerning ESCC and the media replicators is currently filed.

For this reason, the companies adopt Italian as the default language for all official GDPR correspondence involving Italian residents. This ensures:

- full linguistic accessibility for the Italian supervisory authority (Garante Privacy),
- complete alignment with the judicial district handling the criminal proceedings,
- avoidance of any linguistic ambiguity that could arise from English-only communication,
- demonstration of cooperation with Italian judicial and regulatory bodies,
- clear evidentiary traceability in the event of cross-authority review (ICO, Garante, DPC Ireland).

In other words:

Google and Bing reply in Italian not because of my language choice, but because of their legal obligation to communicate in the language of the competent supervisory authority and the jurisdiction where their EU establishment is located.

This behaviour is consistent with:

- Article 3 GDPR (territorial scope),
- the one-stop-shop mechanism,

- the need to ensure that any correspondence can be directly reviewed by the Italian authorities without translation,
- and the fact that my residence is in Italy.

The use of Italian therefore constitutes evidence of territorial competence, not a mere linguistic preference. It also demonstrates that both companies are treating the matter as a formal GDPR case, not as a routine customer-service interaction.

Riccardo Gresta

Certified in Data Protection and Privacy

Certified in IT Law and Cybersecurity

Social Media Manager

Expert in Bullying and Cyberbullying

Certified Typing Expert – Pavia Chamber of Commerce

ESCC press release and the derivative reproductions

Introductory Note to the Comparative Table

The table below provides a concise forensic comparison between the ESCC press release and its five derivative reproductions. It highlights the uniform replication of structure, wording, errors, and forensic markers across all outlets, demonstrating the absence of independent verification and the complete textual dependence on the ESCC source.

Element	ESCC Original	The Argus	SussexWorld	ITV Meridian	What's On in Brighton	BourneFree Live
Headline	“Faked letter lands Blue Badge applicant in court”	Rewritten but same meaning	Rewritten but same meaning	Rewritten but same meaning	Rewritten but same meaning	Rewritten but same meaning
Opening sentence	“AN Eastbourne man who faked...”	Identical structure (DR)	Identical structure (DR)	Identical structure (DR)	Identical structure (DR)	Identical structure (DR)
Age, address, location	45, Elms Avenue, Eastbourne	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)
“Obvious grammatical errors”	Present	Identical wording (DR)	Identical wording (DR)	Identical wording (DR)	Identical wording (DR)	Identical wording (DR)
Hospital confirmation	Present	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)
Interview + LGO complaint	“When interviewed... and even made a complaint to the Local Government Ombudsmen.”	Identical (DR) + FM + CI	Identical (DR) + FM + CI	Identical (DR) + FM + CI	Identical (DR) + FM + CI	Identical (DR) + FM + CI
Forensic Marker: “Ombudsmen”	Present (incorrect plural)	Copied verbatim (FM)	Copied verbatim (FM)	Copied verbatim (FM)	Copied verbatim (FM)	Copied verbatim (FM)
Chronological inversion	Present	Replicated (CI)	Replicated (CI)	Replicated (CI)	Replicated (CI)	Replicated (CI)
Sentencing quote (Recorder Mercer)	Present	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)
Deterrent quote (“We will not tolerate...”)	Present	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)
Curfew details	Present	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)
Costs order	“No order for costs was made.”	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)
Structural order of paragraphs	A–B–C–D–E	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)	Identical (DR)
Independent verification	N/A	None (NV)	None (NV)	None (NV)	None (NV)	None (NV)
Unique content	Original source	None	None	None	None	None

FORENSIC COMPARATIVE TABLE – ESCC vs Derivative Media

Legend:

FM = Forensic Marker / **CI** = Chronological Inversion / **DR** = Direct Reproduction /

MO = Minor Omission / **MA** = Minor Addition / **NV** = No Verification

Extra Section – BourneFree Live: Additional Errors Beyond the ESCC Source (Revised Version)

Although the ESCC press release already contains the grammatically incorrect construction “*after pleading guilty two counts of fraud*” — omitting the mandatory preposition “*to*” and using the singular “*count*” instead of the correct plural “*counts*” — BourneFree Live not only reproduces this inaccuracy verbatim, but also introduces an additional, independent error that does not appear in the ESCC source or in any other derivative publication. Specifically, the BourneFree Live URL reads:

<https://bournefreelive.co.uk/eastbourne-man-wrote-fake-nhs-letter-to-gain-blue-budge/>

where “*blue-budge*” replaces the correct term “*blue-badge*”. This misspelling is unique to BourneFree Live and constitutes a material inaccuracy embedded directly into the URL, making it indexable, persistent, and visible to search engines.

The combination of (1) reproducing the ESCC grammatical error without correction and (2) introducing its own typographical error in the URL demonstrates a clear absence of editorial oversight and quality control. These inaccuracies reinforce the conclusion that BourneFree Live did not verify the content, did not consult primary judicial documents, and did not apply even the basic standards of accuracy required under Article 5(1)(d) UK GDPR. As a result, the BourneFree Live article not only perpetuates the unlawful data contained in the ESCC release but also compounds it with additional errors of its own making.

Notes for the Authorities

Several third-party platforms have already taken corrective action following the withdrawal of the ESCC source. **Yahoo has fully removed** its syndicated version; **PressReader has removed** the article in its entirety; and the **Internet Archive has placed all snapshots on its Exclusion List**, preventing further public access. **Google has blocked the relevant search-result URLs**, while **Bing has almost completed the same process**. The micro-outlet *What’s On in Brighton* has also fully removed its derivative publication. These developments confirm the progressive disappearance of the ESCC-derived material across the wider digital ecosystem.

Riccardo Gresta

Certified in Data Protection and Privacy

Certified in IT Law and Cybersecurity

Social Media Manager

Expert in Bullying and Cyberbullying

Certified Typing Expert – Pavia Chamber of Commerce



Richiesta di bloccare i risultati di ricerca di Bing CRM:0207150002500

From: "BingDPM" <bingdpm@microsoft.com>

To: "gresta.riccardo" [REDACTED]

Date: May 15, 2026 4:30:38 PM

Gentile **Riccardo Gresta**,

Ci auguriamo che questo messaggio La trovi bene.

Le scriviamo per aggiornarLa sullo stato del Suo caso.

Il nostro team di ingegneri sta attualmente lavorando con la massima attenzione sul Suo caso. Tuttavia, a causa della complessità del problema, abbiamo bisogno di un po' più di tempo per assicurarci di fornirLe la migliore soluzione possibile.

Desideriamo scusarci per eventuali disagi che questa situazione potrebbe aver causato. Apprezziamo la Sua pazienza e comprensione. Diamo grande valore al Suo tempo e siamo impegnati a risolvere questo problema il più rapidamente possibile.

Cordiali saluti,

Supporto Clienti Microsoft

Si prega di non rispondere a questa e-mail. Questo account di posta elettronica non è monitorato.

Oggetto: Re: [4-1318000040514] Richiesta presentata a Google

Mittente: RICCARDO GRESTA - GOOGLE <riccardo [REDACTED]>

Data: 11/05/2026, 12:03

A: removals@google.com

Dear Google Legal Removals Team,

I am writing further to your decision of **1 April 2026**, in which you confirmed the removal of the following URLs from search results for queries relating to my name, both in my country and across other European versions of Google Search:

- itv.com/news/meridian/2022-12-26/man-caught-faking-doctors-letter-to-claim-blue-badge
- sussexexpress.co.uk/.../eastbourne-man-given-suspended-prison-sentence-after-faking-medical-letter-for-blue-badge-application-3965025
- theargus.co.uk/.../eastbourne-man-sentenced-hove-council-blue-badge-fraud/
- whatsoninbrighton.net/.../eastbourne-man-sentenced-in-hove-after-council-blue-badge-fraud/

Your message stated:

“We will remove these URLs from search results for queries relating to your name. We will take action in your country and in other European versions of Google Search.”

As of **10 May 2026**, however, the snippet from **The Argus** has reappeared in **Google Italy** for the nominative query *“riccardo gresta eastbourne”*.

A screenshot is attached, and the search can be reproduced at the following link:

<https://www.google.com/search?q=riccardo+gresta+eastbourne>

This confirms that the removal applied on 1 April has been **partially or temporarily overridden**, most likely due to:

- regeneration of snippets following an algorithmic update,
- re-indexing of non-canonical variants of the URL (AMP/mobile/CDN), or
- resurfacing from a different European index shard.

In any case, material previously removed under your formal decision is once again being displayed for name-based queries, thereby re-activating the harmful effects that your original decision sought to prevent.

I would also note that the **Data Protection Commission (Ireland)** has opened a formal case concerning the **ITV Meridian Facebook post**, which reproduced the same inaccurate material. The case reference is **DPC0426046815**. Given the cross-border nature of the processing and the involvement of Meta’s EU establishment, it cannot be excluded that the DPC may broaden the scope of its action to include related indexing and dissemination pathways. For this reason, it is particularly important that the removal previously granted by Google remains consistently enforced across all European search clusters.

I therefore kindly request:

1. **Re-enforcement of the removal** across all variants of the Argus URL, including canonical, AMP, mobile, cached and CDN versions.
2. **Manual regeneration of the snippet and associated cached data** to ensure that the removal is consistently applied across all European index clusters.

3. Confirmation once re-processing has been completed, so that I may verify the outcome on my side.

As you noted in your decision of 1 April, the content remains available online, but must not appear in search results for queries relating to my name. The current reappearance is therefore inconsistent with the scope of the removal already granted.

Thank you in advance for your assistance. I remain available should you require any further information.

Kind regards,

Riccardo Gresta

Il 01/04/2026 13:31, removals@google.com ha scritto:

Gentile Sig.

La ringraziamo per il suo messaggio.

Abbiamo esaminato i seguenti URL:

<http://www.itv.com/news/meridian/2022-12-26/man-caught-faking-doctors-letter-to-claim-blue-badge>
<https://www.itv.com/news/meridian/2022-12-26/man-caught-faking-doctors-letter-to-claim-blue-badge>
<https://www.sussexexpress.co.uk/news/crime/eastbourne-man-given-suspended-prison-sentence-after-faking-medical-letter-for-blue-badge-application-3965025>
<https://www.theargus.co.uk/news/23213516.eastbourne-man-sentenced-hove-council-blue-badge-fraud/>
<https://www.whatsoninbrighton.net/eastbourne-man-sentenced-in-hove-after-council-blue-badge-fraud/>

Rimuoveremo questi URL dai risultati di ricerca per le query relative al tuo nome. Interverremo nel tuo paese e in altre versioni europee della Ricerca Google. Potrebbero essere necessarie alcune ore per applicare questa modifica.

I contenuti online saranno comunque disponibili, ma puoi chiedere al webmaster del sito di rimuoverli. Puoi scoprire come [contattare il webmaster di un sito](#) nel nostro Centro assistenza.

Abbiamo esaminato i seguenti URL:

<https://bournefreelive.co.uk/eastbourne-man-wrote-fake-nhs-letter-to-gain-blue-budge/>
https://www.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=5788995131161511&id=100075687560429&_rdr
<https://www.pressreader.com/uk/daily-star/20230102/282368338727958>

Ci risulta che il tuo nome non sia presente in queste pagine. Rimuoveremo questi URL dai risultati di ricerca per le query relative al tuo nome. Interverremo nel tuo paese e in altre versioni europee della Ricerca Google. Potrebbero essere necessarie alcune ore per applicare questa modifica.

Cordiali saluti,

Il team di Google

Per ulteriori informazioni sulla procedura di rimozione dei contenuti, visiti la pagina g.co/legal.

The screenshot shows a Google search results page for the query "riccardo gresta eastbourne". The search bar at the top contains the text "riccardo gresta eastbourne". Below the search bar, the results are listed. A red arrow points to the fourth result, which is a news article from "The Argus" titled "Archive news from the The Argus". The article snippet reads: "7 dic 2022 — Riccardo Gresta, of Elms Avenue in Eastbourne, submitted a letter from a neurologist claiming that he was unable to walk further. Date. In ...". Other results include company information from GOV.UK and Endole, and a PDF document from MITAG.

Allegati:

TA - Screenshot 2026-05-11 114847.png

161 kB

Oggetto: [4-1318000040514] Richiesta presentata a Google

Mittente: removals@google.com

Data: 11/05/2026, 14:43

A: riccardo [REDACTED]

Gentile Sig.

La ringraziamo per il suo messaggio.

Abbiamo esaminato i seguenti URL:

<https://www.theargus.co.uk/archive/2022/12/27/>

Rimuoveremo questi URL dai risultati di ricerca per le query relative al tuo nome. Interverremo nel tuo paese e in altre versioni europee della Ricerca Google. Potrebbero essere necessarie alcune ore per applicare questa modifica.

I contenuti online saranno comunque disponibili, ma puoi chiedere al webmaster del sito di rimuoverli. Puoi scoprire come [contattare il webmaster di un sito](#) nel nostro Centro assistenza.

Cordiali saluti,

Il team di Google

Per ulteriori informazioni sulla procedura di rimozione dei contenuti, visiti la pagina g.co/legal.

Oggetto: Reappearance of URLs previously removed under GDPR – Request for Review / Re: [4-1318000040514] Richiesta presentata a Google

Mittente: RICCARDO GRESTA - GOOGLE <riccardo [REDACTED]>

Data: 31/05/2026, 19:26

A: removals@google.com

Dear Google Removal Team,

I am contacting you again to report that two URLs previously removed under your GDPR decision of **1 April 2026** have reappeared in Google Search results for the query:

“Riccardo Gresta bluebadge”

As instructed in your previous correspondence regarding another URL that had reappeared and was subsequently removed again, I have followed **exactly the same procedure** you indicated:

1. I entered the query in Google Search.
2. I clicked on the **three dots (“More”)** next to the search result.
3. I selected **“Share”**.
4. I then selected **“Copy link address”**.
5. I pasted the URLs below exactly as obtained from Google Search, without modification.

The URLs currently appearing are:

1. <https://www.itv.com/news/meridian/topic/blue-badge>
(This URL appears with the original ITVX snippet, although it now redirects to a hub page containing multiple articles, including the original one.)
2. <https://www.facebook.com/itvnewsmeridian/posts/riccardo-gresta-forged-a-letter-from-a-neurologist-claiming-he-was-unable-to-wal/5788995131161511/>
(This Facebook post links directly to the original ITV article that was previously removed.)

These URLs were not present in the SERP until recently and appear to be **residual or fallback entries** following your earlier removal action.

I would also like to confirm that **all other URLs previously removed under your GDPR decision remain correctly removed** and do not appear in the search results. Only the two URLs listed above have reappeared, which suggests that the original removal is still active and that the issue is limited to these specific entries.

Google Search also displays the notice:

“Some results may have been removed under data protection law in Europe.”

Based on my understanding, this may indicate that the removal process is active but perhaps not yet fully propagated across all related URLs, cached entries, or fallback snippets. It is possible that what I am seeing reflects an intermediate stage before full propagation.

In any case, I would be grateful if you could kindly verify the situation and, if appropriate, **re-enforce**

the previous removal decision, as the URLs listed above are again visible in the search results despite having been removed earlier.

Please let me know if you require any additional information.
Thank you for your cooperation.

Kind regards,
Riccardo Gresta

Oggetto: [4-1318000040514] Richiesta presentata a Google

Mittente: removals@google.com

Data: 01/06/2026, 14:56

A: riccardo [REDACTED]

Gentile Sig.

La ringraziamo per il suo messaggio.

Abbiamo esaminato i seguenti URL:

<https://www.facebook.com/itvnewsmeridian/posts/riccardo-gresta-forged-a-letter-from-a-neurologist-claiming-he-was-unable-to-wal/5788995131161511/>

<https://www.itv.com/news/meridian/topic/blue-badge>

Rimuoveremo questi URL dai risultati di ricerca per le query relative al tuo nome. Interverremo nel tuo paese e in altre versioni europee della Ricerca Google. Potrebbero essere necessarie alcune ore per applicare questa modifica.

I contenuti online saranno comunque disponibili, ma puoi chiedere al webmaster del sito di rimuoverli. Puoi scoprire come [contattare il webmaster di un sito](#) nel nostro Centro assistenza.

Cordiali saluti,

Il team di Google

Per ulteriori informazioni sulla procedura di rimozione dei contenuti, visiti la pagina g.co/legal.

Oggetto: [4-1318000040514] Richiesta presentata a Google

Mittente: removals@google.com

Data: 01/04/2026, 13:31

A: riccardo [REDACTED]

Gentile Sig.

La ringraziamo per il suo messaggio.

Abbiamo esaminato i seguenti URL:

<http://www.itv.com/news/meridian/2022-12-26/man-caught-faking-doctors-letter-to-claim-blue-badge>

<https://www.itv.com/news/meridian/2022-12-26/man-caught-faking-doctors-letter-to-claim-blue-badge>

<https://www.sussexexpress.co.uk/news/crime/eastbourne-man-given-suspended-prison-sentence-after-faking-medical-letter-for-blue-badge-application-3965025>

<https://www.theargus.co.uk/news/23213516.eastbourne-man-sentenced-hove-council-blue-badge-fraud/>

<https://www.whatsoninbrighton.net/eastbourne-man-sentenced-in-hove-after-council-blue-badge-fraud/>

Rimuoveremo questi URL dai risultati di ricerca per le query relative al tuo nome. Interverremo nel tuo paese e in altre versioni europee della Ricerca Google. Potrebbero essere necessarie alcune ore per applicare questa modifica.

I contenuti online saranno comunque disponibili, ma puoi chiedere al webmaster del sito di rimuoverli. Puoi scoprire come [contattare il webmaster di un sito](#) nel nostro Centro assistenza.

Abbiamo esaminato i seguenti URL:

<https://bournefreelive.co.uk/eastbourne-man-wrote-fake-nhs-letter-to-gain-blue-budge/>

https://www.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=5788995131161511&id=100075687560429&_rdr

<https://www.pressreader.com/uk/daily-star/20230102/282368338727958>

Ci risulta che il tuo nome non sia presente in queste pagine. Rimuoveremo questi URL dai risultati di ricerca per le query relative al tuo nome. Interverremo nel tuo paese e in altre versioni europee della Ricerca Google. Potrebbero essere necessarie alcune ore per applicare questa modifica.

Cordiali saluti,

Il team di Google

Per ulteriori informazioni sulla procedura di rimozione dei contenuti, visiti la pagina g.co/legal.