Neutral Citation Number: [2025] EWHC 331 (KB)

Case No: QB-2021-003094

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

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 19 February 2025

Before:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE NICKLIN

- -

Between:

(1) MBR ACRES LIMITED
(2) DEMETRIS MARKOU
(for and on behalf of the officers and employees of MBR Acres Ltd, and the officers and employees of third party suppliers and service providers to MBR Acres Ltd pursuant to CPR 19.8)
(3) B & K UNIVERSAL LIMITED
(4) SUSAN PRESSICK
(for and on behalf of the officers and employees of B & K Universal Ltd, and the officers and employees of third party suppliers and service providers to B & K Universal Ltd pursuant to CPR 19.8)

Claimants

- and -

JOHN CURTIN **Defendant**

And in the matter of an application by the Claimants for a *contra mundum* injunction to restrain certain activities at the Wyton Site

- -
- -

Caroline Bolton and **Natalie Pratt** (instructed by **Mills & Reeve LLP)** for the **Claimants**
John Curtin appeared in person, save for the hearing on 23 June 2023 when he was represented by **Jake Taylor** (instructed by **Birds Solicitors**)
"Persons Unknown" did not attend and were not represented
Jude Bunting KC and **Yaaser Vanderman** filed written submissions on behalf of **Liberty**

Hearing dates: 24-28 April, 2-5, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17-19, 22-23 May 2023, 23 June 2024, 26 March 2024 and 7 May 2024

- -

Approved Judgment

The Honourable Mr Justice Nicklin :

1. This judgment is divided into the following sections:

A: Introduction

2. This is the final judgment in this civil claim brought by the Claimants against both known and unknown individuals. The common link between the Defendants is that, at one time or another, they have engaged in some form of protest against the activities of the First Defendant at its site at Wyton, Cambridgeshire.

3. Whilst the claim has been pending before the Courts, the law – as it applies to "Persons Unknown" – has been in a state of flux. The decision of the Supreme Court in ***Wolverhampton City Council & others -v- London Gypsies and Travellers & others*** **[2024] AC 983** (heard on 8-9 February 2023 with judgment handed down on 29 November 2023) clarified but also significantly changed the law as it concerns the grant of injunctions against "Persons Unknown" where that target class is protean and the injunction applies to what has been termed 'newcomers'.

4. Whilst the evidence relating to this claim was heard at a trial between 24 April 2023 to 23 May 2023, the trial was adjourned to await the Supreme Court decision in ***Wolverhampton***. Further hearings were fixed on 26 March 2024 and 7 May 2024 for the Court to consider whether, in light of the Supreme Court's decision, the Claimants should be given an opportunity to file any further evidence and to consider final submissions of law consequent upon the ***Wolverhampton*** decision.

5. At the hearing on 26 March 2024, I directed that the final hearing in the claim should be fixed for 7 May 2024. I directed that the Claimants must file their final submissions by 30 April 2024 and that, in addition to publicising the date of the final hearing on notices at the Wyton Site, and online, the written submissions must be served on Liberty and Friends of the Earth, who had intervened in the ***Wolverhampton*** case

("the Interested Parties"). I gave the Interested Parties an opportunity to file written submissions for the final hearing.

6. I received written submissions from Counsel instructed by Liberty, dated 3 May 2024.

7. I also received a letter, dated 30 April 2024 from Friends of the Earth ("FoE"). FoE expressed concern, due to their limited resources, of the risk that an adverse costs order might be made against them. In their letter, FoE stated that it had made an application for a Protective Costs Order in a civil claim brought in 2019 against "Persons Unknown" in a fracking protest case. The application was rejected, and FoE were ordered to pay £4,500 in costs. Because of these funding concerns, and also because FoE's campaigning objectives do not embrace the protest at the Wyton Site, FoE did not file written submissions. They did, however, send a copy of the written submissions, and a witness statement of David Timms, FoE's Head of Political Affairs, dated 25 November 2022, which had been filed with the Supreme Court in the ***Wolverhampton*** case. In their covering letter, FoE said:

> "In ***Wolverhampton***, the Supreme Court rejected our submissions as to the availability of persons unknown injunctions as a matter of principle, but our submissions may include relevant considerations for the Court in terms of criteria and the procedural safeguards for persons unknown injunctions in the protest context. In particular, the evidence of Mr Timms refers to our own experience of the serious chilling effect of these injunctions, in terms of their deterrence of lawful protest including lawful, peaceful, direct action protest. We would stress that the latter is a recognised and legitimate part of freedom of speech and assembly protected by the common law and Articles 10/11 ECHR."

8. I am very grateful to both Liberty and Friends of the Earth for their submissions, which I have considered in writing this judgment.

9. I consider the ***Wolverhampton*** decision in Section M of this judgment ([333]-[362] below). In brief summary, prior to ***Wolverhampton***, the previous method of attempting to restrain the activities of 'newcomers' depended upon the 'newcomer' becoming a party to existing litigation by doing some act that brought him/her within one or more categories of defendant who were party to the litigation and upon whom the Claim Form had been deemed to be served by some method of alternative service authorised by the Court. The Supreme Court swept this away and instead sanctioned the use of *contra mundum* injunctions in limited circumstances.

10. Following the ***Wolverhampton*** decision, at the hearing on 7 May 2024, the Claimants sought an injunction against various categories of "Persons Unknown" or, alternatively, a *contra mundum* injunction, to restrain certain acts. In some respects, the ***Wolverhampton*** decision allows the Court to adopt a more straightforward approach and an opportunity to make any injunction the Court grants much clearer and easier to comprehend (see [353]-[362] below).

11. Finally, this judgment also resolves a contempt application brought by the Claimants against the only remaining individual defendant, John Curtin, which was heard on 23 June 2023 (see Sections D(3), G and O(3); [52]-[53], [109]-[120], [247]-[253] and [400]-[407] below).

B: Background and parties

12. There have been several previous interim judgments in the claim:

    (1) [2021] EWHC 2996 (QB) (10 November 2021) ("the Interim Injunction Judgment");

    (2) [2022] EWHC 1677 (QB) (31 March 2022) ("the Conspiracy Amendment Judgment");

    (3) [2023] QB 186 (16 May 2022) ("the First Contempt Judgment");

    (4) [2022] EWHC 1715 (QB) (20 June 2022) ("the First Injunction Variation Judgment");

    (5) [2022] EWHC 2072 (QB) (2 August 2022) ("the Second Contempt Judgment"); and

    (6) [2022] EWHC 3338 (KB) (22 December 2022) ("the Second Injunction Variation Judgment").

    The background to this case – and the key procedural steps – are set out in these judgments, but as this is the final judgment in the claim, and for ease of reference, I will set out again some of the key facts.

(1) The Claimants

13. The First and Third Claimants are subsidiaries of the Marshall Farm Group Ltd, incorporated in the US and trading as Marshall Bioresources. The First and Third Claimants breed animals for medical and clinical research at sites in Cambridgeshire and Hull.

14. The First Claimant is licensed by the Secretary of State, under ss.2B-2C Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, to breed animals for supply to licensed entities authorised to conduct animal testing and research. It is presently a legal requirement, in the United Kingdom, that all potential new medicines intended for human use are tested on two species of mammal before they are tested on human volunteers in clinical trials.

15. The Second Claimant is an employee of the First Claimant acting in these proceedings to represent the officers and employees of the First Claimant, third-party suppliers, and service providers to the First Claimant pursuant to (what is now) CPR 19.8.

16. The Fourth Claimant is an employee of the Third Claimant and is its Site Manager & UK Administration & European Quality Manager. The Fourth Claimant represents the officers and employees of the Third Claimant, third-party suppliers, and service providers to the Third Claimant pursuant to CPR 19.8.

(2) The Wyton Site

17. The Wyton Site is in countryside, about 2 miles to the northeast of Huntingdon, very close to RAF Wyton. The only entrance to the Wyton Site is situated on a straight

section of the B1090. The road is a single carriageway with verges on either side. Vehicles arriving or leaving from the Wyton Site pass through outer and inner mechanical gates. This facilitates what has been termed an 'airlock' between the two gates enabling the First Claimant's security personnel to control access to the Wyton Site. The outer gate is set back about 1 metre from the boundary of the First Claimant's registered freehold title. This means that anyone standing immediately in front of the outer gate is on the First Claimant's land. The perimeter of the Wyton Site is protected by high outer and inner wire fences. As well as the First Claimant, another biotechnology company is situated within the Wyton Site.

18. A grass verge separates the gated entrance to the Wyton Site from the main carriageway of the Highway. A short tarmacked single lane road, of approximately 8.7 metres length, runs perpendicular to the B1090 over the grass verge and to the gated access at the Wyton Site to enable access to the Highway from the Wyton Site, and vice-versa. This road has been referred to as the "Access Road" in the proceedings. All movements into and out of the Wyton Site (whether vehicular or on foot) must pass along the Access Road. Some, but it transpired during the proceedings, not all, of the Access Road falls within the extent of the adopted Highway.

19. In or around March 2019, the First Claimant installed a new gate, because lorries kept on hitting a post that was part of the old gate was. The new gate was installed about a metre or so back into Wyton Site. Therefore, the area measuring approximately 1 metre in front of the Gate is within the boundary of the Wyton Site and the freehold ownership of the First Claimant. That area has been referred to as the "Driveway" in these proceedings.

20. The boundary of that area, and therefore the Wyton Site as defined, is marked on the ground by a metal strip that runs the full width of the Access Road. That metal strip was left behind when the old gate was removed, and the new Gate was installed.

21. The Claimants originally believed that the full extent of the Access Road had been adopted by the local Highways Authority. During the proceedings, it was discovered that the adopted highway did not extend to the full area.

22. On 4 August 2022, apparently without prior warning to, or consultation with, the First Claimant, a representative of the Local Highway Authority attended the Wyton Site and painted a yellow line halfway up the Access Road. The yellow line ran along the lip of the ditch closest to the Highway over which the Access Road ran. The distance between the yellow line and the metal strip that marks the edge of the Driveway is 2.85 metres. In a letter dated 16 November 2022, the Local Highway Authority confirmed to the First Claimant that the yellow line marked where it considered the extent of the adopted highway to end. The letter explained the basis on which the Local Highways Authority had reached this conclusion.

23. Having taken separate advice, the First Claimant's position is that it agrees with the decision of the Local Highways Authority as to the extent of the adopted highway. The effect of this, which has not been challenged in these proceedings, is that the land between the metal strip and the yellow line, that is not adopted highway, is land owned by the First Claimant. This has been referred to as the "Access Land".

(3) The Defendants

24. When originally issued, the Claimants brought claims against the first two Defendants as "*unincorporated associations*": "*Free the MBR Beagles*" and "*Camp Beagle*". The Third and Fifth Defendants were sued as representatives of these two "*unincorporated associations*". In the Interim Injunction Judgment ([52]-[67]), I refused to allow claims to be brought against the First and Second Defendants on a representative basis, and I stayed the claim against these two Defendants. The Claimants have made no application to lift that stay.

25. As the proceedings have progressed, the Claimants have sought, and generally been granted, permission to add further Defendants. A full list of the Defendants to the claim is set out in Annex 1 to this judgment. Apart from Mr Curtin, the claims against named individuals have all been settled. The one against the Twentieth Defendant, Lisa Jaffray, was settled early in the trial. In most instances, the relevant individual has given undertakings as to his/her future activities regarding the Claimants and the Wyton Site.

26. By the end of the trial, the claim was proceeding only against Mr Curtin, as a named Defendant, and various categories of Person(s) Unknown Defendants identified in Annex 1.

(4) The protest activities

27. It will be necessary to go into the detail of specific incidents later in the judgment, but the following summary will suffice by way of introduction.

28. This litigation concerns protest and its lawful limits. Since around June 2021, a fluctuating number of individuals have been protesting outside the Wyton Site. There is a small semi-permanent camp of protestors on the edge of the carriageway about 20-30 metres from the entrance to the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin, who has been protesting since the outset, is a semi-permanent resident of this camp. There have been isolated other incidents away from the Wyton Site, for example, in August 2021, there were some limited protests outside the B&K Site, but the main focus of the protest activity – and most of the Claimants' evidence – concerns protest activities at the Wyton Site.

29. The Claimants do not challenge that Mr Curtin, and the other protestors, have a sincerely and firmly held belief that animal testing is wrong. In terms of overall objective, the protestors probably share a common aim that animal testing should be prohibited. By extension, most protestors at the Wyton Site would like to see the First (and Third) Claimants put out of business. These objectives are not unlawful, and, subject to acting lawfully, Mr Curtin and others, may campaign and protest in their efforts to attempt to achieve a change in the law that would see their objective achieved.

30. The main complaints raised by the Claimants in this litigation are (1) incidents of trespass onto the Wyton Site, including the flying of a video-equipped drone around and above the Wyton Site, which is said to amount to trespass on the First Claimant's land; (2) repeated incidents of obstruction of the highway outside the Wyton Site, said to constitute a public nuisance, and specifically obstruction of people and vehicles entering and leaving the Wyton Site; and (3) specific incidents involving confrontation with individual employees when they arrive at or leave the Wyton Site, which are said to amount to harassment.

31. Although it is more complicated than this, the issue at the heart of the litigation is broadly whether the method of protest that the Defendants use (or threaten to use) is lawful. Ultimately this is an issue of striking the proper balance between the protestors' rights of freedom of expression and demonstration against the Claimants' rights to go about their lawful business. The law does not require a person exercising the right to demonstrate or to protest to demonstrate that s/he is "right" (whatever that would mean), and Mr Curtin is not required to persuade the Court that he is "right" to oppose animal testing.

C: The Interim Injunction

(1) The interim injunction granted on 10 November 2021

32. The Claimants were granted an urgent interim injunction on 20 August 2021 by Stacey J ("the Interim Injunction"). The return date was fixed for 4 October 2021. I handed down judgment on 10 November 2021. The Interim Injunction Judgment set out my reasons for modifying the terms of the injunction that had previously been granted. The protest activities that had led to the grant of the Interim Injunction are set out in [13]-[23]. In [18], I summarised the evidence as follows:

> "A clear picture emerges from the evidence, that the central complaint of the Claimants is the protestors' activities when people (particularly employees of the First Claimant) enter or leave the Wyton Site. At these times, protestors, including the named Defendants, have surrounded and/or obstructed the vehicles. Their ability to drive off is not only impaired by the physical obstruction of the protestors, but also because placards have been used, on occasions, to obstruct the view that the driver of the vehicle has of the road and whether it is safe to pull out. These incidents have frequently led to confrontation between the protestors and those inside the vehicles, allegedly leaving them feeling harassed and intimidated."

33. As a temporary solution, I prohibited trespass on the First Claimant's land and imposed an exclusion zone around the entrance to the Wyton Site ([116]-[119]) ("the Exclusion Zone"). I refused to grant an injunction to prohibit the flying of drones over the Wyton Site, which was alleged to be a trespass ([111]-[115]). The Interim Injunction did not restrain alleged harassment whether by named Defendants or "Persons Unknown" ([118]), and I refused to grant any orders to control the methods of protest adopted by the Defendants ([122]-[128]).

34. So far as concerns trespass and the Exclusion Zone, the material parts of the Interim Injunction, granted on 10 November 2021, were as follows. Paragraph 1 of the Injunction provided:

> "The Third to Ninth, Eleventh to Fourteenth, and Fifteenth to Seventeenth Defendants **MUST NOT**:
>
> (1) enter into or remain upon the following land:
>
> a. the First Claimant's premises known as MBR Acres Limited, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT as set out in Annex 1 (the 'Wyton Site'); and

b. the Third Claimant's premises known as B&K Universal Limited, Field Station, Grimston, Aldborough, Hull, East Yorkshire HU11 4QE as set out in Annex 2 (the 'Hull Site')

(2) enter into or remain upon the area marked with black hatching on the plans at Annex 1 … (the 'Exclusion Zone'), save where … accessing the highway whilst in a vehicle, for the purpose of passing along the highway only and without stopping in the Exclusion Zone, save for when stopped by traffic congestion, or any traffic management arranged by or on behalf of the Highways Authority, or to prevent a collision, or at the direction of a Police Officer.

(3) park any vehicle, or place or leave any other item (including, but not limited to, banners) anywhere in the Exclusion Zone;

(4) approach and/or obstruct the path of any vehicle directly entering or exiting the Exclusion Zone (save that for the avoidance of doubt it will not be a breach of this Injunction Order where any obstruction occurs as a result of an emergency)."

35. Definitions, set out in Schedule A to the Interim Injunction, provided:

> "The 'Exclusion Zone' is… for the purpose of the Wyton site, the area with black hatching at Annex 1 of this Order measuring 20 metres in length either side of the midpoint of the gate to the entrance of the Wyton site and extending out to the midpoint of the carriageway…"

36. Annex 1 to the Injunction was a plan of the Wyton Site marked with the Exclusion Zone around the entrance to the First Claimant's premises. Annex 1 included boxes containing annotations. One of those provided:

> "Exclusion Zone in black crosshatched area is 20 metres either side of the centre of the Gate to the Wyton Site marked by posts on the grass verge up to the centre of the carriageway."

(2) Modifications to the Interim Injunction

37. The terms of the Interim Injunction, and the persons it restrains, have been modified during the proceedings.

38. Orders of 18-19 January 2022 and 31 March 2022 added new Defendants to the claim, both named and further categories of "Persons Unknown". Those new Defendants became bound by the Interim Injunction, the material terms of which remained unchanged.

39. By Order of 2 August 2022, Paragraph (4) of the Interim Injunction (see [34] above) was replaced with the following restrictions:

> "(2) The Third to Ninth and Eleventh to the Twenty-Fourth Defendants **MUST NOT** within 1 mile in either direction of the First Claimant's Land, approach, slow down, or obstruct any vehicle which is believed to be travelling to or from the First Claimant's Land at the Wyton Site.

(3) The Seventeenth Defendant **MUST NOT** within 1 mile in either direction of the First Claimant's Land, approach, slow down, or obstruct any vehicle:

(a) for the purpose of protesting and/or campaigning against the activities of the First and/or Third Claimant; and

(b) where the vehicle is, or is believed to be, travelling to or from the First Claimant's Land at the Wyton Site.

(4) The Third, Twelfth, Fifteenth, Twentieth and Twenty-Second Defendants **MUST NOT** cut, push, shake, kick, lift, climb up or upon or over, damage or remove, or attempt to remove any part of the perimeter fence to the Wyton Site, as marked in red on the attached plan at Annex 1."

40. In the Second Injunction Variation Judgment, I explained why I had amended the Interim Injunction in these terms:

> [10] In respect of obstruction of vehicles (the subject of the new sub-paragraphs (2) and (3)), evidence of events following the grant of the injunction, particularly that which had been filed by the Claimants in relation to the contempt applications against the Twelfth and Thirteenth Defendants (see [2023] QB 186), showed that some protestors had adopted tactics of surrounding and/or obstructing vehicles that were travelling to or from the Wyton Site further along the carriageway of the B1090. It had also become apparent that the earlier formulation – prohibiting approaching/obstruction of any vehicle "directly" entering or exiting the exclusion zone – had the potential to catch behaviour that the injunction was not designed to prevent. A particular example was an occasion in which a police vehicle was about to exit the exclusion zone when it was obstructed by protestors who wanted to ascertain what was happening to a person who had been arrested. The exclusion zone has always been recognised to be an expedient, justified because it is the best way of avoiding the flashpoints that have occurred between the protestors and those coming and going to/from the Wyton Site. However, the Court will keep the terms of the any interim injunction under review – and in appropriate cases will make changes to the terms of the order – to ensure that they are not having an unintended effect. The revised restrictions now more directly focus on the obstruction of vehicles travelling to/from the Wyton Site where that obstruction is for the purpose of protesting.
>
> [11] Sub-paragraph (4) contained a new prohibition upon interfering with and/or damaging the perimeter fence of the Wyton Site. I was satisfied on the Claimants' evidence that the relevant Defendants had been damaging or interfering with the fence. Such actions are tortious, are not an exercise of a right to protest and the balance of convenience clearly favoured an interim prohibition. The Claimants had asked for a 1 metre exclusion zone to be imposed around the entire perimeter of the Wyton Site. I refused to make such an order. The correct way of targeting this particular wrongdoing is by making a direct order that prohibits that behaviour, not an indirect order that would also restrict lawful activities. The Claimants do not own the land over which they were seeking the imposition of this further exclusion zone, so I was not persuaded that there was an adequate legal basis upon which to impose the wider restriction that they had sought.

(The reference to obstruction of a police vehicle in [10] is to an incident on 12 May 2022, which featured as an allegation of breach of the Interim Injunction made in the Contempt Application against Mr Curtin – see [248]-[254] below.)

41. I refused to grant other amendments to the Interim Injunction sought by the Claimants: see Section E of the Second Injunction Variation Judgment ([58]-[80]). The Claimants had originally sought to revisit the question of whether the Interim Injunction should prohibit the flying of drones, but they abandoned that part of the application (see [16]).

D: Alleged breaches of the Interim Injunction

42. The Claimants have pursued several contempt applications, against both named Defendants and against a person alleged to fall within a category of "Persons Unknown", alleging breaches of the Interim Injunction.

(1) The First Contempt Applications

43. Contempt applications were issued against the Twelfth and Thirteenth Defendants ("The First Contempt Applications"). Both Defendants were alleged to have breached the Interim Injunction in the contempt application issued on 17 December 2021. A second contempt application, alleging further breaches of the Interim Injunction, was issued against the Thirteenth Defendant on 16 February 2022. They were heard on 6-7 April 2022. In the First Contempt Judgment, handed down on 16 May 2022, I dismissed the 17 December 2021 contempt application brought against the Thirteenth Defendant. Both Defendants were found guilty of contempt of court in respect of admitted breaches of the Interim Injunction.

44. On 17 June 2022, a further contempt application was made against the Twenty-Third Defendant.

45. On 2 August 2022, I imposed penalties for contempt of court on the Defendants. The Twelfth Defendant was given a sentence of imprisonment of 3 months and the Thirteenth Defendant was given a sentence of imprisonment of 28 days. Both periods of imprisonment were suspended for 18 months. The periods of suspension have now ended. I imposed no sanction on the Twenty-Third Defendant, who had admitted a breach of the Interim Injunction, although she was ordered to pay a sum in costs. None of these Defendants has been alleged to be guilty of a further breach of the Interim Injunction.

(2) The Second Contempt Application

46. On 4 July 2022, the Claimants issued a further contempt application against Gillian Frances McGivern, a solicitor ("the Second Contempt Application"). Ms McGivern was alleged to have breached the Interim Injunction, as a "Person Unknown", on 4 May 2022 by, variously, parking her car in the Exclusion Zone, entering the Exclusion Zone, trespassing on the First Claimant's land (by approaching the entry gate) and approaching and/or obstructing vehicles directly exiting and/or entering the Exclusion Zone.

47. The Second Contempt Application was heard on 21-22 July 2022. In the Second Contempt Judgment, handed down on 2 August 2022, I dismissed the contempt

application and declared it to be totally without merit. It is necessary, for the purposes of this judgment to recall some of the paragraphs of the Second Contempt Judgment.

> [94] I have found it very difficult to understand the motive(s) behind the Claimants' tenacious pursuit of Ms McGivern and the way that the contempt application has been pursued. First there is the delay in commencing the proceedings. Then there is the failure to send any form of letter before action to Ms McGivern giving her the opportunity to give her response. Next, the Claimants' response to the evidence of Ms McGivern, provided first in a position statement and then in a witness statement, both verified by a statement of truth. The contempt application was pursued in the face of this evidence. The Claimants did so on a somewhat speculative basis relying upon the evidence of PC Shailes (inaccurately trailed first in the email from Mills & Reeve to the Court on 15 July 2022 – see [39] above) and which was only obtained after serving a witness summons, on the eve of the Contempt Application. Finally, the Claimants persisted in a cross-examination of Ms McGivern in which allegations of the utmost seriousness were made suggesting, not only that had she, a solicitor, had deliberately breached a court injunction, but that she had brazenly and repeatedly lied for over a day in the witness box. The evidential support for this line of cross-examination was tissue thin.
>
> [95] In his skeleton argument, Mr Underwood QC submitted that the contempt application was an abuse of process. Certainly, allegations were made by some of the unrepresented Defendants that action had been taken against Ms McGivern because she was a lawyer helping some of the protestors. That would be the form of abuse of process by using proceedings for a collateral purpose. I can understand why they might suspect this, but Mr Underwood QC did not put any such suggestion to Ms Pressick when she gave evidence. I am unable to reach a conclusion as to the Claimants' motives for pursuing Ms McGivern. All I can say is I find them very difficult to understand.
>
> [96] In my judgment this contempt application has been wholly frivolous, and it borders on vexatious. The breaches alleged were trivial or wholly technical. Apart from a technical trespass, it is difficult to identify any civil wrong that was committed by Ms McGivern. At worst, obstructing the vehicles for a short period might be regarded as provocative, but there were no aggravating features. As the Claimants must have appreciated, this was not the sort of conduct that the Injunction was ever intended to catch. The Court does not grant injunctions to parties to litigation to be used as a weapon against those perceived to be opponents. At its commencement, this contempt application was based almost entirely upon deemed notice of the terms of the Injunction by operation of the alternative service order. Once Ms McGivern had provided evidence confirmed by a statement of truth that she had no knowledge of the Injunction, the Claimants should have taken stock as to the prospect of success of the contempt application and, particularly, whether there was a real prospect of the Court imposing any sanction for the alleged breaches. Instead of doing so, the Claimants embarked on what proved to be a hopeless attempt to impeach Ms McGivern's transparently honest evidence by witness summonsing a police officer. This was not a proportionate or even rational way to approach litigation of this seriousness.

> [97] Ms Bolton's final submission was that the Claimants were "*entitled*" to bring the contempt application against Ms McGivern; "*entitled*" to spend two days of Court time and resources pursuing an application that, on an objective assessment of the evidence, was only ever likely to end with the imposition of no penalty; and "*entitled*" to put a solicitor through the ordeal of a potentially career-ending contempt application and all the disruption that it has caused to Ms McGivern's work and the impact it has had on this litigation. There is no such "*entitlement*". The contempt application against Ms McGivern will be dismissed and will be certified as being totally without merit.

48. I was satisfied that, in the circumstances of this litigation, and particularly given the risk of abuse of "Persons Unknown" injunctions, it was necessary to impose a requirement that the Claimants must obtain the permission of the Court before instituting any contempt application against someone alleged to have breached the Interim Injunction as a "Person Unknown". I explained my reasons for doing so:

> [101] For the reasons I have explained in this judgment, depending upon its terms, a "Persons Unknown" injunction can have the potential to catch in its net people that were never intended by the Court to be caught. Ms McGivern is an example, but others were discussed at the hearing, including the passing motorist who stops temporarily in outside the gates of the Wyton Site and who inadvertently obstructs a vehicle that is leaving the premises. By dint of the operation of the definition of "Persons Unknown" and the deemed notice of the terms of the Injunction under the alternative service order, that motorist, like Ms McGivern, ends up potentially having to face a contempt application. In ordinary cases, the Court might usually expect that a litigant who had obtained such an injunction would consider carefully whether it was proportionate and/or a sensible use of the Court's and the parties' resources for contempt proceedings to be brought against someone who had inadvertently contravened the terms of the injunction. The Claimants have demonstrated that, even with the benefit of professional advice and representation, the Court cannot rely upon them to perform that task appropriately.
>
> [102] I am satisfied that the Court does have the power, ultimately as part of its case management powers to protect its processes from being abused and its resources being wasted, to impose a permission requirement. I reject the submission that the Court is powerless and must simply adjudicate upon such contempt applications that the Claimants seek to bring. "Persons Unknown" injunctions are recognised to be exceptional specifically because they have the potential to catch newcomers. I do not consider that it is an undue hardship that these Claimants should be required to satisfy the Court that a contempt application they wish to bring (a) is one that has a real prospect of success; (b) is not one that relies upon wholly technical or insubstantial breaches; and (c) is supported by evidence that the respondent had actual knowledge of the terms of the injunction before being alleged to have breached it.
>
> [103] Although the conditions for the making of a limited civil restraint order are not met, the imposition of a requirement that the Claimants must obtain the permission of the Court before bringing any further contempt applications

> against "Persons Unknown" is not a limited civil restraint order, it restricts only this specific form of application. The Claimants will remain free to issue and pursue applications in the underlying proceedings. I am satisfied that the imposition of a targeted restriction on the Claimants' ability to bring such contempt applications is a necessary and proportionate step to protect the Court (and the respondents to any future contempt applications) from proceedings that have no real prospect of success and/or serve no legitimate purpose.
>
> [104] I will therefore make an order requiring the Claimants to obtain the permission of the Court before they bring any further contempt application against anyone alleged to be in the category of "Persons Unknown" and to have breached the Injunction.

49. The order, on 2 August 2022, dismissing the Second Contempt Application therefore included the following provisions ("the Contempt Application Permission Requirement"):

> "3. Any further contempt application against any person, not being a named Defendant in the proceedings, may only be brought by the Claimants with the permission of the Court.
>
> 4. An application for permission under Paragraph 3 above, must be made by Application Notice attaching the proposed contempt application and evidence in support. The Court will normally expect the Claimants to have notified the proposed Respondent in writing of the allegation(s) that s/he has breached the injunction order. Any response by the Respondent should be provided to the Court with the application to bring a contempt application. Unless the Court otherwise directs, any such application will be dealt with by the Court on the papers."

50. I refused an application by the Claimants for permission to appeal against the imposition of the Contempt Application Permission Requirement. The Claimants did not renew their application for permission to appeal to the Court of Appeal.

51. I returned to the issue of potential abuse of "Persons Unknown" injunctions in the Second Injunction Variation Judgment, where I said this ([12]):

> "The operation of the interim injunction over the last 12 months has given cause for concern about whether the order is being used by the Claimants as a 'weapon' against the protestors or their supporters. The contempt application against Ms McGivern was dismissed. I found that the breaches alleged against Ms McGivern were trivial: see [the Second Contempt Judgment] [96]. The Claimants well know, and fully understand, the basis on which the exclusion zone has been imposed. It is not to be used by the Claimants as an opportunity to take action against protestors for trivial infringements that have none of the elements that led to the grant of the interim injunction and are not otherwise unlawful acts. Ultimately, if there were to be any repetition of contempt applications being brought for trivial infringements, then the Court might have to reconsider the terms of the interim injunction order that should remain in place pending trial".

(3) The Third Contempt Application

52. On 17 June 2022, the Claimants issued a contempt application against Mr Curtin ("the Third Contempt Application"). Some of the breaches of the Interim Injunction alleged against Mr Curtin were also relied upon as causes of action in the claim against him. As a result, the Claimants' evidence against Mr Curtin, both in relation to the claim against him and the Third Contempt Application was heard at a further hearing, on 23 June 2024, at which Mr Curtin was represented for the purposes of the Contempt Application.

53. I deal with the Third Contempt Application in Sections G and O(3) of this judgment (see [109]-[120], [247]-[253] and [400]-[407] below).

E: Alternative service orders in respect of "Persons Unknown"

54. Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Wolverhampton***, on 12 August 2021, the Court granted permission for alternative service of the Claim Form on the "Persons Unknown" Defendants. The order provided:

> "Pursuant to CPR Part 6.14, 6.15, 6.26 and 6.27 the Claimants have permission to serve the Tenth Defendant, Persons Unknown, by the following alternative forms of service:
>
> (1) Affixing copies (as opposed to originals) of the Claim Form, the Injunction Application Notice, draft Injunction Order and this Order permitting alternative service, in a transparent envelope on the gates of the First and Third Claimants' Land and in a prominent position on the grass verge at the front of the First and Third Claimant's Land.
>
> (2) The documents shall be accompanied by a cover letter in the form set out in Annexure 2 explaining to Persons Unknown that they can access copies of
>
> (a) the Response Pack;
>
> (b) evidence in support of the Alternative Service and Injunction Applications; and
>
> (c) the skeleton argument and note of the hearing of the Alternative Service Application
>
> at the dedicated share file website at: [Dropbox link provided]"
>
> (3) The deemed date of service for the documents referred to in (1) to (3) above shall be two working days after service is completed in accordance with paragraphs (1) to (3) above.

55. The Defendants (including those in the category of "Persons Unknown") were required to file an Acknowledgement of Service 14 days after the deemed date of service. No Acknowledgement of Service has been filed by any person in any of the categories of "Persons Unknown".

56. Similar orders have been made for service of the Claim Form by an alternative method on the additional categories of "Persons Unknown" Defendants as they have been added

to the claim. Following the imposition of the Exclusion Zone in the Interim Injunction granted 10 November 2021, the location at which the relevant documents were to be displayed was moved to a noticeboard opposite the entrance of the Wyton Site.

F: The claims advanced by the Claimants

57. As a result of some narrowing down of the Claimants' focus during the trial, the claims finally advanced by the Claimants against Mr Curtin and the "Persons Unknown" Defendants at the conclusion of the trial were: (1) trespass (including alleged trespass as a result of the flying of drones over the Wyton Site); (2) public nuisance on the highway; and (3) interference with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway from the Wyton Site. Although the Claimants had included a claim for harassment against both Mr Curtin and Persons Unknown, that claim was only pursued against Mr Curtin at the end of the trial. It was not pursued as a basis for the grant of relief against Persons Unknown. It is appropriate here to analyse the causes of action relied upon by the Claimants.

(1) Trespass

(a) Physical encroachment onto the Wyton Site

58. This claim is straightforward.

59. Trespass to land is the interference with possession or the right to possession of land. It includes instances in which a person intrudes upon the land of another without legal justification. The key features of trespass are:

    (1) it is a strict liability tort: a defendant need not know that s/he is committing a trespass to be liable;

    (2) the tort is actionable without proof of damage; and

    (3) the extent of the trespass is irrelevant to liability: ***Ellis -v- Loftus Iron Company* (1874-75) LR 10 CP 10, 12**: "… *if the defendant place a part of his foot on the plaintiff's land unlawfully, it is in law as much a trespass as if he had walked half a mile on it.*"

60. A person does not commit a trespass where s/he enters upon, or remains on the land, if s/he has permission (or licence). That permission (or licence) can be express or implied.

61. However, a person who enters land pursuant to a licence, but who proceeds to act in such a way that in exceeds the scope of that licence, or who remains on the land after the expiration of the licence, commits a trespass: ***Hillen -v- ICI (Alkali) Ltd* [1936] AC 65, 69**; ***Jockey Club Racecourse Limited -v- Persons Unknown* [2019] EWHC 1026 (Ch)** [15].

(b) Trespass to the airspace above the Wyton Site

62. This claim is not straightforward.

63. The First Claimant claims that the act of flying a drone directly over the Wyton Site is a trespass. In the early phase of this litigation, I refused to grant an interim injunction to restrain drone flying (see Interim Injunction Judgment [111]-[115]).

64. The only authority cited by the Claimants in support of the claim that flying a drone over land amounts to trespass is the first-instance decision of ***Bernstein -v- Skyviews & General Ltd*** **[1978] QB 479**. The case concerned an aircraft that the defendant flew over the claimant's land for the purpose of taking a photograph the claimant's country house which was then offered for sale to him. The claimant alleged that, by entering the airspace above his property to take aerial photographs, the defendant was guilty of trespass (alternatively that the defendant was guilty of an actionable invasion of his right to privacy by taking the photograph without his consent or authorisation). The claim failed. The Judge held that an owner's rights in the airspace above his/her land were restricted to such height as was necessary for the ordinary use and enjoyment of the land and structures upon it, and above that height s/he had no greater rights than any other member of the public. Accordingly, the defendant's aircraft did not infringe any rights in the claimant's airspace and thus did not commit any trespass by flying over land for the purpose of taking a photograph.

65. Griffiths J considered the authority of ***Kelsen -v- Imperial Tobacco Co.*** **[1957] 2 QB 334**, which concerned a sign that was overhanging the claimant's land by about 8 inches. He quoted part of the judgment of McNair J which held that the overhanging sign was a trespass to the claimant's airspace above his land, and held (at **486E-487A**):

> "I very much doubt if in that passage McNair J was intending to hold that the plaintiff's rights in the air space continued to an unlimited height or 'ad coelum' as [the plaintiff] submits. The point that the judge was considering was whether the sign was a trespass or a nuisance at the very low level at which it projected. This to my mind is clearly indicated by his reference to *Winfield on Tort*, 6th ed. (1954) in which the text reads, at p. 380: 'it is submitted that trespass will be committed by [aircraft] to the air space if they fly so low as to come within the area of ordinary user.' The author in that passage is careful to limit the trespass to the height at which it is contemplated an owner might be expected to make use of the air space as a natural incident of the user of his land. If, however, the judge was by his reference to the Civil Aviation Act 1949 and his disapproval of the views of Lord Ellenborough in ***Pickering -v- Rudd*** **(1815) 4 Camp 219**, indicating the opinion that the flight of an aircraft at whatever height constituted a trespass at common law, I must respectfully disagree.
>
> I do not wish to cast any doubts upon the correctness of the decision upon its own particular facts. It may be a sound and practical rule to regard any incursion into the air space at a height which may interfere with the ordinary user of the land as a trespass rather than a nuisance. Adjoining owners then know where they stand; they have no right to erect structures overhanging or passing over their neighbours' land and there is no room for argument whether they are thereby causing damage or annoyance to their neighbours about which there may be much room for argument and uncertainty. But wholly different considerations arise when considering the passage of aircraft at a height which in no way affects the user of the land."

66. Griffiths J then noted that, in both ***Pickering -v- Rudd*** and ***Saunders -v- Smith*** **(1838) 2 Jur 491**, the Court had rejected a submission that sailing a hot air balloon over

someone's land could amount to trespass. The Judge also quoted from Lord Wilberforce's speech in ***Commissioner for Railways -v- Valuer-General*** **[1974] AC 328, 351** in which he noted that: "*In none of these cases is there an authoritative pronouncement that 'land' means the whole of the space from the centre of the earth to the heavens: so sweeping, unscientific and unpractical doctrine is unlikely to appeal to the common law mind.*"

67. Griffiths J could find no support in the case law for the contention that a landowner's rights in the air space above his property extend to an unlimited height (**487G-H)**:

> "In ***Wandsworth Board of Works -v- United Telephone Co. Ltd.*** **(1884) 13 QBD 904** Bowen LJ described the maxim, *usque ad coelum*, as a fanciful phrase, to which I would add that if applied literally it is a fanciful notion leading to the absurdity of a trespass at common law being committed by a satellite every time it passes over a suburban garden. The academic writers speak with one voice in rejecting the uncritical and literal application of the maxim... I accept their collective approach as correct. The problem is to balance the rights of an owner to enjoy the use of his land against the rights of the general public to take advantage of all that science now offers in the use of air space. This balance is in my judgment best struck in our present society by restricting the rights of an owner in the air space above his land to such height as is necessary for the ordinary use and enjoyment of his land and the structures upon it, and declaring that above that height he has no greater rights in the air space than any other member of the public."

68. On the facts, there had been a "*fierce dispute*" between the parties as to the height at which the plane had flown to take the photograph, and the Judge found only that it had flown "*many hundreds of feet above the ground*" (**488C**). He added:

> "… it is not suggested that by its mere presence in the air space it caused any interference with any use to which the plaintiff put or might wish to put his land. The plaintiff's complaint is not that the aircraft interfered with the use of his land but that a photograph was taken from it. There is, however, no law against taking a photograph, and the mere taking of a photograph cannot turn an act which is not a trespass into the plaintiff's air space into one that is a trespass."

69. In a passage that perhaps echoes some of Ms Bolton's submissions in this case, Griffiths J noted, but rejected, the argument that photographs of the claimant's property obtained from the air could be used for nefarious purposes (**488E-F**):

> "… [Counsel for the plaintiff], however, conceded that he was unable to cite any principle of law or authority that would entitle Lord Bernstein to prevent someone taking a photograph of his property for an innocent purpose, provided they did not commit some other tort such as trespass or nuisance in doing so. It is therefore interesting to reflect what a sterile remedy Lord Bernstein would obtain if he was able to establish that mere infringement of the air space over his land was a trespass. He could prevent the defendants flying over his land to take another photograph, but he could not prevent the defendants taking the virtually identical photograph from the adjoining land provided they took care not to cross his boundary, and were taking it for an innocent as opposed to a criminal purpose."

70. For my part, I would respectfully disagree that proof that photographs of a property, captured from adjoining land, were taken for a "*criminal purpose*" would render photographer liable for trespass upon the land of the property-owner. If there is to be a remedy against taking such photographs, it is to some other area of the law that the aggrieved property-owner would have to turn.

71. Griffiths J therefore dismissed the claimant's claim for trespass, but he concluded his judgment with this observation (**489F-H**):

> "… I [would not] wish this judgment to be understood as deciding that in no circumstances could a successful action be brought against an aerial photographer to restrain his activities. The present action is not founded in nuisance for no court would regard the taking of a single photograph as an actionable nuisance. But if the circumstances were such that a plaintiff was subjected to the harassment of constant surveillance of his house from the air, accompanied by the photographing of his every activity, I am far from saying that the court would not regard such a monstrous invasion of his privacy as an actionable nuisance for which they would give relief. However, that question does not fall for decision in this case and will be decided if and when it arises."

72. The decision does not appear to deal expressly with the claim for breach of privacy. Perhaps that reflects the reality that, in 1977, there was no recognised right of privacy, so-called (a submission the defendant made – see p.481 in the report). Griffiths J's observations about whether repeated photographing of a person's property, amounting effectively to surveillance, might ground a cause of action were very much rooted in the notion that such behaviour might be found to be an actionable nuisance (cf. ***Fearn -v- Board of Trustees of the Tate Gallery*** **[2024] AC 1** [188]).

73. The law has developed significantly since 1977. A claimant who is subjected to the sort of surveillance that Griffiths J described might well now consider, in addition to a claim for nuisance, claims for misuse of private information, potential breaches of data protection legislation and harassment. For the purposes of this judgment, it is important to note that, as against "Persons Unknown", the Claimants have not advanced their claim for injunctive relief to restrain further drone usage on any of these bases; the claim is advanced solely as an alleged trespass. I can well see that pursuing claims for these additional torts might not be straightforward (and the omission to advance such claims may reflect an appreciation of those difficulties by the Claimants). For present purposes, it is sufficient to note that not only have the Claimants have not pursued such claims, but they have also not provided the evidence necessary to demonstrate that the historic drone usage (and apprehended future use) would amount to any of these further torts. For the purposes of the Claim against "Persons Unknown" I will therefore consider, only, whether the Claimants' evidence of drone usage amounts to trespass. For the claim against Mr Curtin, personally, I must additionally consider whether his use of a drone on 21 June 2022 was part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the First Claimant's employees (and others in the Second Claimant class) – see [255]-[274] below.

(2) Interference with the right of access to the highway

74. The common law right of access to the highway was described by Lord Atkin, in ***Marshall -v- Blackpool Corporation*** **[1935] AC 16, 22** as follows:

> "… The owner of land adjoining a highway has a right of access to the highway from any part of his premises. This is so whether he or his predecessors originally dedicated the highway or part of it and whether he is entitled to the whole or some interest in the ground subjacent to the highway or not. The rights of the public to pass along the highway are subject to this right of access: just as the right of access is subject to the rights of the public, and must be exercised subject to the general obligations as to nuisance and the like imposed upon a person using the highway."

75. An interference with this right is actionable *per se*: ***Walsh -v- Ervin*** **[1952] VLR 361**. The right is separate from the land-owner's right, as a member of the public, to utilise the highway itself: ***Ineos Upstream Ltd -v- Persons Unknown*** **[2017] EWHC 2945 (Ch)** [42]. This private right ceases as soon as the highway is reached and any subsequent interference with access to the highway is actionable, if at all, only if it amounts to a public nuisance. In ***Chaplin -v- Westminster Corporation*** **[1901] 2 Ch 329, 333-334**, Buckley J explained:

> "The right which [the claimants] here seek to exercise is a right which they enjoy in common with all other members of the public to use this highway. They have an individual interest which enables them to sue without joining the Attorney-General, in that they are persons who by reason of the neighbourhood of their own premises use this portion of the highway more than others. They have a special and individual interest in the public right to this portion of the highway, and they are entitled to sue without joining the Attorney-General because they sue in respect of that individual interest; but the right which they seek to exercise is not a private right, but a public right. A person who owns premises abutting on a highway enjoys as a private right the right of stepping from his own premises on to the highway, and if any obstruction be placed in his doorway, or gateway, or, if it be a river, at the edge of his wharf, so as to prevent him from obtaining access from his own premises to the highway, that obstruction would be an interference with a private right. But immediately that he has stepped on to the highway, and is using the highway, what he is using is not a private right, but a public right."

76. The reference to the Attorney-General is to the important principle that an individual cannot, without the consent of the Attorney-General, seek to enforce the criminal law in civil proceedings: ***Gouriet -v- Union of Post Office Workers*** **[1978] AC 435, 477E-F**. Obstruction of the highway is a criminal offence. It does not create a civil cause of action unless the obstruction of the highway amounts to a public nuisance.

77. Ms Bolton submits that the First Claimant, as the owner of the Wyton Site, has an immediate right to access the highway from the Wyton Site to the B1090. Obstruction of this right of access gives rise to a private law claim.

78. I can readily accept that acts of the protestors which deliberately blockade the Wyton Site, preventing vehicles gaining access to or from the highway, would be an infringement of this private right.

79. However, Ms Bolton goes further. She argues that there is no protest right that can justify any interference with the access to the highway. She contends that there is no right to obstruct, slow down or hinder the passage of vehicles exiting the Wyton Site.

80. Put in those absolute terms, I reject this part of Ms Bolton's submission. As is clear from the passage I have quoted from ***Marshall*** (see [74] above), such private law right

of access to the highway that the First Claimant has is "*subject to the rights of the public*". At its most prosaic, the right of access to the highway cannot be absolute because people leaving the Wyton Site would have to give way to traffic on the B1090. In heavy traffic, or if there was significant congestion or a traffic jam, a person exiting the Wyton Site might have to wait for some time before s/he could access the highway. Another example, directly linked to the protest activities, would be if the protestors organised a march or procession along the B1090 (with due notification being given to the police under s.11 Public Order Act 1986). For the time it took for the procession to pass the entrance of the Wyton Site, it would interfere with the First Claimant's right of access to the highway. The First Claimant has no right to ask the Court to prohibit lawful use of the highway by the protestors on the grounds that it would interfere – for a short period – with the First Claimant's right of access to the highway. Under s.12 Public Order Act 1986, if certain requirements are met, the police can impose conditions on processions. In that way a proper balance can be struck between the protestors' right to demonstrate, and the First Claimant's right of access to the highway.

(3) Public nuisance

81. When these proceedings were commenced, it was an offence at common law to cause a public nuisance. From 28 June 2022, the offence of public nuisance has been put on a statutory footing in s.78 Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022, and the old common law offence has been abolished. The new s.78 provides:

> "(1) A person commits an offence if—
>
> (a) the person—
>
> (i) does an act, or
>
> (ii) omits to do an act that they are required to do by any enactment or rule of law,
>
> (b) the person's act or omission—
>
> (i) creates a risk of, or causes, serious harm to the public or a section of the public, or
>
> (ii) obstructs the public or a section of the public in the exercise or enjoyment of a right that may be exercised or enjoyed by the public at large, and
>
> (c) the person intends that their act or omission will have a consequence mentioned in paragraph (b) or is reckless as to whether it will have such a consequence.
>
> (2) In subsection (1)(b)(i) "serious harm" means—
>
> (a) death, personal injury or disease,
>
> (b) loss of, or damage to, property, or
>
> (c) serious distress, serious annoyance, serious inconvenience or serious loss of amenity.

> (3) It is a defence for a person charged with an offence under subsection (1) to prove that they had a reasonable excuse for the act or omission mentioned in paragraph (a) of that subsection.
>
> (4) A person guilty of an offence under subsection (1) is liable—
>
> (a) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding he general limit in a magistrates' court, to a fine or to both;
>
> (b) on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years, to a fine or to both.
>
> …
>
> (6) The common law offence of public nuisance is abolished.
>
> (7) Subsections (1) to (6) do not apply in relation to—
>
> (a) any act or omission which occurred before the coming into force of those subsections, or
>
> (b) any act or omission which began before the coming into force of those subsections and continues after their coming into force.
>
> (8) This section does not affect—
>
> (a) the liability of any person for an offence other than the common law offence of public nuisance,
>
> (b) the civil liability of any person for the tort of public nuisance, or
>
> (c) the ability to take any action under any enactment against a person for any act or omission within subsection (1).
>
> (9) In this section "enactment" includes an enactment comprised in subordinate legislation within the meaning of the Interpretation Act 1978."

82. The Act retains civil liability for the tort of public nuisance: s.78(8)(b). That reflects the position that used to apply under the common law and the authors of *Clerk & Lindsell on Tort* (§19-179, 24th edition, Sweet & Maxwell, 2023) consequently suggest: "*it is clear that the previous common law decisions on liability for public nuisance continue to provide guidance on the scope of civil liability in highway cases*".

83. Consideration of the law relating public nuisance arising from an obstruction of the highway must start with the following basic propositions:

(1) simple obstruction of the highway is a criminal offence under s.137 Highways Act 1980;

(2) a threatened or actual offence under s.137 *cannot* ground a civil claim (without the consent of the Attorney-General): ***Gouriet*** – see [76] above);

(3) if the conditions of s.78 Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022 (or, prior to enactment, the common law offence of public nuisance) are met, obstruction of the highway *may* amount to public nuisance; and

(4) a threatened or actual public nuisance *can* ground a civil claim upon proof of special damage.

(a) Obstruction of the highway: s.137 Highways Act 1980

84. So far as material, s.137 Highways Act 1980 provides:

> "(1) If a person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way wilfully obstructs the free passage along a highway he is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 51 weeks or a fine or both…"

85. Any occupation of part of a highway which interferes with people having the use of the whole of the highway is an obstruction; and unless the obstruction is so small that it is *de minimis*, any stopping on the highway is *prima facie* an obstruction. However, the prosecution must also prove that the person responsible for the obstruction was acting unreasonably. Resolving that issue depends on all the circumstances, including the length of time of the obstruction, the place where it occurs, the purpose for which it is done, and whether it does in fact cause an actual obstruction as opposed to a potential obstruction: ***Nagy -v- Weston*** **[1965] 1 WLR 280**; ***Hirst -v- Chief Constable of West Yorkshire*** **(1987) 85 Cr App R 143, 151** .

86. These principles were approved by the Divisional Court in ***DPP -v- Ziegler*** **[2020] QB 253** (and not subject to adverse comment in the Supreme Court **[2022] AC 408**).

87. The law resolves the tension between the criminal offence of obstruction of the highway, under s.137, and the right to protest (protected by Articles 10 and 11 of the ECHR) by recognising that some protest activities, that create an obstruction on a highway, can be defended on the basis that the right to protest provides a lawful excuse for the obstruction. That was the effect of ***Ziegler*** and Lord Reed gave the following summary in ***Reference by the Attorney General for Northern Ireland – Abortion Services (Safe Access Zones) (Northern Ireland) Bill*** **[2023] AC 505** ("***Northern Ireland Abortion Services***"):

> [22] Section 137 and the equivalent predecessor provisions have a long and specific history, and have been the subject of a great deal of judicial consideration. The approach adopted to section 137 and its predecessors for over a century prior to ***Ziegler*** was rooted in authorities which treated the question to be decided under the statute as similar to the question to be decided in civil nuisance cases of an analogous kind. On that basis, it was held that it was necessary for the court to consider whether the activity being carried on in the highway by the defendant was reasonable or not: see, for example, ***Lowdens -v- Keaveney*** **[1903] 2 IR 82, 87** and **89**. That question was treated as one of fact, depending on all the circumstances of the case: ***Nagy -v- Weston*** **[1965] 1 WLR 280, 284**; ***Cooper -v- Metropolitan Police Commissioner*** **(1985) 82 Cr App R 238, 242** and **244**. That approach accorded with the general treatment in the criminal law of assessments of reasonableness as questions of fact. In cases where the activity in question

> took the form of a protest or demonstration, common law rights of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly were treated as an important factor in the assessment of reasonable user: see, for example, ***Hirst -v- Chief Constable of West Yorkshire*** **(1986) 85 Cr App R 143**. That approach was approved, *obiter*, by members of the House of Lords in ***Director of Public Prosecutions -v- Jones*** **[1999] 2 AC 240, 258-259** and **290**. Lord Irvine of Lairg LC summarised the position at p 255: 'the public have the right to use the public highway for such reasonable and usual activities as are consistent with the general public's primary right to use the highway for purposes of passage and repassage'. The same approach continued to be followed after the Human Rights Act entered into force: see, for example, ***Buchanan -v- Crown Prosecution Service*** **[2018] EWHC 1773 (Admin)**; **[2018] LLR 668**.

88. Lord Reed did criticise some aspects of the approach adopted by the Divisional Court in ***Ziegler*** ([23]-[25]), but recognised that the Supreme Court's decision in ***Ziegler*** governed the proper approach to the interpretation of s.137 in protest cases:

> [26] … it was agreed between the parties, and this court accepted [in ***Ziegler***], that section 137 has to be read and given effect, in accordance with section 3 of the Human Rights Act, on the basis that the availability of the defence of lawful excuse, in a case raising issues under articles 10 or 11, depends on a proportionality assessment carried out in accordance with the approach set out by the Divisional Court: see [10]-[12] and [16]. As that question is not in issue in the present case, we make no comment upon it.
>
> [27] One of the issues in dispute in the appeal was whether there can be a lawful excuse for the purposes of section 137 in respect of deliberate physically obstructive conduct by protesters, where the obstruction prevented, or was capable of preventing, other highway users from passing along the highway. Lord Hamblen and Lord Stephens concluded that there could be (***Jones*** was neither cited nor referred to). Lady Arden and Lord Sales expressed agreement in general terms with what they said on this issue.
>
> [28] In the course of their discussion of this issue, Lord Hamblen and Lord Stephens stated at [59]:
>
> > "Determination of the proportionality of an interference with ECHR rights is a fact-specific enquiry which requires the evaluation of the circumstances in the individual case".
>
> One might expect that to be the usual position at the trial of offences charged under section 137 in circumstances where articles 9, 10 or 11 are engaged, if the section is interpreted as it was in ***Ziegler***; and that was the only situation with which Lord Hamblen and Lord Stephens were concerned…

89. Lord Reed's quarrel with ***Ziegler*** was with the suggestion – in [59] – that the Supreme Court had been stating a principle of universal application relevant to all contexts in which protest rights were engaged. It was this submission that Lord Reed rejected: [29]ff.

(b) Public nuisance by obstructing the highway

90. Assuming that a claimant can demonstrate commission of a public nuisance by the defendant(s), then s/he can bring a civil claim if s/he can prove (1) that s/he has sustained particular damage beyond the general inconvenience and injury suffered by the public as a result of the public nuisance; (2) that the particular damage which he has sustained is direct, not consequential; and (3) that the damage is substantial, "*not fleeting or evanescent*": ***Jan De Nul (UK) Ltd -v- N.V. Royale Belge*** **[2000] 2 Lloyd's Rep 700** ("***N.V. Royale Belge***") [42] relying upon ***Benjamin -v- Storr*** **(1874) LR 9 CP 400**.

91. Relying upon ***East Hertfordshire DC -v- Isobel Hospice Trading Ltd*** **[2001] JPL 597**, Ms Bolton submitted that "*it is well-established law that it is a public nuisance to obstruct or hinder the free passage of the public along the highway*". That is not an accurate statement of the law and the decision upon which she relied is not authority for that proposition. The case was a judicial review of the dismissal (by a Magistrates' Court, and then on appeal) of a local authority's complaint under s.149 Highways Act 1980 after several large wheelie bins had been placed on a highway. The Council had served a notice on the defendant to remove the wheelie bin that it had placed on the highway. The defendant did not comply with the notice and proceedings were then brought in the Magistrates' Court. The Magistrates dismissed the complaint, and the Council appealed. The Crown Court dismissed the appeal. The Crown Court was satisfied that the wheelie bin was situated on the highway, but that it could not be said to be a nuisance or, if it was, "*it was a nuisance of such a piffling nature that it did not warrant the intervention of any court*".

92. The High Court quashed the decision of the Crown Court. The Judge found that the wheelie bin was an obstruction of the highway that was not temporary. It was not relevant that people could navigate around it. The Judge concluded that the Crown Court had been wrong to hold that the positioning of the wheelie bin on the highway did not in law amount to a nuisance under s.149 ([32]), and remitted the case for redetermination: [38]. The case is not authority for what obstructions of the highway amount to a public nuisance; it is not a case about public nuisance at all.

93. The leading case concerning the common law offence of public nuisance is ***R -v- Rimmington*** **[2006] 1 AC 459**. In it, Lord Bingham identified ***Attorney General -v- PYA Quarries Ltd*** **[1957] 2 QB 169** as the modern authority on what amounts to a public nuisance [18]:

> "This was a civil action brought by the Attorney General on the relation of the Glamorgan County Council and the Pontardawe Rural District Council to restrain a nuisance by quarrying activities which were said to project stones and splinters into the neighbourhood, and cause dust and vibrations. It was argued for the company on appeal that there might have been a private nuisance affecting some of the residents, but not a public nuisance affecting all Her Majesty's liege subjects living in the area. In his judgment Romer LJ reviewed the authorities in detail and concluded, at p.184:
>
> > 'I do not propose to attempt a more precise definition of a public nuisance than those which emerge from the textbooks and authorities to which I have referred. It is, however, clear, in my opinion, that any nuisance is "public" which materially affects the reasonable comfort and convenience of life of

> a class of Her Majesty's subjects. The sphere of the nuisance may be described generally as "the neighbourhood"; but the question whether the local community within that sphere comprises a sufficient number of persons to constitute a class of the public is a question of fact in every case. It is not necessary, in my judgment, to prove that every member of the class has been injuriously affected; it is sufficient to show that a representative cross-section of the class has been so affected for an injunction to issue.'

Denning LJ agreed. He differentiated between public and private nuisance at p.190 on conventional grounds: '*The classic statement of the difference is that a public nuisance affects Her Majesty's subjects generally, whereas a private nuisance only affects particular individuals.*' He went on to say, at p.191:

> 'that a public nuisance is a nuisance which is so widespread in its range or so indiscriminate in its effect that it would not be reasonable to expect one person to take proceedings on his own responsibility to put a stop to it, but that it should be taken on the responsibility of the community at large.'"

94. Ms Bolton's submissions on behalf of the Claimants have very much proceeded on the assumption that *every* threatened or actual obstruction of the highway is amounts to an actionable public nuisance. That is not correct. Whether a public nuisance is caused by an obstruction of the highway is a question of fact and degree: see e.g. ***N.V. Royale Belge*** [40].

95. The criminal offence of obstruction of the highway can embrace behaviour ranging from the obstruction of a single vehicle on a minor 'B' road at 3 o'clock in the morning, to a massive blockage of the M25 motorway during rush hour. The former, even if it amounts to a criminal offence under s.137 Highways Act 1980, would not remotely constitute a public nuisance, whereas the latter probably would.

96. In her submissions, Ms Bolton referred to and relied upon ***DPP -v- Jones*** **[1999] 2 AC 240**, ***Ziegler*** and ***Northern Ireland Abortion Services***. Whilst these authorities do contain important statements of principle, they have limited direct application to the issues that I must resolve. Each of those cases was concerned with the way in which the criminal law accommodates protest rights. None of the cases concerned the torts relied upon by the Claimants. ***DPP -v- Jones*** was a case about trespassory assembly, contrary to s.14A Public Order Act 1986; ***Ziegler*** concerned the offence of obstructing the highway, contrary to s.137 Highways Act 1980; and ***Northern Ireland Abortion Services*** concerned the legislative competence of the Northern Ireland Assembly to enact provisions that would prohibit certain activities within "*safe access zones*" adjacent to the premises where abortion services were provided.

97. Several of Ms Bolton's submissions, based upon ***Northern Ireland Abortion Services***, I consider to be wrong. For example, she argued that the case was authority for the proposition that ***Ziegler*** is not to be applied universally to cases concerning obstruction of the highway, "*and the approach is that set out by Lord Irvine in* ***Jones****, namely 'the public have the right to use the public highway for such reasonable and usual activities as are consistent with the general public's primary right to use the highway for purposes of passage and repassage'*". I reject that submission. ***Northern Ireland Abortion Services*** could not, and did not, overrule the authority of ***Ziegler*** on the proper interpretation of s.137. Lord Reed did not doubt the correctness of the Supreme Court's decision in ***Ziegler*** as it applied to the offence of obstructing the highway, indeed he

noted that it represented the position that was both well-established by earlier authorities and necessary given the parameters of the offence (see [87] above). He rejected the submission that the principle from ***Ziegler*** applied to all cases involving protest rights. He held that the answer to whether determination of the proportionality of an interference with Convention-protected protest rights required a fact-specific evaluation of the circumstances in the individual case depended upon the nature and context of the particular statutory provision. Even in relation to other offences that provide for a defence of lawful or reasonable excuse, it did not necessarily mean that the Court is required to carry out an individual proportionality assessment, "*the position is more nuanced than that*": [53] (and see [58]).

98. It is not necessary to consider the other arguments that Ms Bolton advanced based on ***Northern Ireland Abortion Services*** because the case has only tangential relevance to the Claimants' case against the Defendants in this claim. This case is not about, for example, whether it would be lawful for Cambridgeshire County Council to impose a Public Spaces Protection Order to prohibit certain protest activities in a designated zone around the Wyton Site (c.f. ***Dulgheriu -v- London Borough of Ealing*** **[2020] 1 WLR 609**). Nor is this case concerned with alleged offences of obstructing the highway. Even if the Claimants could establish that such an offence had been committed on one or more occasions, that could not be used as the basis for a civil claim against these Defendants. At the stage of liability, the case is about whether the Claimants can demonstrate: (1) that Mr Curtin (and others) have (a) trespassed on the Wyton Site; (b) obstructed access between the Wyton Site and the public highway; and/or (c) obstructed the carriageway in such a way as to cause a public nuisance; (d) (against Mr Curtin alone) that he has pursued a course of conduct involving the harassment; and/or (2) threaten to do one or more of these acts unless restrained by injunction.

(4) Harassment

99. The Protection from Harassment Act ("the PfHA"), s.1 provides, so far as material:

> "(1) A person must not pursue a course of conduct —
>
> (a) which amounts to harassment of another, and
>
> (b) which he knows or ought to know amounts to harassment of the other.
>
> (1A) A person must not pursue a course of conduct —
>
> (a) which involves harassment of two or more persons, and
>
> (b) which he knows or ought to know involves harassment of those persons, and
>
> (c) by which he intends to persuade any person (whether or not one of those mentioned above)—
>
> (i) not to do something that he is entitled or required to do, or
>
> (ii) to do something that he is not under any obligation to do.

> (2) For the purposes of this section …, the person whose course of conduct is in question ought to know that it amounts to or involves harassment of another if a reasonable person in possession of the same information would think the course of conduct amounted to harassment of the other.
>
> (3) Subsection (1) or (1A) does not apply to a course of conduct if the person who pursued it shows -
>
> (a) that it was pursued for the purpose of preventing or detecting crime,
>
> (b) that it was pursued under any enactment or rule of law or to comply with any condition or requirement imposed by any person under any enactment, or
>
> (c) that in the particular circumstances the pursuit of the course of conduct was reasonable."

100. A breach of ss.1(1) and/or (1A) is a criminal offence: s.2. Sections 3 and 3A PfHA provide that any actual or apprehended breach of ss.1(1) and (1A) may be the subject of a civil claim by anyone who is or may be the victim of the course of conduct.

101. A corporate entity is not a "person" capable of being harassed under s.1(1): s.7(5) and ***Daiichi UK Ltd -v- Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty*** **[2004] 1 WLR 1503**. However, a company may sue in a representative capacity on behalf of employees of the company if that is the most convenient and expeditious way of enabling the court to protect their interests: ***Emerson Developments Ltd -v- Avery*** **[2004] EWHC 194 (QB)** [2]. Alternatively, claims for an injunction under s.3A may be brought by a company in its own right: ***Harlan Laboratories UK Ltd -v- Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty*** **[2012] EWHC 3408 (QB)** [5]-[9]; ***Astrellas Pharma -v- Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty*** **[2011] EWCA Civ 752** [7].

102. Section 7 provides, so far as material:

> "(2) References to harassing a person include alarming the person or causing the person distress.
>
> (3) A 'course of conduct' must involve—
>
> (a) in the case of conduct in relation to a single person (see section 1(1)), conduct on at least two occasions in relation to that person, or
>
> (b) in the case of conduct in relation to two or more persons (see section 1(1A)), conduct on at least one occasion in relation to each of those persons.
>
> (3A) A person's conduct on any occasion shall be taken, if aided, abetted, counselled or procured by another—
>
> (a) to be conduct on that occasion of the other (as well as conduct of the person whose conduct it is); and
>
> (b) to be conduct in relation to which the other's knowledge and purpose, and what he ought to have known, are the same as they were in relation

to what was contemplated or reasonably foreseeable at the time of the aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring.

(4) 'Conduct' includes speech.

(5) References to a person, in the context of the harassment of a person, are references to a person who is an individual."

103. A defendant has a defence if s/he shows: (i) that the course of conduct was pursued for the purpose of preventing or detecting crime; and/or (ii) that in the particular circumstances the pursuit of the course of conduct was reasonable (s.1(3)).

104. Assessing whether conduct amounts to or involves harassment, and whether any defendant has a defence under s.1(3), can be difficult and is always highly fact specific. In ***Hayden -v- Dickenson*** **[2020] EWHC 3291 (QB)** [44], I reviewed the relevant authorities and identified the following principles (with citations mostly omitted):

"(i) Harassment is an ordinary English word with a well understood meaning: it is a persistent and deliberate course of unacceptable and oppressive conduct, targeted at another person, which is calculated to and does cause that person alarm, fear or distress; '*a persistent and deliberate course of targeted oppression*'…

(ii) The behaviour said to amount to harassment must reach a level of seriousness passing beyond irritations, annoyances, even a measure of upset, that arise occasionally in everybody's day-to-day dealings with other people. The conduct must cross the boundary between that which is unattractive, even unreasonable, and conduct which is oppressive and unacceptable. To cross the border from the regrettable to the objectionable, the gravity of the misconduct must be of an order which would sustain criminal liability under s.2… A course of conduct must be grave before the offence or tort of harassment is proved…

(iii) The provision, in s.7(2) PfHA, that '*references to harassing a person include alarming the person or causing the person distress*' is not a definition of the tort and it is not exhaustive. It is merely guidance as to one element of it… It does not follow that any course of conduct which causes alarm or distress therefore amounts to harassment; that would be illogical and produce perverse results…

(iv) s.1(2) provides that the person whose course of conduct is in question ought to know that it involves harassment of another if a reasonable person in possession of the same information would think the course of conduct involved harassment. The test is wholly objective… '*The Court's assessment of the harmful tendency of the statements complained of must always be objective, and not swayed by the subjective feelings of the claimant*'…

(v) Those who are '*targeted*' by the alleged harassment can include others '*who are foreseeably, and directly, harmed by the course of targeted conduct of which complaint is made, to the extent that they can properly be described as victims of it*'…

(vi) Where the complaint is of harassment by publication, the claim will usually engage Article 10 of the Convention and, as a result, the Court's duties under ss.2, 3, 6 and 12 of the Human Rights Act 1998. The PfHA must be interpreted and applied compatibly with the right to freedom of expression. It would be a serious interference with this right if those wishing to express their own views could be silenced by, or threatened with, proceedings for harassment based on subjective claims by individuals that they felt offended or insulted…

(vii) In most cases of alleged harassment by speech there is a fundamental tension. s.7(2) PfHA provides that harassment includes '*alarming the person or causing the person distress*'. However, Article 10 expressly protects speech that offends, shocks and disturbs. '*Freedom only to speak inoffensively is not worth having*'…

(viii) Consequently, where Article 10 is engaged, the Court's assessment of whether the conduct crosses the boundary from the unattractive, even unreasonable, to oppressive and unacceptable must pay due regard to the importance of freedom of expression and the need for any restrictions upon the right to be necessary, proportionate and established convincingly. Cases of alleged harassment may also engage the complainant's Article 8 rights. If that is so, the Court will have to assess the interference with those rights and the justification for it and proportionality… The resolution of any conflict between engaged rights under Article 8 and Article 10 is achieved through the '*ultimate balancing test*' identified in ***In re S*** [17] …

(ix) The context and manner in which the information is published are all-important… The harassing element of oppression is likely to come more from the manner in which the words are published than their content…

(x) The fact that the information is in the public domain does not mean that a person loses the right not to be harassed by the use of that information. There is no principle of law that publishing publicly available information about somebody is incapable of amount to harassment…

(xi) Neither is it determinative that the published information is, or is alleged to be, true… '*No individual is entitled to impose on any other person an unlimited punishment by public humiliation such as the Defendant has done, and claims the right to do*'… That is not to say that truth or falsity of the information is irrelevant… The truth of the words complained of is likely to be a significant factor in the overall assessment (including any defence advanced under s.1(3)), particularly when considering any application interim injunction… On the other hand, where the allegations are shown to be false, the public interest in preventing publication or imposing remedies after the event will be stronger… The fundamental question is whether the conduct has additional elements of oppression, persistence or unpleasantness which are distinct from the content of the statements; if so, the truth of the statements is not necessarily an answer to a claim in harassment.

(xii) Finally, where the alleged harassment is by publication of journalistic material, nothing short of a conscious or negligent abuse of media freedom will justify a finding of harassment. Such cases will be rare and exceptional…"

105. That summary of the law was approved by the Divisional Court in ***Scottow -v- CPS*** **[2021] 1 WLR 1828** [24], to which Warby J added [25(1)]:

> "A person alleging harassment must prove a 'course of conduct' of a harassing nature. Section 7(3)(a) of the PfHA provides that, in the case of conduct relating to a single person, this 'must involve … conduct on at least two occasions in relation to that person'. But this is not of itself enough: a person alleging that conduct on two occasions amounts to a 'course of conduct' must show 'a link between the two to reflect the meaning of the word "course"': ***Hipgrave -v- Jones*** **[2004] EWHC 2901 (QB)** [62] (Tugendhat J). Accordingly, two isolated incidents separated in time by a period of months cannot amount to harassment: ***R -v- Hills (Gavin Spencer)*** **[2001] 1 FLR 580** [25]. In the harassment by publication case of ***Sube -v- News Group Newspapers Ltd*** **[2020] EMLR 25** I adopted and applied this interpretative approach, to distinguish between sets of newspaper articles which were 'quite separate and distinct'. One set of articles followed the other 'weeks later, prompted, on their face, by new events and new information, and they had different content': [76(1)], [99] (and see also [113(1)])."

106. Factors (vi) to (ix) from ***Hayden*** are likely to have equivalent resonance in protest cases, which similarly engage Article 10 (and Article 11). It is relevant to consider the speech that is alleged to amount to or involve harassment. Any attempt to interfere with political speech requires the most convincing justification, and the most anxious scrutiny from the Court: ***Hourani -v- Thomson*** **[2017] EWHC 432 (QB)** [212]; ***Hibbert -v- Hall*** **[2024] EWHC 2677 (KB)]** [154]. The objective nature of the assessment of whether the conduct amounts to or involves harassment (***Hayden*** factor (vi)) is critical to ensuring proper respect for Article 10.

107. The course of conduct, viewed as a whole, must be assessed objectively. It is not necessary for each individual act that comprises the course of conduct to be oppressive and unacceptable. Individual acts which, viewed in isolation, appear fairly innocuous, may take on a different complexion when viewed as part of a bigger picture: ***Hibbert -v- Hall*** [152].

108. Finally, the claim of harassment pursued against Mr Curtin, at trial, does not allege that Mr Curtin has breached s.1(1) of the PfHA. It is not alleged that he has targeted any individual. The claim alleges a breach of s.1(1A). As such, the Claimants must also demonstrate, not only that Mr Curtin pursued a course of conduct, which involved harassment of two or more persons, which he knew or ought to have known involved harassment of those persons, but also, under s.1(1A)(c) that he intended, by that harassment, to persuade any person (which could include either those who were harassed or the First Claimant) not to do something that s/he/it was entitled or required to do, or to do something that s/he/it was under no obligation to do.

G: The Third Contempt Application

109. As already noted (see [52] above), the Third Contempt Application, against Mr Curtin, was issued by the Claimants on 17 June 2022. It was supported by the Sixth Affidavit of Ms Pressick and the Second Affidavit of Mr Manning. The evidence was heard

during the trial, with a further hearing, after the trial, on 23 June 2023. Mr Curtin was represented at this hearing, and he gave evidence.

(1) Allegations of breach of the Interim Injunction

110. The contempt application alleged that Mr Curtin had breached the Interim Injunction, in the terms imposed on 31 March 2022, as follows ("the Grounds"):

(1) On 26 April 2022, at 03.08, Mr Curtin entered the Exclusion Zone, in breach of Paragraph 1(2) of the 31 March 2022 order.

(2) On 26 April 2022, at 03.55 and in the period immediately thereafter, Mr Curtin twice approached and/or obstructed the path of a white van that was directly exiting the Exclusion Zone, in breach of Paragraph 1(4) of the 31 March 2022 order.

(3) On 12 May 2022, at 10.57, Mr Curtin entered the Exclusion Zone, in breach of Paragraph 1(2) of the 31 March 2022 order.

(4) On 12 May 2022, at 11.56, Mr Curtin instructed and/or encouraged an unknown and unidentifiable person to enter the Exclusion Zone, in breach of Paragraph 1(2) of the 31 March 2022 order.

(5) On 12 May 2022, at 15.13, Mr Curtin entered the Exclusion Zone, in breach of Paragraph 1(2) of the 31 March 2022 order.

(6) On 12 May 2022, between 15.24 and 15.27, Mr Curtin approached and/or obstructed the path of a Police van, such that the van was unable to exit the Exclusion Zone, in breach of Paragraph 1(4) of the 31 March 2022 order.

(2) Evidence relied upon

111. Principally, the evidence upon which the Claimants relied to prove the alleged breaches is video footage. The affidavits of Ms Pressick and Mr Manning do little more than produce this video evidence and then comment upon what it shows.

112. Grounds 1 and 2 relate to an incident, on 26 April 2022, when a white van left the Wyton Site at just after 3am. Police were in attendance. The protestors clearly believed that dogs were being transported from the Wyton Site in the vehicle.

113. Grounds 3 to 6 concern various separate incidents on 12 May 2022.

(a) Ground 1

114. The video footage relied upon shows that a person, alleged to be Mr Curtin, stands and walks through an area which is alleged to be within the Exclusion Zone. The person is alleged to be in the Exclusion Zone for no more than 9 seconds.

(b) Ground 2

115. The video footage relied upon shows, from several different viewpoints, that a person, alleged to be Mr Curtin, approached and/or obstructed the path of a white van that was

directly exiting the Exclusion Zone. Specifically, it is alleged that Mr Curtin approached the white van when it was inside, attempting to exit, and immediately upon its exit from, the Exclusion Zone. Essentially, the white van left the Wyton Site by the main gate and attempted to turn right. As it did so, several protestors, including Mr Curtin, stood in front of and around the vehicle. Albeit temporarily, the vehicle was obstructed by Mr Curtin (and others) as it attempted to leave the Exclusion Zone.

(c) Ground 3

116. The video evidence shows that, at around 10.57 on 12 May 2022, a protestor throws a plastic box into the carriageway which is within the Exclusion Zone. Mr Curtin crosses the central line of the carriageway and kicks the plastic box away from the road. In doing so, Mr Curtin is within the Exclusion Zone for possibly 2 seconds.

(d) Ground 4

117. At 11.53 on 2 May 2022, an unidentified person, dressed as a dinosaur described by Mr Manning as a "*tyrannosaurus-rex costume*", enters the Exclusion Zone. The dinosaur ambles around the verge of the carriageway to the left of entrance to the Wyton Site. Another protestor appears to film the dinosaur without entering the Exclusion Zone. At 11.56, the dinosaur approaches Mr Curtin, who appears to have been filming him/her, and engages in conversation. Mr Curtin remains outside the Exclusion Zone. Mr Curtin then can be seen to take off and give his footwear to the dinosaur. Thereafter, Mr Manning says that the dinosaur "*seems to be doing little more than messing around on the driveway area… showing off for the CCTV cameras and the protestors who are cheering*". Mr Manning speculates that the dinosaur was looking for a lost drone. Mr Manning concludes: "*the CCTV of the t-rex incident clearly shows Mr Curtin assisting the t-rex's breach of the Exclusion Zone, as he lends his shoes to the person in the costume*". It is not alleged that, at any point, the itinerant dinosaur trespassed on the First Claimant's land or committed any other civil wrong.

(e) Ground 5

118. Later, on 12 May 2022, from around 15.08, the video evidence shows a convoy of vehicles leaves the Wyton Site, largely unobstructed. There is a significant police presence. On occasions, protestors can be seen to step over the mid-point of the carriageway into the exclusion zone. Police officers can be seen to gesture at the white lines, which I take to be a reminder of the Exclusion Zone. The protestors then step back.

119. At 15.13 a police van pulls up in front of the gates to the Wyton Site. It stops in the Exclusion Zone. A man, dressed in black, appears to have been arrested. Mr Curtin and another protestor approach the police vehicle, and in doing so enter the Exclusion Zone for a couple of seconds. Following a search, at 15.16, the detained man is placed into the van.

(f) Ground 6

120. This incident follows closely on from the Ground 5. A second police van can be seen to be stationary on the carriageway to the left of the Wyton Site. Police officers get into the van at around 15.18 and appear to be about to leave. However, their route is

obstructed by several protestors. At 15.24, Mr Curtin joins the protestors who are standing in front of the police van. A police officer gets out of the van and speaks to the protestors. The protestors disperse by 15.28 and the van drives off. Mr Manning states that the video evidence shows that Mr Curtin was in front of the van for a little over a minute. Arguably, the actions of the protestors were an obstruction of the highway, but the police did not take any action, perhaps in view of the very short-lived extent of the obstruction.

H: The parameters of the Claimants' claims

(1) The case against Mr Curtin

121. At an earlier stage of the proceedings, I made directions that the Claimant must plead, separately, the allegations that they made against each of the named Defendants in their Particulars of Claim. This was to ensure fairness. It was not fair to expect litigants in person to have to grapple with extensive Particulars of Claim – containing allegations directed at "Persons Unknown" – to attempt to identify what, if anything, was being alleged against them specifically. For the purposes of trial, Defendant-specific bundles were required to be provided by the Claimants. Each bundle contained only the allegations and evidence relevant to that Defendant.

122. By the time we reached the end of the trial, Mr Curtin was the only named Defendant who remained. The parameters of the case against him are set by what is pleaded in his Defendant-specific Particulars of Claim.

123. In their pleaded case, the Claimants allege that Mr Curtin, on various occasions, has been guilty of trespass, public nuisance on the highway, interference with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway from the Wyton Site and, finally a course of conduct involving harassment of the First Claimant's employees (and others in the Second Claimant class).

124. As I will come on to consider (see Section J(2) below), the Claimants advanced allegations against Mr Curtin, both in the witness evidence and at trial, that went beyond the case pleaded against him in the Particulars of Claim.

125. The Claimants' pleaded case against Mr Curtin relies upon the incidents I shall identify and address in the next section of the judgment when I deal with the evidence. I shall deal with each incident, chronologically, setting out the evidence and stating my conclusions, including, where necessary, resolving any disputed aspects of that evidence.

(2) The case against "Persons Unknown"

126. Although the pleaded case against the various categories of "Persons Unknown" included other claims, by the end of the evidence and in their closing submissions following the Supreme Court decision in ***Wolverhampton***, the Claimants had narrowed the claims advanced against "Persons Unknown" to a claim for an injunction against various categories of "Persons Unknown" or, alternatively, a *contra mundum* injunction, to restrain: (1) trespass (including prohibiting drone flying below 100 metres); (2) public nuisance caused by obstruction of the highway; and (3) interference with the First Claimant's right of access to the public highway. The Claimants did not

pursue a claim for harassment against "Persons Unknown" (or *contra mundum*) at the end of the trial.

I: The evidence at trial: generally

127. Before turning to the evidence relating to specific incidents, I should set out the evidence that was adduced at the trial and deal with some general issues. Some of the most important evidence at the trial were extracts of CCTV footage of various incidents. At the time the evidence for trial was prepared, the Wyton Site had 30 CCTV cameras in various locations. The security team are also equipped with body-worn cameras in certain situations.

128. The following witnesses were called by the Claimants at trial: (1) Susan Pressick; (2) Wendy Jarrett; (3) David Manning; (4) Demetrius Markou; (5) Employee A; (6) Employee AF; (6) Employee B; (7) Employee F; (8) Employee G; (9) Employee H; (10) Employee J; (11) Employee L; (12) Employee V; and (13) the Production Manager.

129. Anonymity orders were made for some of the witnesses. This was to protect the relevant witnesses from the risk of reprisal. The evidence has demonstrated that a small minority of individuals (not Mr Curtin) have sought to target those whom they identify as being employees of the First Claimant. At the trial, the anonymised witnesses gave their evidence via video link, in public, but with their identity protected. That was achieved by the Court, initially, sitting temporarily in private, during which the witness appeared on screen and was sworn. The screen was then deactivated, and the Court went back into open Court for the witness to be questioned on his/her evidence.

130. Some of the witnesses were not anonymised. For some, their names were well known to the protestors so anonymising them would have served no real purpose. Nevertheless, I have decided to adopt a cautious approach to naming them in this judgment. That is because, once handed down, this judgment, will become a public record.

131. The Claimants also relied upon witness statements of four witnesses, as hearsay, who were not called to give evidence: Employee C; Employee I; Employee P; and Jane Read.

132. Finally, Mr Curtin gave evidence at the trial. This largely consisted of his being cross-examined by Ms Bolton over three days.

133. The existence and availability of extensive CCTV recordings of the incidents means that there are no material disputes of fact that require me to decide between accounts given in the oral evidence. When I deal in the next Section of the judgment with the various incidents relied upon by the Claimants, I will refer to the evidence of the Claimants' witnesses. Before that, I should refer to the key witnesses for the Claimants who gave evidence relevant to the claim as a whole.

(1) Susan Pressick

134. Ms Pressick has provided many witness statements (and several Affidavits) during the litigation. She is employed by the Third Claimant as the Site Manager & UK Administration & European Quality Manager for the UK subsidiaries of Marshall Farm

Group Ltd. Ms Pressick has been closely involved in the litigation on behalf of the Claimants. Although she is based in Hull, Ms Pressick confirmed that she attends the Wyton Site most weeks. Her direct evidence of events is therefore limited, but she has played a significant role in the coordination of the evidence gathering process for the Claimants. Her witness evidence has been used as the primary vehicle for the introduction of the video evidence upon which the Claimants rely in relation to events at the Wyton Site.

135. Ms Pressick confirmed that, on occasions, she had been shouted at by protestors when she has visited the Wyton Site. In cross-examination she accepted that the protestors were not shouting at her, personally, but because she was perceived to be an employee of the First Claimant. One of the things that Ms Pressick recalled being shouted was "*puppy killer*". Questioned by Mr Curtin, Ms Pressick said that she did not understand why the protestors shouted that at people going to and from the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin put it to her that it was because dogs were euthanised at the site in a process that was termed "*terminal bleeding*". Ms Pressick accepted that on occasions that happened, but she maintained that being called a "*puppy killer*" was not a pleasant experience. Mr Curtin asked Ms Pressick about the impact of this upon her:

> Q: Do you take it personally, or do you take it 'They're calling me that because I work here?' …
>
> A: You take it personally, because we do everything we can do correctly…
>
> Q: Have you ever been specifically pointed out, 'That's the puppy killer'?
>
> A: No, as I described before, it's all of us, when we're moving around on and off site.
>
> Q: And in a form of legitimate protest, can you have any understanding… of why that would be a legitimate thing for a protestor to shout outside a very controversial beagle breeding establishment?
>
> A: I can understand the peaceful protest and the need for emotion to explain what the protestors are saying. It's still difficult to accept being shouted at.

136. In her witness evidence, Ms Pressick dealt with the, very limited, protest activity at the B&K Site in Hull.

137. Following the ***Wolverhampton*** decision, the Claimants were given the opportunity to file further evidence relevant to their claim for a *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction. Ms Pressick provided a further witness statement, dated 19 March 2024.

(2) Wendy Jarrett

138. The Claimants filed a witness statement for trial, dated 25 January 2023, from Wendy Jarrett, who attended to give evidence. Ms Jarrett is the Chief Executive of Understanding Animal Research ("UAR"). Ms Jarrett explained that UAR is a not-for-profit organisation that exists to explain to the public and policymakers why animals are used in medical and scientific research. UAR is funded by Marshall BioResources, the parent company of the First and Third Claimants; the Medical

Research Council and other bodies including the Wellcome Trust, the British Heart Foundation and Cancer Research.

139. Whilst Ms Jarrett's evidence was generally helpful in explaining the current UK legislation regarding animal research, I struggled to see the relevance that it had to the issues I must decide. Ms Bolton suggested that it was evidence that would explain the harm to medical research in this country were the First (and Third) Defendant to cease trading, thereby interrupting or curtailing the supply of beagles for clinical trials.

140. It was a feature at the trial that it was necessary, on several occasions, to remind Mr Curtin that he was not required (not was it relevant for him) to prove that the use of animals in medical research was "wrong". I appreciate why he feels the need to do so. That is a product of the adversarial process in which Mr Curtin feels the need to defend his actions. But the Claimants do not dispute that he, and the other protestors, have a sincerely held belief that animal testing – and the First and Third Claimant's role in supplying dogs for animal testing – is wrong (see [29] above). By the same token, it is equally irrelevant for the Claimants to attempt, in these proceedings, to show that animal testing is "*right*" or that Mr Curtin's beliefs are "*wrong*". Most of Ms Jarrett's evidence falls into this category, and is irrelevant to the issues that I must decide.

141. Even on the narrow issue identified by Ms Bolton – the consequences to medical research were the First (and Third) Defendants to be put out of business – I struggle to see its relevance. If the Defendants' protest activities are lawful – yet they lead to the First and Third Defendants going out of business – the harm that that might cause (which is highly speculative in any event) is not a basis on which the Court could curtail or limit otherwise lawful acts of protest. If the Defendants' protest activities are unlawful, then the Court will grant appropriate remedies to provide adequate redress whether or not harm might be caused to medical research in this country.

(3) David Manning

142. Mr Manning is employed by the First Claimant. He is a security guard at the Wyton Site. Although Mr Manning has only been employed by the First Claimant since June 2022, he has been a security guard at the site since 2014, having been previously employed by a contractor that used to provide security services at the Wyton Site. The contractor continues to provide other security guards at the site, but Mr Manning is now employed directly by the First Claimant to supervise the security team. As a result of that history, Mr Manning has had a direct involvement with the activities of the protestors from the start. If there is one employee of the First Claimant who has been in the 'front line', it is Mr Manning.

143. In his evidence, Mr Manning noted that because of the escalation of the protests, there is now a need for him to be supported by a security team of between four and ten guards. Mr Manning carries out a risk assessment on a day-to-day basis to determine how many of his team he will need. He also reviews CCTV footage and uses the cameras to monitor the protestors. In his witness statement, Mr Manning has identified the key incidents relied upon by the Claimants by reference to the CCTV footage that is available.

J: The evidence at trial against Mr Curtin

144. Before turning to the individual incidents alleged against Mr Curtin, it is necessary to set them in their context and the overall questioning of Mr Curtin.

145. The protest activities fall, broadly, into what can be called pre- and post-injunction periods. Before the Interim Injunction was granted, the hallmark of the main protest activities was the obstruction, and usually surrounding, of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site. That was done largely to enable the protestors to confront those accessing the Wyton Site with the protest message they wanted to deliver. Mr Curtin described this as the 'ritual'. As part of the 'ritual', protestors would routinely delay entry or exit from the site. The extent of the delay varied. In the worst, pre-injunction incidents, the workers were prevented from accessing the Wyton Site for several hours, but typically the delay was only some minutes. In the Interim Injunction Judgment, I described this as the "*flashpoint*" in the protest activities.

146. After the Interim Injunction was granted, the phenomenon of protestors surrounding vehicles and delaying their access to/from the Wyton Site was largely brought to an end. This was achieved by the imposition of the Exclusion Zone as a temporary measure. After the Interim Injunction, although there are instances where it is alleged that Mr Curtin and others have obstructed vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site, it is nothing on the scale of what had been happening prior to the grant of the Interim Injunction.

(1) The pleaded allegations against Mr Curtin

13 July 2021

147. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) trespassed on the Access Land and obstructed vehicles driven by the First Defendant's employees at the Wyton Site, whilst using a loudhailer to shout at those in the vehicles. Employee F was driving a white Mercedes A Class car, Employee Q was driving a black Volkswagen Polo, Jane Read was driving a green Vauxhall Mokka, and Employee AA was driving a white Seat Ibiza.

148. It is further alleged that Mr Curtin (and others), by their obstruction of the vehicles, interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway from the Wyton Site and caused a public nuisance by obstructing the same vehicles on the public highway.

149. The obstruction of the vehicles and Mr Curtin's use of the loudhailer is alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the employees involved, in particular it is alleged that Mr Curtin shouted at Ms Read: "*leave this place… are you seriously thinking that this time next year you want to be working at this hellhole… it's your choice*".

150. Although witness statements had been filed for Employees AA and Q, they did not give evidence at trial.

151. Employee F gave evidence at trial, and in doing so gave his name because he had been identified by some protestors. For the reasons I have explained, I have decided not to use Employee F's name in this judgment.

152. Employee F had worked at the Wyton Site since around 2015, including for the company that operated the site prior to the First Claimant. In his witness statement, Employee F gave some general evidence about the effect upon him/her of the demonstrations. One of the problems in this case is that the evidence – perhaps naturally – tends to focus upon the actions of "*the protestors*", as a general group, and without always being careful to identify the acts of specific individuals. An individual protestor does not lose the right to demonstrate because of unlawful acts committed by others in the course of the demonstration if the individual in question behaves lawfully: ***Canada Goose -v- Persons Unknown*** **[2020] 1 WLR 417** [99(8)].

153. In one particular paragraph, Employee F stated:

> "During the summer of 2021, the protests outside the Wyton Site became more intense, and it was not possible to enter or exit the Wyton Site safely. In particular, the staff cars trying to enter and exit the Wyton Site were frequently obstructed and surrounded by large groups of protestors. The abuse on particular days and threats and conduct of the Defendants towards me and others working at MBR is referred to in more detail below. It was, however, a terrifying experience entering and exiting the Wyton Site at this time, with protestors standing in front of and surrounding my vehicle on a daily basis, preventing me from freely accessing the Highway from the Wyton Site, or the Wyton Site from the Highway, whilst threatening me and abusing me in an angry and intense manner."

154. Although the wording used in this paragraph of Employee F's witness statement is very similar to that used by Mr Manning, and other witnesses who gave evidence – a point that Mr Curtin highlighted in cross-examination of some of the witnesses – I have no difficulty in accepting that it is an accurate description of what was happening at the Wyton Site in the summer of 2021, before the Interim Injunction was granted. During that period, there were occasions when the protestors were effectively dictating the terms on which people could access and leave the Wyton Site. I also accept that the experience of having their vehicles surrounded by protestors who were shouting at the occupants was frightening for Employee F and others. It is important, however, to isolate the allegedly harassing conduct for which Mr Curtin is responsible.

155. Employee F in his/her witness statement said this about the incident on 13 July 2021:

> "On 13 July 2021 at 15.56 onwards, [various protestors including John Curtin], stood on the Highway and obstructed my vehicle as I sought to travel along the Access Road to the main carriageway of the Highway, having exited the Wyton Site. [John Curtin and two other protestors] stood to the front and side of my car, which prevented me driving freely along the Access Road as there was no clear pathway for my car through the protestors… Two protestors stood on the Access Road directly in front of my car, so that I had to stop for around 45 seconds. While my car was on the Access Road… John Curtin continually shouted at me through a megaphone… [Another protestor] continually shouted at me, leaning into my passenger side window. [A further protestor] held a placard reading: 'STOP ANIMAL TESTING' and took a video recording of my vehicle and those travelling inside. [This protestor] then moved to the front passenger window and continued to take a video recording of those of us travelling inside my car. I have seen the video that [this protestor] was live streaming and, while speaking to those watching his Facebook live video, he can be heard to say 'Do you recognise these

> people? Look.' I understand this statement and recording to be an attempt to identify myself and those travelling with me in my car…"

156. Employee F then described an incident with another protestor in which the protestor represented that the law required Employee F to ask him/her to move out of the way. That was a misapprehension as to the law, but it was one that a police officer in attendance appeared to adopt. Employee F continued:

> "The protestors obstructing my vehicle, filming me and trying to film inside my vehicle and shouting at us made me feel intimidated and anxious and is a huge distraction from concentrating on the road while driving… I felt annoyed that the protestors were delaying me getting home, especially whilst making demands that I gesture to them to move and insisting to the police that they needed to ask me to do that. I also felt stressed prior to leaving the Wyton Site because I knew I would get delayed trying to get out of the Wyton Site, as I usually had to wait for the police to move the protestors out of the way. The protestors were scaring, threatening and intimidating me, and I believe their aim is to stop me coming back to the Wyton Site and to make me get a different job."

157. Employee F was cross examined by Mr Curtin. Employee F was a careful and impressive witness. S/he generally gave considered answers to the questions s/he was asked. I accept his/her evidence. Both in his/her witness statement, and confirmed in cross-examination, Employee F said that, in respect of the pre-injunction phase, s/he was frustrated by the lack of police action and thought that the police could have done more to help the employees entering and leaving the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin asked Employee F about his/her being terrified by the actions of the protestors. Employee F said: "*there's always the aspect of terror because, as far as I'm concerned, the behaviour of the protestors is uncertain*".

158. In cross-examination, Employee F confirmed that, at some point prior to the injunction being granted, anti-terrorism police came to the First Claimant and gave a presentation to the staff. The talk covered issues including car and letter bombs and was designed to support staff and raise awareness. Employee F confirmed that s/he found the information alarming and distressing.

159. In his/her witness statement, Employee F had identified thirteen protestors, including Mr Curtin, by name, whom he was able to identify as having been involved in the protests. S/he said that there were "*other protestors at the Wyton Site who [s/he] recognise by sight, but who are just making their views known, and not doing anything especially 'wrong' (for example, they have never surrounded or obstructed [his/her] car*". Mr Curtin asked Employee F what s/he thought that Mr Curtin had done wrong. Employee F said that there had been times when Mr Curtin had "*verbally abused [him/her] and other colleagues*" by "*name-calling*". Employee F gave as examples of "*monster*" and "*puppy killer*". Employee F believed that this was behaviour was "*wrong*". Mr Curtin asked Employee F whether s/he could appreciate that, in the context of a demonstration, such terms as "*puppy killer*" could be regarded as legitimate. Employee F agreed that "*everyone's entitled to their own opinion*". Nevertheless, Employee F maintained that s/he took the comment personally.

160. Mr Curtin established the following matters with Employee F. Employee F was aware that under the terminal bleeding procedures, some dogs did die at the Wyton Site.

Employee F accepted that Mr Curtin was not responsible for publishing Employee F's photograph online and that he was not responsible for sending abusive messages to Employee F.

161. In her witness statement, relied upon as hearsay evidence by the Claimants, Ms Read described the incident on 13 July 2021 as follows:

> "On 13 July 2021 at 15:56, protestors stood in the Access Road and obstructed the convoy of staff vehicles as we sought to leave the Wyton Site, as shown in Video 24. I was in my green Vauxhall, which was third in the convoy. [Two protestors] stood directly in front of my car as I sought to exit the Wyton Site, causing me to need to stop on the Driveway for around 50 seconds before I was able to slowly pass them; the incident prevented me having free passage along the Access Road and to the main carriageway of the Highway. [One of these protestors] was yelling 'shame on you'. I found [this protestor] very intimidating as he was so in my face and so close to my car. I was shaking by the time I got past him. I just did not know what to expect from him given his behaviour, and I feared for my safety. I also found [the other protestor] very intimidating, as he was so worked up, and seemed to be ranting, and kept making reference to whether I was 'proud' of my job. He did not appear to be acting rationally, so I was worried about what he would do. John Curtin was also standing to the side of my car, whilst using a loudhailer to shout at me. He can be heard yelling 'leave this place...are you seriously thinking that this time next year you want to be working at this hellhole...it's your choice'. I was just trying to ignore him and just drive safely.
>
> In another video of the same incident (Video 22), I can see [another female protestor] standing near the bell mouth of the Access Road and to the side of my car (once I have been able to reach that point) and holding posters to my windows and touching my car. I had to stop the car because of her presence. I was thinking of the traffic ahead, because I was trying to join the main carriageway of the Highway, and that this was a road traffic accident waiting to happen, and I was hoping that [she] would move. I then managed to get away. I remember not being able to see because of all the protestors crowding around my car, and the parked cars at the entrance to the Access Road.
>
> In Video 21, [another protestor] can be seen stepping back and forth in front of my car, looking like he was moving to the side and then stepping back in front of me; his movements made it very difficult to drive past him.
>
> There was also a woman in a baseball cap… standing to the front and side of my car, with a placard."

162. Although Mr Curtin was not able to cross-examine Ms Read, I readily accept the description she gives of the incident because it is corroborated by the video footage.

163. Mr Curtin was cross-examined about this incident by reference to the video footage. Police officers were present during the incident. Mr Curtin disputed that he was obstructing the vehicles leaving the Wyton Site, but I am quite satisfied that – together with the other protestors involved in the incident – he was. Indeed, an essential part of the 'ritual' was delaying and confronting those entering and exiting the Wyton Site with the protestors' message; that was the hallmark of the pre-injunction period. As Mr Curtin accepted in cross-examination, when the vehicles were slowed down or

stopped for a period when leaving or entering the Wyton Site the occupants became a "*captive audience*" to the protest message. He denied that he was intending to harass any of the employees of the First Claimant. He had not threatened any of them. Mr Curtin accepted that he was using a loudhailer. Ms Bolton put it to him that he was "*directing abuse directly at Employee F's car*". Mr Curtin disputed that it was abuse; he stated that he was communicating the protest slogans.

164. Mr Bolton put it to Mr Curtin that he was confronting the employees with his protest message, using a loudhailer, to try and get them to leave their jobs. Mr Curtin answered: "*If they were to leave their job, I'd be pleased for them, but there's no coercion, there's no intimidation, absolutely none*".

165. The video evidence shows that passage out of the Wyton Site was not free. As well as being delayed by those protestors who were standing in front of or near to the vehicles, in turn, each driver, would have had his/her view of the carriageway obstructed by people standing next to his/her vehicle. Mr Curtin accepted in cross-examination that, in this respect, he was inferring with each vehicle's access to the highway. He made clear that that had not been his intention at the time. This was Mr Curtin's reflection upon being asked this question in cross-examination. He said:

> "I'm there, and because I'm there, if I'm standing there as a protestor and I'm in some way impairing a perfect view it I wasn't there, then yes. But these thoughts were not in my mind, and they're more likely – they should have been in the mind of the police officer really… If it had been pointed out to me, I would have been more than happy – because my job that day was to protest and it wasn't to endanger anyone. I wouldn't have wanted that."

And a little later, in answer to Ms Bolton putting to him that he was standing in position which would have obstructed the driver's view to the right when entering the carriageway, Mr Curtin replied:

> "I accept – I don't want to be funny – I'm accepting I'm not transparent. The driver would have to – might have to move their neck out or their head… they should not move onto a highway if they can't see. And if that had been relayed to anyone at the time, it would have been part of the police liaison procedure… My aim here is to protest, and only protest, and do it safely and do it legally and do it well."

166. On closer analysis of the video footage of this incident, it appears that Ms Bolton's point on obstruction of Employee F's view along the carriageway is more theoretical than real. I asked her to identify the moment, on the CCTV, at which she alleged that Mr Curtin was blocking Employee F's view along the carriageway. At the point she identified, a police officer, who was attempting the guide Employee F's vehicle out of the Wyton Site was standing in front of the vehicle. The reality of this situation is that whilst Mr Curtin might have been obstructing, for a matter of moments, Employee F's view down the carriageway, the reality is that his/her attention would have been on the police officer in front of his vehicle. The point had not been explored in Employee F's evidence, so it is difficult to reach any firm conclusions beyond the fact that any obstruction of Employee F's view along the carriageway could only have been for a matter of moments.

167. Mr Curtin also made the point that it was never suggested by any of the police officers present that there was a problem with the way he was demonstrating. He also stated that he was not wilfully obstructing the drivers' view down the carriageway. He was demonstrating. He accepted that the performance of the 'ritual' meant that the cars were held up leaving the Wyton Site.

168. My findings in relation to the pleaded 13 July 2021 incident are:

(1) Mr Curtin trespassed, for a short period, on the Claimant's land.

(2) Mr Curtin (with others) obstructed the vehicles leaving the Wyton Site from gaining access to the highway. As such, Mr Curtin interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway by being part of a group of protestors who stood around and at times in front of the vehicles as they attempted to leave the Wyton Site. The obstruction was short-lived; being no longer than a few minutes. It will have caused only minor inconvenience. Insofar as it is relevant, I am not satisfied that Mr Curtin intended to obstruct vehicle access to the highway when he stood to the side of vehicles. He frankly accepted in cross-examination, that his standing in that position on the carriageway, close to the vehicles, may have meant that the driver of the vehicle's view of the carriageway was temporarily impaired, but I am unable to reach a firm conclusion about that. In any event, had this been the sole basis for the alleged interference with access to the highway, I would have rejected it. But this incident must be considered as a whole and, with others, Mr Curtin did directly obstruct the vehicles leaving the Wyton Site that day. It was the usual 'ritual'.

(3) To the extent that there was any obstruction of the highway in this incident, it did not amount to a public nuisance, particularly having regard to the limited role played by Mr Curtin. The obstruction was temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), it affected only a few private individuals rather than the public generally. The only people affected by the obstruction were the employees of the First Claimant who were leaving the Wyton Site.

(4) The issue of whether Mr Curtin has engaged in a course of conduct involving harassment must be assessed by considering the full extent of the acts upon which the Claimants rely (and I do so below), but in this individual incident the protest message delivered by Mr Curtin was not, either in the words used or the manner in which it was delivered, inherently harassing. Ms Read simply tried to ignore him and did not say that she was caused distress or alarm either by what Mr Curtin shouted at her, or that his method of address was itself harassing. Employee F did not appreciate being called names – like "*monster*" and "*puppy killer*" – by Mr Curtin but he did not suggest that this name-calling had caused him/her distress or alarm. The alarming part of the protestors' behaviour, in Employee F's eyes, was the physical actions of surrounding the vehicles and their general unpredictability; in other words, more a fear of what they *might* do, rather than what that had actually done.

169. In cross-examination, Ms Bolton asked Mr Curtin questions about alleged obstruction of vehicles arriving at the Wyton Site in the morning of 13 July 2021. This was not included in the Claimants' pleaded allegations against Mr Curtin.

17 July 2021

170. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) trespassed on the Access Land and again obstructed vehicles driven by the First Defendant's employees at the Wyton Site, whilst using a loudhailer to shout at those in the vehicles. A former employee was driving a yellow Ford Ka and Employee F was driving a white Mercedes A class.

171. It is further alleged that Mr Curtin (and others), by their obstruction of the vehicles, interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway from the Wyton Site and caused a public nuisance by obstructing the same vehicles on the public highway. The obstruction of the vehicles is also alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the relevant employees by Mr Curtin.

172. Whilst there is CCTV footage of the events, Employee F is the only witness who gave evidence about the incidents on 17 July 2021. Mr Curtin did not challenge Employee F on the detail of his/her account. Employee F stated that Mr Curtin was one of several identified protestors who had obstructed Employee F's vehicle (the second of two vehicles) when he was attempting to leave the Wyton Site. The first vehicle was held up for around 2 minutes before it could pass along the Access Road and onto the highway. Once the leading vehicle had left, the protestors, including Mr Curtin, stood in the middle of the Access Road in front of Employee F's vehicle, causing him to have to stop. He was held there for about a minute after which he was able to edge his vehicle forward – surrounded by protestors – and out onto the highway. During the incident, another protestor identified by Employee F, shouted at him/her "*get another job, get another job… problem solved*". Employee F interpreted this as the protestor threatening him/her and suggesting that s/he should leave his/her job so that s/he would not have to deal with the protestors when coming in and out of work. Mr Curtin is not alleged to have said anything threatening or intimidating to Employee F (or the employee driving the other vehicle) during this incident.

173. Mr Curtin was cross-examined based on the CCTV evidence. This was another pre-injunction incident, and it has the same features of the 'ritual' in action. Mr Curtin accepted that he stood in the path of the vehicles, temporarily preventing them from leaving the Wyton Site. In doing so, he also accepted that he trespassed on the Claimant's land for a brief period. It was clear from Mr Curtin's answers in evidence that, at this stage, he did not believe that he was doing anything wrong in temporarily obstructing the exiting vehicles as part of the 'ritual'. It was clear from his evidence that Mr Curtin did believe, however, that although the 'ritual' did delay the departure of vehicles, it ultimately facilitated their leaving. The alternative, in the early days of the protest, would have been that other protestors would either have blockaded them into the Wyton Site, or totally prevented them from gaining access. To have taken that step, Mr Curtin clearly believed, would simply have invited action by the police, so, in his eyes, the 'ritual' represented a compromise between the protestors and those attempting to gain access to/from the Wyton Site.

174. My findings in relation to the pleaded 17 July 2021 incident are:

(1) Mr Curtin trespassed, for a short period, on the First Claimant's land.

(2) Mr Curtin (with others) obstructed the vehicles leaving the Wyton Site from gaining access to the highway. As such, Mr Curtin interfered with the First

Claimant's common law right of access to the highway by being part of a group of protestors who obstructed the vehicles as they attempted to leave the Wyton Site. The obstruction was short-lived; being measured in a few minutes. It will have caused only minor inconvenience.

(3) To the extent that there was any obstruction of the highway in this incident, it did not amount to a public nuisance, particularly having regard to the limited role played by Mr Curtin. The obstruction was temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), it affected only a few private individuals rather than the public generally. The only people affected by the obstruction were the employees of the First Claimant who were leaving the Wyton Site.

(4) The issue of whether Mr Curtin has engaged in a course of conduct involving harassment must be assessed by considering the full extent of the acts upon which the Claimants rely (and I do so below – see [298]-[308]), but in this individual incident the Claimants rely only on the alleged obstruction as involving harassment, not any shouting at any of the employees by Mr Curtin.

20 July 2021

175. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin trespassed on the Driveway and banged on the Gate and shouted, "*open the fucking gate to get the workers in*".

176. In cross-examination, Mr Curtin did not dispute that during this incident he did set foot on the First Claimant's land. As such, he has admitted an incident of trespass on the First Claimant's land.

25 July 2021

177. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin caused a public nuisance on the highway by parking a Vauxhall Corsa on the Access Road, such that the Access Road was impassable for vehicles, including those driven by the First Claimant's staff. The obstruction of the vehicles is also alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the relevant employees by Mr Curtin and to have interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway from the Wyton Site.

178. On this occasion, as is apparent from the CCTV footage, a large number of dog crates can be seen piled up in front of the gates to the Wyton Site causing an obstruction to those entering or leaving. It is right to note that police officers are in attendance, and they did not think that action needed to be taken in respect of the dog crates.

179. Mr Curtin was cross-examined about this incident by reference to the CCTV footage. Mr Curtin accepted that he was driving the Vauxhall Corsa, and that it was parked on the Access Road between 12.01pm and 4.45pm, and then again from 4.57pm to 5.52pm. Mr Curtin denied that his vehicle, and where it was parked, caused an obstruction of the highway. He made the point that, had he obstructed the highway, the police would have intervened. He said that if anyone had asked him to move the vehicle he would have done so.

180. My findings in relation to the pleaded 13 July 2021 incident are:

(1) By parking his car on the Access Road, Mr Curtin did obstruct the highway. However, this was wholly technical. There is no evidence that anyone was *actually* obstructed by the vehicle. The placing of the dog crates on the Access Road was arguably more of an obstruction in this incident, and I am surprised that the police allowed this to take place. Nevertheless, even the placing of the dog crates represented only a temporary obstruction. The Claimants do not hold Mr Curtin responsible for the alleged obstruction created by the placing of the dog crates on the Access Road.

(2) To the extent that there was any obstruction of the highway in this incident, it did not amount to a public nuisance. The obstruction was temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), there is no evidence that anyone was actually obstructed still less that the obstruction affected the public generally.

(3) The incident did not involve any arguable harassment of the First Claimant's employees.

9 August 2021

181. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) trespassed on the Access Land and obstructed vehicles leaving the Wyton Site. A white Nissan Duke, driven by a contractor, was obstructed.

182. It is further alleged that Mr Curtin (and others), by their obstruction of the vehicles, interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway from the Wyton Site and caused a public nuisance by obstructing the same vehicles on the public highway. The obstruction of the vehicles is also alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the relevant employees by Mr Curtin.

183. Mr Curtin was not cross-examined about this incident. I make no findings about it.

12 August 2021

184. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) stood on, and slow walked along, the Access Road and the main carriageway and obstructed vehicles driven by the First Claimant's staff; a white Vauxhall Astra, driven by Employee V; a black Volkswagen Polo, driven by Employee Q, a white Ford car, driven by Employee P; and a white Mercedes A Class, driven by Employee F.

185. It is further alleged that Mr Curtin (and others), by their obstruction of the vehicles, interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway from the Wyton Site.

186. Employee F gave evidence about this incident. On this occasion, Mr Curtin had what was described as a tambourine-style drum. By reference to the CCTV footage, Employee F gave the following description:

> "Each of [the] protestors stood in the Access Road so as to block the convoy of cars in which I was driving the fourth and last car. The protestors then slow walked, and occasionally stopped, along the Access Road and the highway so that the convoy could only pass along the highway at a very slow speed… Once we had

> travelled about 30 meters along the highway, we were able to drive past the protestors and travel home). Police officers formed a line either side of the convoy of cars to stop protestors from approaching staff cars from the side and rear, and walked the cars out onto the highway. It felt surreal having a police escort; it was like being in a film. The police escort was out of the ordinary, and not something that would usually happen during the protests, so it made me feel uncomfortable as this clearly was not an ordinary event, but on the other hand, their presence also enhanced the sense that this was not a safe situation to be in. The feeling of danger from the protestors makes me feel anxious and stressed. I just wanted to get out of the situation and go home so I did not have to deal with it anymore."

187. Mr Curtin put to Employee F that the protestors had mimicked a slow-paced funeral march when the employees left the Wyton Site. Employee F agreed with the description. Mr Curtin asked Employee F whether his/her emotion on this occasion was between terror and frustration. Employee F answered: "*Again, terror is still there in the back of your minds. We were unaware of how they could behave at any point… frustration played a big part it in because we just wanted to go home*". Employee F said that the number of police present on this occasion did not reduce the level of terror; s/he said it made it more surreal. Mr Curtin asked whether, at the point Employee F was giving evidence, some 20-22 months further on, the level of terror had diminished. Employee F replied: "*Since the injunction has been in place, I would say that my level of terror has dropped, yes, but there is still the thought something could happen…*"

188. Employee F, in his/her evidence, spoke more generally of the impact of the injunction, granted on 10 November 2021, which imposed an exclusion zone around the entrance to the Wyton Site:

> "The change in the protestors' behaviour since the grant of the November 2021 Injunction has been, at times, limited. Although the introduction of an exclusion zone did reduce the quantity of protestors on the Access Road and around the Gate, it also meant that the obstructing of cars just happens outside of the exclusion zone. Often protestors wait on the boundary of the exclusion zone, or slightly further along the main carriageway of the Highway and intercept cars there instead. It feels like protestors believe that, once staff vehicles are out of the exclusion zone, they can do whatever they like. The exclusion zone is a safety zone and once me and the other MBR staff are out of it, we are fending for ourselves…"

189. Ms Bolton cross-examined Mr Curtin about this incident. Ms Bolton suggested to Mr Curtin that his actions, with the other protestors, had delayed the employees leaving the Wyton Site getting out onto the carriageway. Although Mr Curtin stated that this was part of the 'ritual' he did not disagree with Ms Bolton. He said: "*I make no apologies for the funeral march… and I think it's a good thing we did the funeral march. The protest happened and the workers got home safely*". Again, it became apparent in his cross-examination that Mr Curtin believed that the limited obstruction of the employees leaving the Wyton Site was an accommodation that enabled them, ultimately, to leave the site albeit with some minor delay. In answer to a question from Ms Bolton that he and the other protestors had interfered with the First Claimant's employees' free passage along the highway, Mr Curtin answered:

> "There is a protest by its nature that interferes with the surrounding area by being there, but it's – the idea of the funeral march was exactly to have as free passage

> as possible, without unruly demonstrators kicking cars or doing something off their own bat. There's a joint enterprise here between the police [and] the protestors… even though it's slower, it's better than driving through a mob".

190. Ms Bolton put to Mr Curtin that the staff could not simply pass by the protest, he (and others) had held them up and they had to endure the protest. Mr Curtin answered: "*For a temporary and relatively tiny amount of time*".

191. My findings in relation to the pleaded 12 August 2021 incident are:

(1) Mr Curtin (with others) obstructed the vehicles leaving the Wyton Site from gaining access to the highway. As such, Mr Curtin interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway by being part of a group of protestors who stood around and at times in front of the vehicles as they attempted to leave the Wyton Site. The obstruction was short-lived; being measured in a few minutes. It will have caused only minor inconvenience.

(2) To the extent that there was any obstruction of the highway in this incident, it did not amount to a public nuisance. The obstruction was temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), it affected only a limited number of private individuals rather than the public generally. The only people affected by the obstruction were the employees of the First Claimant who were delayed leaving the Wyton Site for a few minutes.

15 August 2021

192. The events that took place on 15 August 2021, although significant in relation to the claim against "Persons Unknown", were not relied upon by the Claimants to advance any specific claim against Mr Curtin. Mr Curtin had relied upon this incident as demonstrating his role in attempting to calm the demonstrators and to ensure that they kept their protest within lawful bounds. By the 15 August 2021, Mr Curtin accepted, it was generally known amongst the protestors that the Claimants were intending to apply for an interim injunction.

193. As usual, there is video evidence available to demonstrate what happened on 15 August 2021. It was an event of a different order and scale from the 'rituals', as Mr Curtin called them. A large demonstration had been arranged for 15 August 2021, organised by Free the MBR Beagles (see Interim Injunction Judgment [22(10)]. It lasted most of the day, finishing at between 4-5pm. At its height, it was estimated to have been attended by around 250 demonstrators. There was a suggestion that up to 5 people had been arrested by the police (see Interim Injunction Judgment [17(17)]).

194. The number of people in attendance at this protest meant that, at times, the carriageway outside the Wyton Site was blocked and became impassable; indeed, for some period it may have been closed by the police. The morning arrival of the staff in the usual convoy of vehicles was being managed by the police, who had held back the vehicles some distance from the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin's evidence was that his intention was to facilitate the arrival of the staff at the Wyton Site. In one section of the recordings, Mr Curtin can be heard asking other protestors to show discipline. Ms Bolton put it to him that he was doing so because of the impending injunction application. Mr Curtin disagreed that was the sole reason, but accepted that it was a factor:

> "What I am dealing with there is we've got loads of volatile people around. It's going to be a big demo day, let's get the workers in… [The injunction] is a factor. We've got a lot of people coming today, a lot of people who have maybe never been there. I wanted to show … each other that we're able to not act as everyone for themselves, an unruly mob. There's many factors why I said that and the injunction is only one of those factors…"

195. The vehicles of the staff were guided into the Wyton Site by the police. Mr Curtin can be seen to be using a loud hailer trying to clear the way.

196. Ms Bolton then played the footage of the vehicles leaving at the end of the day. In contrast to the arrival of the vehicles, the protestors engaged in a substantial obstruction, and it took significant police intervention and a long time to enable the vehicles to leave. Vehicles were struck and apparently damaged by protestors. Mr Curtin said that, by this stage of the day, he had withdrawn and gone back to his tent. He had become disillusioned with some of the protest activities, and he had also been unable to communicate with the police. He said that he had attempted to speak to two of the usual police liaison officers, but that they had told him that it was out of their hands, and was being handled by a senior officer. Mr Curtin said he was not supportive of what some protestors had done that afternoon.

197. It was not apparent to me, given the absence of any allegation made against Mr Curtin in the Claimants' case against him, the purpose of the cross-examination of Mr Curtin. I asked Ms Bolton whether she challenged Mr Curtin's evidence that he was not present in the afternoon when the protestors effectively blockaded the Wyton Site for perhaps up to 2 hours and then used physical violence towards the vehicles when they did exit. Ms Bolton said that she was suggesting that Mr Curtin had failed to take a role in facilitating the staff leaving the Wyton Site in a similar way that he had done for their arrival earlier in the day. I do not find that criticism has any force. Mr Curtin is not responsible for the actions of other protestors. It is unreal to suggest that, on this day, Mr Curtin could have prevented what the police were unable to prevent. He did not join with or encourage the violent actions of a very small minority of the protestors. I accept Mr Curtin's evidence that he did not support them and that he thought they were counterproductive. As the Claimants do not allege any wrongdoing on the part of Mr Curtin, there is nothing more that I need to add.

198. The relevance of the events on 15 August 2021 is to the claim made in relation to "Persons Unknown" (see [325] below). This was a rare instance where the evidence does show that the scale and duration of the obstruction of the carriageway outside the Wyton Site may arguably have amounted to a public nuisance.

4 September 2021

199. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin trespassed on the Driveway and approached the open Gate where he is alleged to have shouted abuse at the First Claimant's security staff.

200. In cross-examination, Mr Curtin accepted that he set foot again on the First Claimant's land. He disputed that he knew he was trespassing at the time, but as trespass does not require any particular state of mind, no purpose is served by resolving this further issue.

201. My finding in relation to the pleaded 4 September 2021 incident is that Mr Curtin trespassed, for a few moments, on the First Claimant's land.

6 September 2021

202. The Claimants allege the Mr Curtin (and others) repeatedly trespassed on the Access Land and obstructed a white van attempting to enter the Wyton Site.

203. Further, it is alleged that Mr Curtin (and others) caused a public nuisance by obstructing the white van's passage along the carriageway. The obstruction of the vehicle is also alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the driver by Mr Curtin.

204. Although this incident was witnessed by Mr Manning, the principal evidence relied upon by the Claimants is the video footage, captured by CCTV.

205. Mr Manning called the police to ask for assistance at 13.38. Mr Manning told the driver of the van that the police had been called. There is no evidence from the driver of the vehicle. There is no suggestion that he was subject to any abuse.

206. The video evidence shows the arrival of the white van at the gates of the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin quickly arrives on the scene. At some point, prior to the grant of the Interim Injunction, the protestors had taken to placing banners (with protest messages) around the entrance to the Wyton Site. On some occasions, and visible in the forage for this incident, a banner was placed across the front of the gates, which would have needed to be removed before any vehicle could gain access to the Wyton Site.

207. Ms Bolton cross-examined Mr Curtin about the incident. Mr Curtin stated that the protestors were always concerned when white vans turned up, as the vehicles used to transport the dogs were often white vans. Mr Curtin said that he would usually want to inquire with the van driver who s/he was and what s/he was doing. He accepted that protestors were standing in front of the van. Mr Curtin said that he would often offer a leaflet to the drivers of vehicles who were not employees of the First Claimant to attempt to spread the message about the protest. Mr Curtin accepted that the length of time that a vehicle might be held up at the gate might depend on the attitude of the driver. He also accepted that, on this occasion, the vehicle had been obstructed from entering the Wyton Site. On the evidence, that was for about 6 minutes. Mr Curtin was, however, frank that he could not prevent vehicles accessing the site. He thought that, if he did that, he would get arrested. He wanted to avoid arrest because that would put him at risk of being subject to bail conditions that might include a prohibition on his attending the Wyton Site, which would have curtailed his ability to protest. The best he said he could achieve was to delay the arrival, to attempt to find out the purpose of the person's visit and to hope to convey information about the protest, either by conversation or by handing over a leaflet. To Mr Curtin's mind, there was no question that the vehicle would end up going into the Wyton Site, but he would attempt to engage the driver in conversation.

208. In answer to some questions from me, Mr Curtin confirmed that the banners were a regular fixture at this stage of the protest, although on occasions the police might ask them to remove some banners if they were obstructing the view down the highway. He said that the banner, "*Gates of Hell*", which was placed across the main gate was

taken down each time a vehicle needed to gain access to/from the Wyton Site. I asked Mr Curtin whether the First Claimant had ever asked the protestors to remove the banner that was placed across the main gate. He answered that it had not. Ms Bolton challenged this. It is not a point I need to resolve.

209. My findings in relation to the pleaded 6 September 2021 incident are:

(1) Mr Curtin trespassed, for a short period, on the First Claimant's land.

(2) Mr Curtin (with others) obstructed the white van seeking to enter the Wyton Site. The obstruction was short-lived; lasting about 6 minutes. At worst, it could have caused only minor inconvenience to the driver of the vehicle, but there is no evidence that he was inconvenienced at all.

(3) To the extent that there was any obstruction of the highway in this incident, it did not amount to a public nuisance. The obstruction was temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), it affected only one individual rather than the public generally.

(4) The incident is not even arguably capable of amounting to harassment, applying the legal test I have set out above.

8 September 2021

210. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) trespassed on the Access Land and obstructed vehicles seeking to enter the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin is alleged to have obstructed a white Volvo XC60, driven by the First Claimant's Production Manager ("the Production Manager"); a white Vauxhall Astra, driven by Employee V; a silver Kia Sorento, driven by Employee B; a white Skoda Fabia, driven by Employee AA; a grey Vauxhall Corsa, driven by Employee J; a white Ford motor car, driven by Employee P; a blue Ford Kuga; and a grey Honda Civic, driven by Employee I ("the First Incident").

211. It is further alleged that Mr Curtin (and others), by their obstruction of the vehicles in the First Incident, interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway from the Wyton Site and caused a public nuisance by obstructing the same vehicles on the public highway.

212. Later that same morning ("the Second Incident"), the Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) caused a further public nuisance by obstructing a grey pickup truck towing a trailer, being driven by an employee of the First Claimant. The vehicle was delivering dog crates to the Wyton Site, and it is alleged that Mr Curtin obstructed the vehicle by approaching the front driver's side of the vehicle, causing it to stop. It is alleged that a further public nuisance was caused when Mr Curtin (and others) obstructed the same vehicle as it attempted to exit the Wyton Site a little time later. The obstruction of the vehicles, on both occasions, is also alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the drivers of the relevant vehicles by Mr Curtin.

213. In the final incident that day, in the afternoon, the Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) caused a further public nuisance by obstructing the highway for several vehicles driven by the Production Manager, Employee AA and Employee A which were

attempting to leave the Wyton Site ("the Third Incident"). The obstruction of the vehicles is also alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the relevant employees by Mr Curtin and an interference with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway.

214. The Production Manager and Employees B, J and V gave evidence at trial. The Claimants relied upon the evidence of Employees I and P in relation to this incident as hearsay.

215. In respect of the First Incident:

(1) the Production Manager's witness statement does not contain any evidence relating to an alleged obstruction of his/her vehicle entering the Wyton Site on 8 September 2021;

(2) Employee AA's witness statement does allege that Mr Curtin was part of the group of protestors involved in the First Incident. The evidence is limited to the allegation that Mr Curtin held a placard inches from his/her vehicle and shouted abuse, the content of which is not specified. Employee AA's evidence does not state, in terms, that Mr Curtin obstructed his/her vehicle; and

(3) Employees B, I, J, P and V's witness statements also allege that Mr Curtin was part of the group of protestors involved in the First Incident. Employee B was driving the third vehicle in the convoy. S/he states that Mr Curtin stood on the Access Road with a placard "*to the front and side of my car*". Employee I states that s/he was obstructed by Mr Curtin and another protestor both of whom stood "*to the front and side of my vehicle as I drove along the Access Road*" towards the gate. Employee I felt intimidated by the protestors' actions. Employee P was the fifth car in the convoy. S/he said that Mr Curtin had held a placard in front of his/her window as s/he drove by. Employee V was driving the second vehicle in the convoy and said that s/he felt frightened during the incident.

216. Mr Curtin was cross-examined about most of these incidents. In respect of the First Incident, Mr Curtin accepted that he had trespassed on the First Claimant's land, but stated that he was not aware that he was trespassing at the time. Ms Bolton did not ask Mr Curtin any questions in cross-examination about the alleged obstruction of vehicles entering the Wyton Site during the First Incident.

217. In relation to the Second Incident, the CCTV evidence shows that the van is forced to stop on the highway. Mr Curtin stood next to the vehicle and other protestors were standing either in the main carriageway or in the Access Road. Mr Curtin can be seen talking to the driver of the vehicle. The driver has not given evidence. Mr Curtin thought that he would simply have been engaging the driver in the usual conversation about the purpose of his/her visit and whether s/he was aware of the business of the First Claimant.

218. About 10 minutes later, the same van then attempts to leave the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin accepted that he and a few other protestors had obstructed the exit of the vehicle from the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin made the point that he had disconnected the banner to allow the vehicle to leave. He said that he had personally stood in the front of the vehicle only because he was concerned about a risk to the dog that was present. Mr Curtin accepted

that he had again tried to engage the driver in conversation as s/he left when another protestor stood in front of the vehicle.

219. In relation to the Third Incident, Mr Curtin accepted that he had been part of the protestor group who had obstructed vehicles leaving the Wyton Site as part of the daily 'ritual'. The evidence shows that the effect of the obstruction was short-lived and – after a few minutes of delay – the vehicles made their way off along the highway. There is no evidence that anything harassing was shouted at the employees on this occasion.

220. My findings in relation to the three pleaded incidents on 8 September 2021 incident are:

(1) During the First Incident, Mr Curtin trespassed on the First Claimant's land and (with others) obstructed the vehicles of several employees who were attempting to enter the Wyton Site. The obstruction was short-lived; being measured only in minutes. At worst, it could have caused only minor inconvenience to each driver.

(2) The two occasions of obstruction of the grey truck entering and later leaving the Wyton Site that make up the Second Incident were also short-lived, measured only in minutes. Again, if it caused any inconvenience to the driver (as to which there is no evidence) it could only have been trivial. The obstruction on these occasions could not remotely be described as harassing conduct (whether on its own or in combination with any other of the acts alleged against Mr Curtin).

(3) During the Third Incident, Mr Curtin (with others) obstructed the vehicles leaving the Wyton Site from gaining access to the highway. As such, Mr Curtin interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway by being part of a group of protestors who stood around and at times in front of the vehicles as they attempted to leave the Wyton Site. The obstruction was short-lived; being measured in a few minutes. It will have caused only minor inconvenience. I do not accept that the actions of Mr Curtin in obstructing the vehicles were inherently harassing in nature (or had any elements that would mark them out as harassing)

(4) To the extent that there was any obstruction of the highway in any of these incidents, on no occasion did the obstruction amount to a public nuisance. The obstruction on each occasion was temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), it affected only the specific individuals involved rather than the public generally.

13 September 2021

221. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) trespassed on the Access Land and obstructed vehicles attempting to leave the Wyton Site. Employee C was driving a black Kia Sportage and Employee B was driving a silver Kia vehicle.

222. About an hour later, it is alleged that Mr Curtin (and others) trespassed on the same land and obstructed further vehicles, attempting to leave the Wyton Site: a white Volvo XC60 driven by the Production Manager, a white Skoda car driven by Employee AA and a blue Volkswagen driven by Employee A.

223. Both incidents are alleged to be an interference with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway and part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the relevant employees.

224. In addition to the CCTV footage, the Production Manager and Employees A and B gave evidence at the trial. The Claimants relied upon the evidence of Employee C as hearsay.

225. The Production Manager was the driver of one of the vehicles whose exit from the Wyton Site was obstructed by the protestors on this day. The Production Manager identified Mr Curtin as one of the protestors and said that s/he felt that Mr Curtin's pointing at him/her was threatening: "*I was scared that he might know who I was, and he was attacking me personally (even though I was wearing a balaclava and sunglasses…)*". The Production Manager said that Mr Curtin's actions made him/her feel anxious about his/her safety.

226. Employee A stated that Mr Curtin stood to the front and side of his/her vehicle, pointed at Employee A and shouted through a loudhailer "*Shame on you! Where do you tell people you work?*". Mr Curtin's actions of pointing at Employee A made him/her feel worried for his/her safety. The sound of the loudhailer so close to the car's window was alarming.

227. Employee B stated that, as s/he was attempting to leave the Wyton Site, protestors blocked the road. Employee B recognised Mr Curtin, who had a loudhailer. Mr Curtin and another protestor stood in front of the car in front of Employee B's vehicle, causing both vehicles to stop. Employee B said that s/he felt "*very scared and shaky*" as s/he was worried about what the protestors were going to do to the vehicles. S/he found it stressful and intimidating, particularly because there were no police or security personnel present. Employee B recalled hearing Mr Curtin shout, using the loudhailer: "*here comes the shit shovellers… hold them back*". He was also yelling: "*shame on you!*".

228. Employee C was attempting to leave the Wyton Site on the same occasion. S/he was unable to do so for a time because his/her exit was blocked by the protestors, one of whom was Mr Curtin. Employee C considered that Mr Curtin was organising the protestors because, as the vehicles were waiting to leave the Wyton Site, Mr Curtin used his loudhailer to address the other protestors and he said: "*For those who haven't been here before, the workers are coming out now. The shit shovellers. And … because of an injunction and the police, the idea is to stand here, hold them back, keep moving and they'll get to the road, and they'll go off.*" Mr Curtin then removed the banners that were placed over the main gate and a line of protestors then stood in the path of the vehicles. Mr Curtin used his loudhailer to address the protestors: "*Move back!*" and then addressing the employees in the vehicles: "*Puppy killers… Shame on you. You're scandalous! Have you noticed, have you noticed what everyone thinks about you now the secret's out… Where do you tell people you work, puppy killer!*"

229. Employee C said that s/he felt intimidated during the incident: "*I was hostage to the protestors in front of my car*".

230. After the incident, Employee C made a report to the police complaining that Mr Curtin had struck her car. Mr Curtin was apparently prosecuted, and Employee C attended to

give evidence. Little further information is given about the charge, but Employee C confirmed in his/her witness statement that Mr Curtin was acquitted.

231. Ms Bolton cross-examined Mr Curtin about this incident. She suggested to him that, in his address to the other protestors, he had made plain that the purpose was to obstruct the workers leaving the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin accepted that, as part of the 'ritual' they were going to be held up "*to some degree*" but there was not going to be a blockade: "*We're going to have a demonstration. They're going to look at our banners, and they're going to go home*". He wanted the other protestors to observe the 'ritual', rather than lashing out at the employees' vehicles. Mr Curtin accepted that the video evidence showed him standing in front of a vehicle. Mr Curtin accepted that he hoped that the protest activities against the First Claimant would lead to it being closed down. He denied that his protest was targeting workers to get them to leave their jobs. He denied that the protest methods adopted by him and others at Camp Beagle had sought to target individual employees.

232. In cross-examination, Ms Bolton did not pursue the allegation that Mr Curtin was guilty of trespass in this incident.

233. My findings in relation to the incident on 13 September 2021 are:

(1) Mr Curtin (with others) obstructed the vehicles leaving the Wyton Site from gaining access to the highway. As such, Mr Curtin interfered with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway by being part of a group of protestors who stood around and at times in front of the vehicles as they attempted to leave the Wyton Site. The obstruction was short-lived; being measured in a few minutes. It will have caused only minor inconvenience.

(2) The obstruction of the highway in this incident did not amount to a public nuisance. The obstruction on each occasion was temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), it affected only the specific individuals involved rather than the public generally.

(3) I state my conclusions below ([298]-[308]) on whether, taken with other incidents, the events on 13 September 2021 amount to a course of conduct by Mr Curtin that involves harassment of the employees of the First Defendant. However, looked at in isolation, I am not persuaded that Mr Curtin's behaviour in this incident crossed the line from unattractive, even unreasonable, to that which is oppressive and unacceptable.

22 September 2021

234. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) caused a public nuisance by obstructing the highway for an Anglian Water vehicle that was attempting to leave the Wyton Site. Specifically, Mr Curtin is alleged to have stood in front of the vehicle and instructed other protestors to do similarly. The obstruction of this vehicle is also alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the driver by Mr Curtin and an interference with the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway.

235. Apart from the narrative in Ms Pressick's witness statement (which is simply a commentary on the CCTV footage) the evidence relating to this incident comes solely

from the CCTV footage. There is no evidence from the driver of the Anglian Water van.

236. Mr Curtin was cross-examined about this incident. Mr Curtin agreed that he had stood in front of the vehicle as it attempted to leave the Wyton Site. He explained that he had wanted to give the driver of the vehicle a leaflet about the protest. The video footage shows that once the vehicle had stopped, Mr Curtin approached the driver's window. As he did so, another protestor stood in front of the vehicle to prevent it from driving off. The driver refused to lower his window. Mr Curtin's recollection was that the driver was not interested in taking a leaflet. The incident then appears to escalate, with more protestors being drawn towards the vehicle. It appears from the footage that another protestor then places what may well be a leaflet under the windscreen wiper of the vehicle. Mr Curtin accepted that he could not force the driver to accept a leaflet, but he also recognised that the incident "*got out of hand*". It is apparent that the driver wants to leave, and the vehicle moves incrementally forward. Mr Curtin said that the driver was revving his engine, being obnoxious and "*winding people up*". This, Mr Curtin said, inflamed the situation. Mr Curtin can be heard saying "*take a leaflet, you buffoon*" at some point. Mr Curtin stood in front of the vehicle and used a phone to photograph or record the driver. He said, in evidence, "*I'm wound up by his behaviour. So, I'm allowed to be a human being too. I can get wound up with someone's obnoxious behaviour, what I consider obnoxious… I had no intention whatsoever of holding an Anglian Water man up for any longer than a second to take the leaflet.*"

237. The incident did not end there. Confronted by the protestors, who refused to move, the driver of the Anglian Water van then reversed back into the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin said that this was not his intention: "*My little plan to give the guy a leaflet ended up as a bit of a ten-minute debacle*". Mr Curtin said that the incident had escalated because another protestor had claimed that the driver had attempted to run her over, and word had spread amongst the protestors: "*Things like this can really quickly escalate*".

238. My findings in relation to the incident on 13 September 2021 are:

    (1) Mr Curtin (with others) obstructed the Anglian Water vehicle leaving the Wyton Site from gaining access to the highway. This was a more significant obstruction than had become typical in the 'ritual', and it forced the driver of the vehicle to retreat. It is perfectly apparent from the footage that the incident escalates. The protestors – including Mr Curtin – bear some responsibility for this escalation. Mr Curtin appeared to accept his responsibility this part when he gave evidence; he clearly regretted that things had got out of hand. Nevertheless, the driver of the Anglian Water vehicle also plays a part in the escalation, principally in the manner he edged his vehicle forward when there were protestors standing in front of the vehicle. That act significantly contributed to the escalation, with the protestors feeling aggrieved at what they perceived to be an aggressive act. Standing back, and judging the matter objectively, this incident is fairly trivial. In total, the driver of the Anglian Water vehicle was delayed for 10-15 minutes leaving the Wyton Site. There was some shouting. There is no evidence of any damage having been caused to the vehicle, and the Claimants have called no evidence from the driver as to whether he was caused distress or alarm in the incident. No-one apparently considered that the incident should be reported to the police.

(2) Such obstruction of the highway as there was in this incident did not amount to a public nuisance. Although the obstruction of the vehicle on this occasion was longer than had typically been the case in the 'rituals' it was temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), it affected only a single driver rather than the public generally.

(3) Although this incident has been pleaded against Mr Curtin as part of a course of conduct involving harassment, in my judgment it is incapable of supporting the harassment claim. There is no evidence from the driver of the vehicle that Mr Curtin's conduct caused him distress or alarm. I am not persuaded that Mr Curtin's behaviour in this incident crossed the line from unattractive, even unreasonable, to that which is oppressive and unacceptable. At worst, Mr Curtin's role in the episode can be described as regrettable, as I think he accepted when he gave evidence.

10 April 2022 and 7 May 2022

239. I shall take these two incidents together, because they amount, essentially, to a single complaint. The Claimants allege that, on 10 April 2022, Mr Curtin placed a CCTV camera (or similar device) on a mast erected outside the Wyton Site and, on 7 May 2022, Mr Curtin (and another unidentified male) placed a CCTV camera (or similar device) on a container within Camp Beagle. It is alleged that these cameras were positioned and used to monitor the activities of the First Claimant's staff. Mr Curtin's activities are alleged to be part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the First Claimant's staff.

240. The Claimants' evidence as to the positioning of the cameras in these incidents is CCTV footage, and Mr Curtin does not dispute that he was one of those who was involved in the siting of the relevant camera in each incident.

241. None of the Claimants' witnesses gave evidence regarding the siting of and use of the cameras in the two incidents complained of by the Claimant. There is therefore no evidence that any of them was caused distress or alarm at what Mr Curtin was alleged to have done. Instead, the Claimants relied upon the evidence of several witnesses as to their fears about being filmed/photographed. In her closing submissions, Ms Bolton identified the following:

(1) Mr Markou said:

> "Around this time (summer 2021) the protestors were very active on social media and would upload videos from their protests at the Wyton Site, as well as 'live stream' from outside the Wyton Site on Facebook. As I explain below, it was very invasive and caused me distress that images of my (albeit covered) face and vehicle were being uploaded to public social media sites where I could then potentially be identified and targeted. I knew (from reading articles online and speaking to other colleagues) that some of the protestors ([one] in particular [not Mr Curtin]) had criminal records in relation to activities that they had undertaken in the course of earlier protests, and this made me fear for my own safety even more as I didn't know what they were capable of. I have taken every single step I can to protect my identity, and I fear for my own safety if I am recognised by the protestors.

> Since the protests began, I have always been really worried about being identified by the protestors and then being targeted outside of work at my own home. Sadly, targeting at home has happened to a few of my colleagues who have been identified by the protestors, including Employee L (who had their house vandalised), Employee Q (who had their car vandalised outside of their parents' house), Employee K (who also had their car vandalised) and Dave Manning (who has been approached and abused in public, and had his house vandalised as well). I fear that the same will happen to me if I am identified by the protestors.
>
> As I set out below, I was also followed by protestors on 1 August 2021, a protestor took a photo of me through my car window whilst I was stationary at traffic lights. This image was then uploaded to the Camp Beagle Facebook group but thankfully the image quality was not very good, and the image could not reasonably be used to identify me. Nonetheless, this was a scary experience and has caused me a significant amount of anxiety about being recognised ever since."

(2) Ms Read said:

> "When driving to and from the Wyton Site, I would wear particular clothes and accessories to disguise my identity. I would wear dark glasses, a face mask, and have my hood up. I wore these clothes and accessories so that the protestors could not identify me. The Production Manager and I also advised staff to cover up as much as possible, to disguise their identity.
>
> I was anxious to disguise my identity because I did not want my face posted on social media. On 22 April 2021, the Production Manager and I identified that the protestors had published on social media footage of staff the Wyton Site whilst they working, which appeared to be taken from a camera hidden in the fence line at the Wyton Site. This behaviour continued, with the protestors then trying to film or photograph us as we entered and exited the Wyton Site every day, and posting images and videos on social media for anyone to identify us. The most prudent thing is to cover yourself from head to toe.
>
> Even though I have experienced many protests at the Wyton Site, I have never worn a disguise before, as I did not feel as at risk with previous protestors that protested at the Wyton Site. The historic protestors would usually notify police in advance of a big protest, so we could plan accordingly. Now the protests are 24/7 and can never be avoided. In the historic protests, the protestors were not interested in the staff as individuals, and they would not harass or target individual people like the current protestors do. Social media was not existent or not as prevalent as it currently is, so the protestors were not able to as easily share the identities of employees. Now the protestors seem to be protesting not only against MBR as a company, but also against the specific individuals that work for the company."

(3) Employee A said:

> "Initially, when arriving in convoy, we would drive in our own cars. However, on a date I cannot remember, we started to car share to reduce the

> number of cars entering and exiting the Wyton Site. Car sharing also meant that we could provide physical and emotional support to each other, and I felt more comfortable and slightly safer by having more people in the car with me, rather than being isolated on my own and in my car…
>
> Car sharing was helpful as when I was in my own car, and the protestors surrounded me (which happened often), it was incredibly scary, intimidating and harassing. I felt nervous and bullied. The intimidation and feeling of being personally targeted was heightened by the protestors holding the car captive by surrounding it, making a lot of noise, by playing drums and shouting threateningly, and filming me. I was scared that the protestors might smash the windows of the car, slash the tyres or damage the car in some way. It was helpful to have the emotional support of those with me in the car."

242. Whilst this evidence gives an insight into the fears of some of the employees, it provides little (if any) support for the particular claim advanced against Mr Curtin concerning his siting of the two cameras. First, the evidence of these three witnesses, particularly that of Ms Read, fails to distinguish between Mr Curtin's actions and the methods practised by different protestors. The evidence shows that *some* protestors have adopted a strategy of filming or photographing the employees. Others have not. Of those that have, some of them – a small minority – appear to have posted a small number of images on social media. Not all protestors adopt these methods. Only some protestors – again a small minority – have directed their protests at individual workers. Importantly, the Claimants do not suggest that Mr Curtin has adopted any of these tactics. Mr Curtin is not to be judged by the conduct of other protestors. If there is a complaint about such conduct, it is better dealt with on a direct basis by seeking to identify and take steps against the individuals concerned. I appreciate that many of the workers *feel* that they are being personally targeted by the protestors, but save for a few isolated incidents – which in all probability amount to criminal offences – the vast majority of protestors are not targeting any individual worker. Perhaps of most importance for the case against Mr Curtin, the Claimants do not allege that he has been targeting individual workers.

243. Mr Curtin was cross-examined about the allegations that his act of siting these two cameras was part of a campaign of harassment against the employees. In relation to the camera positioned outside the main gate of the Wyton Site, Mr Curtin said that it had been the idea of another protestor to place a camera. He had hoped that it might enable the footage to be "*beamed across the world*". The device was a "Ring" camera and this apparently meant that anyone with the relevant password could log in and view the livestream from the camera. Mr Curtin said that there were several cameras. One faced the gate and others pointed in the direction of the carriageway. The "Ring" camera provided a fixed view. Other cameras could be controlled to point in different directions. Ms Bolton suggested to Mr Curtin that "*if the target of the protest wasn't the staff, there would be no need to have a camera facing the gate, would there?*" Mr Curtin disagreed, and he rejected the suggestion that the camera was installed to intimidate the workers. Mr Curtin said that the cameras had been removed after there had been some falling out in the camp.

244. In relation to the later incident of siting a camera on a container within Camp Beagle, Mr Curtin again rejected Ms Bolton's suggestion that it had been placed there to "*capture … the staff arriving in the morning and leaving*". Mr Curtin said that camera

was not capable of doing that and that he had tried to use it as a way of alerting the camp to the movement of vehicles into and out of the Wyton Site, but it had not worked. The protestors, he said, had been concerned that there had been some night-time movement of vans which the "Ring" camera had not detected.

245. Ms Bolton suggested to Mr Curtin that the cameras were used to identify vehicle number plates and then put them on social media, as a means of targeting the employees. The Claimants had no evidential basis to make that assertion. Ms Bolton clarified that she was not suggesting that Mr Curtin had done this but that the footage could be used for this purpose. There followed this exchange:

> Q: It's reasonable, isn't it, that when [the employees] see cameras pointed at the gates, as they come and go, that that's going to cause them distress that yet again they are being recorded and that that could be for the purposes of identifying them, stopping them in the road, working out where they live. That's foreseeable, isn't it, that that's going to cause them distress?
>
> A: They live in Britain. They live in a place where they know damn well the controversial nature… they know how sensitive it is. They can now expect people to be watching their movements because they are so controversial. So a person of reasonable firmness – unless you want the protest to absolutely like I said, vaporise, once the secret is out – they were happy enough when nobody knew it was there and the local people didn't know it was there. Now it's out, a reasonable person kind of has to accept some sort of… well people watching them. They know it."
>
> …
>
> Q: It's right, isn't it, Mr Curtin, that whilst the employees have accepted there will be a degree of protest, it's quite a different thing, isn't it, for them to have to experience the distress of knowing that, if they don't put on a disguise to drive in and out of work everyday, that they could be picked up on cameras and that information may be shared and they may be identified? That's going to cause them distress, isn't it.
>
> A: Not all of the workers cover their faces… If there are fears – there have been some incidents – where people have been outed publicly. If these cameras went along with parallel, with say like the rogues' gallery, then yes there's like 'The cameras are going to mean we're going to be put on some site and they are going to generate hate for us'. That hasn't happened, that hasn't materialised, apart from some – there have been no incidents with individuals. The campaign has not gone down that road.

246. My conclusions in relation to these allegations are as follows:

(1) These two incidents cannot, and do not, support the Claimants' case that Mr Curtin is guilty of a course of conduct involving harassment.

(2) Mr Curtin accepts that he was involved in the siting of the two cameras. The Claimants have adduced no evidence as to the footage that was actually captured by either of these devices. They have not challenged Mr Curtin's evidence that, in relation to the camera sited in Camp Beagle (not opposite the

gate), that it did not work as intended (i.e. as an early warning device to alert the camp to vehicle movements).

(3) No witness has said that s/he was caused distress or alarm or otherwise felt harassed by the siting of the cameras. It may be that none of them noticed one or other of the cameras, or that they were more concerned by the hand-held recording of them by individual protestors, but this would be to speculate about evidence I do not have. The short – and simple – point is that the Claimants have adduced no evidence that the siting of these cameras caused any distress/alarm/upset to any employee. In the absence of that evidence, the cross-examination of Mr Curtin (see [245] above) was conducted on a hypothetical basis.

26 April 2022 and 12 May 2022: the Third Contempt Application

247. The Claimants allege that, on 26 April 2022, Mr Curtin (and others) caused a public nuisance by obstructing the highway for an Impex delivery vehicle after it had left the Wyton Site. Specifically, Mr Curtin is alleged to have stood in front of the vehicle.

248. The Claimants allege that, on 12 May 2022, Mr Curtin (and others) caused a public nuisance by obstructing the highway for a police van that sought to move off from a stationary position on the carriageway outside the Wyton Site. Specifically, Mr Curtin is alleged to have stood in front of the vehicle.

249. As these allegations were the subject of contempt proceedings against Mr Curtin (the Third Contempt Application), the evidence (and submissions) were dealt with at a separate hearing, following the trial, on 23 June 2023. Mr Curtin had been granted legal aid for the Third Contempt Application, and he was represented by Mr Taylor.

250. At an earlier directions hearing in November 2022, the Claimants indicated that they would not be pursuing Ground 3 (kicking the box) and Ground 4 (assisting someone in a dinosaur costume). At the commencement of the hearing on 23 June 2023, Ms Bolton indicated that the Claimants had agreed also not to proceed (as an allegation of contempt) with Grounds 1 and 5 (entry into the Exclusion Zone) and Ground 6 (obstruction of the police van leaving the Exclusion Zone). That left Ground 2 as the only allegation of breach of the Interim Injunction pursued by the Claimants. On behalf of Mr Curtin, Mr Taylor indicated that Mr Curtin accepted the breach of the Interim Injunction in Ground 2.

251. As noted already, Mr Curtin gave evidence at the hearing on 23 June 2023. He stated that he had been campaigning against vivisection for 40 years. He hoped that, by protesting, he would draw attention to the activities of the First Defendant and he wanted the law to be changed to prohibit testing on animals. Mr Curtin accepted that he was aware of the terms of the Interim Injunction. In light of that, Mr Curtin was asked by Mr Taylor about the events in the small hours of 26 April 2022, which gave rise to Ground 2 of the contempt application. Mr Curtin said this:

> "We had some information that night-time – shipments of dogs at night-time had already happened, a number. They'd sneak the vans in and out. We had an assurance from the police liaison officer that the police were not prepared to cover night-time actions. That was the understanding, and I couldn't believe this

> information we received. I was shocked. So we began to have a night-time shift and, hey presto, the van turned up without any police escort and now my intention –once I'm there, apart from the shock of, 'Oh my God, they're actually doing this', there hadn't been a daytime shipment… for 40 days. I tried to bring it up in court, why are there no more shipments anymore? It wasn't – I don't believe it was because of the protestors. They have the police to facilitate that. There was another reason. So I was in shock, it was at night-time, I feel the police had broken their word... They're sneaking in at night and that's all. There was no intention to ever stop a van. Other people were always having a go at me, 'We've got to stop the vans'; 'The police will stop you stopping the vans, the injunction will stop you stopping the vans'… When I spoke to Caroline Bolton after the last hearing, 'Are we going ahead with this contempt?', I said, 'Where's the obstruction?', and she said 'Approaching'. That word 'approaching', even I'd sat through the entire injunction, it hadn't and it still hasn't –– I don't think it's filtered into anyone's mind actually. What does 'approaching' mean? I didn't have on that night I'm not going to approach a van as in 'Shame on you' because that's breaking the injunction, isn't it, if we're going to use the English language? But not to block any van, not to – no."

252. Mr Curtin confirmed that, as can be seen in the video evidence, he was using his mobile phone to film the incident so that he could post it as evidence to a wider audience. He said saw the injunction as imposing a sort of "*force field*" and he would "*just work around it*". By that he meant that he was content to observe the terms of the injunction because it enabled Camp Beagle to maintain a presence at the site and he just needed to avoid the Exclusion Zone.

253. I am satisfied, based on the circumstances of the events that gave rise to Ground 2 and Mr Curtin's evidence, that Mr Curtin had not deliberately flouted the Interim Injunction. It is clear from the audio from the various recordings that emotions were running high early that morning because the nocturnal movement of the dog vans was an unexpected and unwelcome development, so far as the protestors were concerned. Mr Curtin got partly carried away by those emotions. As a result, he approached, and fleetingly obstructed, the van leaving the Wyton Site. That, as he accepts, was a breach of the injunction. I will deal with the penalty for this breach of the Interim Injunction below (see Section O(3): [400]-[407] below).

254. For the purposes of the civil claim against Mr Curtin, his obstruction of the van leaving the Wyton Site in the early hours of 26 April 2022 and his obstruction of the police van on 12 May 2022 were both temporary and, applying the test of what amounts to "public nuisance" (set out in [93] above), it affected only the specific individuals involved rather than the public generally. Insofar as there was any obstruction of the highway on these two occasions, neither amounted to a public nuisance. The police were present on both occasions, and they did not take any action against Mr Curtin, or others, involved in alleged obstruction of the highway. Almost certainly, that reflects the fact that any obstruction was very short-lived and required no police intervention.

21 June 2022

255. The Claimants allege that, on 21 June 2022, Mr Curtin flew a drone directly over the Wyton Site, at a height of less than 150m and/or 50m, without the permission of the

First Claimant. The footage obtained was posted to the Camp Beagle Facebook page the same day.

256. They flying of the drone is alleged by the Claimants to be (a) a trespass; and (b) part of a course of conduct involving harassment of the First Claimant's staff.

257. Although some of the Claimants' witnesses give general evidence of drone usage over the Wyton Site, the evidence relating to this specific incident – as it relates to Mr Curtin – is solely video, drawn largely from footage obtained from the drone that was posted on the Camp Beagle Facebook page. The drone is equipped with a camera, that clearly has the ability to zoom in and magnify the image of the terrain below it.

258. Ms Pressick, in her witness statement, gave a narrative commentary on drone usage based on the video evidence available to her. Ms Pressick purports to give evidence as to the height at which the drone was being flown on each occasion. However, much of the evidence she gives is (a) vague and imprecise (e.g. "*at a height I estimate was below 150 and/or 50 meters*" (which appears to embrace a range between 1 to 150m); and (b) expert evidence which she is not qualified to give. The only reliable evidence as to the height at which any drone was being flown, on any occasion, comes from instances where the height of the drone is shown as part of the footage (e.g. the footage posted to Camp Beagle's Facebook page on 16 June 2022 which records the height as being 50 metres). Finally, much of Ms Pressick's witness statement about generic drone usage is irrelevant to the claim in trespass. Her contention, for example, that, in one example, "*the drone is being used to monitor business activity*" is not relevant to the claim in trespass. Either the drone is trespassing on the relevant occasion, or it is not. Absent any suggestion of implied licence (of which there is none), the purpose of a drone's alleged trespass is not relevant.

259. Ms Pressick was questioned about Mr Curtin's use of a drone. She stated that, in around April/May 2022, staff had been forced to transport dogs around the site in a van rather than in crates because of the drone. Mr Curtin disputed that this was a regular practice. Ms Pressick accepted that the workers might still move the dogs in crates, even when the drone was around the site. Ms Pressick said that she had personally seen the drone whilst she had been on site. Asked at what height it was being flown, Ms Pressick said that it was "*above building height*". Ms Pressick stated that her main objection to the drone use was the fact that it was filming. It was that aspect, rather than any annoyance caused by the drone operations, that was the concern. Ms Pressick said that she understood why the protestors wanted to monitor the activities on site which was linked to their protest activities: "*It's what the feel they need to do*".

260. Potentially relevant evidence was provided by several witnesses who spoke of their direct experience of drones flying over the Wyton Site (emphasis added):

(1) Mr Manning stated:

> "In general, I do not have an issue with the use of drones if they are flown in the right manner and they are not being used to invade people's privacy. However, there are a number of occasions when I have experienced the protestors flying their drones in a dangerous manner. For example, sometimes they are very erratically flown downwards, and then from side to side quickly. Sometimes the drones are also flown really low, **to about the**

> **height of a one storey building**, which I would say happens about 20–40% of the time I see a drone flight over the Wyton Site. Very occasionally, they come down **very low, so it feels like I could reach up and grab the drone**. It is very concerning when the low and erratic flights happen, as they drop them suddenly from quite a height. I fear for my safety on these occasions as a drone dropped from such a height could potentially cause physical harm to me or one of my colleagues. I am often concerned for the safety of the staff when the protestors are flying the drones. Typically, the pilot will be sitting in the tent outside the Gate, and will not have a clear view of where the drone is flying. If they were to lose video signal on the drone, they would not be able to see what they were doing and someone could be injured.
>
> I have also noticed the protestors fly the drones directly overhead the Wyton Site, and over areas that cannot be observed from the fence line of the Site; I believe that the drones are flown there so they can see what the staff are doing every step of the way during the day. In this respect, there is no privacy.
>
> Due to the nature of my role, I spend a lot of time working outside on the Wyton Site, making sure the site is secure and checking the fence, so I have seen a lot of the drones being flown around the site. I do not like being outside when the drones are being flown, because I find them dangerous for the reasons outlined above. However, I have no choice to be outside, as part of my job is keeping an eye on what is going on around the Wyton Site. I am responsible for logging whenever there is a drone sighted on site. I log the date and time each time a drone goes up and is brought down by the protestors. I also try to locate who the pilot is by looking around outside the perimeter of the Wyton Site, and into their camp to see who goes to retrieve the drone when it lands. The security staff undertaking the nightshift follow the same process, and write it on a whiteboard for me to review when I return to work the next day. I then update a central spreadsheet, which I started keeping in September 2022… The CCTV sometimes captures the use of the drones, but they are very small and move around so quickly that they can be hard to spot on CCTV footage."

(2) Employee A stated:

> "Previously, when the protestors were flying a drone flying over area of the Wyton Site on which I was working, my colleagues used to stop carrying out tasks outside; we did not want to be identified by the protestors or have footage of us posted online (which the protestors do regularly). Stopping outdoor tasks whilst drones were flying meant that anything we needed to do was delayed. For example, part of my role is taking the electric meter reading in the generator room, which involves walking across the car park. On the occasions when I have heard from my colleagues that the protestors are flying the drone, I will delay undertaking the task until I have heard that the drone has come down.
>
> I often hear the drones flying, even from inside the office, however as I am not often outside I do not know how low they fly. If I ever do go outside, such as when moving between buildings or during my breaks, to prevent the drone camera capturing images of my face and being identified as a result, I put a mask on and make sure that my face is covered.

I am aware that the drones are flown by the protestors a few times a week as I can either hear them, or a member of staff will notify all other staff members about it on the internal radios. If a drone is up, I will try not to go outside. I feel like we are constantly under surveillance, and it is quite a suffocating environment to be in. It feels like an invasion of privacy.

On four or five occasions (but I cannot recall when) I have been outside at the Wyton Site when a drone was being flown, and have been scared of it and being identified by it that I turned and faced a wall until it was gone.

I will never get used to the sound of a drone for the rest of my life. If I hear one in my personal life, I am worried it is the protestors' and that they have found me. This happened recently when a neighbour flew a drone over my garden. I panicked and went and hid indoors."

(3) Employee B stated:

"The use of drones by the protestors over the Wyton Site has affected my day-to-day activities when at work. It feels like I am being watched 24/7. I wear a cap, balaclava, mask and sunglasses now when working outside at the Wyton Site, because I do not want the drones to video my face and for the protestors to then know my identity. Even though the protestors might know what my name is (for which, see below), they currently do not know what I look like. I do not want to be harassed by protestors who recognise my face. I go outside to empty the bins and I have to wear a disguise just to protect myself.

When drones are being flown, we have to adopt a different procedure on how we move around the site, and how we move the animals around the site. We minimise staff working outside to avoid exposing them to the drones, and transport the animals in van instead of in an open air trolley. These different procedures add time to our tasks and means we cannot perform our tasks efficiently.

When I hear the drones, it makes me feel uneasy.

The drones do fly very low on occasion. One has come within 10 feet of my head before. It does not feel very safe when a remotely controlled drone is flying that close to me."

(4) Employee G stated:

"In addition to the harassment as we arrive and leave the Wyton Site, the staff also have to deal with invasive filming by overhead drones. These are now a daily occurrence. I understand from my colleagues that most staff can hear the drones as they buzz overhead, but I have hearing difficulties and will only be aware they are there if I see them. I therefore look up before I leave the buildings to check for drones and make sure that I am covered up with my hat, snood and glasses. **The drones often fly really low, sometimes little higher than the single storey buildings on the Wyton Site**.

When there is a drone overhead and I am outside, I don't look up. Whilst I am covered up, I really don't want to be recognised for the reasons I detail

above. In order to ensure that I am not recognised I have to carry my hat, snood and glasses with me everywhere I go in case I have to go outside. I also wear these, just to get to the car park in case I am filmed walking to my vehicle. I have seen footage of myself taken by the drones online. The footage shows me moving the animals around site. I believe I saw the footage posted on the Facebook page of Camp Beagle. I recognised myself from the hat I was wearing in the footage and for the activity that I was involved in."

(5) Employee I stated, by way of hearsay evidence:

"I remember drones first started appearing over the Wyton Site sometime in 2021, around the time the protests started increasing in intensity in June.

Sometimes the drones come as low as the height of our buildings (which are only one storey high), and one time I remember a drone looking through our tea room window. If we are doing something outside, like moving dogs, the drones seem to come lower.

The presence of the drones makes me feel like I am constantly being watched, so that the protestors can find more ammunition against us. I can usually hear the drones when I am working outside. They make me feel on edge, and I second guess everything I am doing. The lower the drone is, the more I second guess myself, and whether anything I am doing could be captured by the drone and the footage used by the protestors in a negative light. When the drone is higher, I do not feel as stressed, as it does not feel like the drone is focusing on me as much.

Because of the drones, when I am working outside I wear a facemask, a jumper, and I tie my hair up in a bun, to avoid being identified. Photos taken of me by the drones moving animals have been shared on social media but, because of my disguise, I cannot be identified from those photographs."

(6) Employee P stated, by way of hearsay evidence:

"The protestors fly drones over the Wyton Site and film staff working or moving on site. When I was first filmed by a drone, I was moving dogs around the Wyton Site. Given the use of the drones, we had started moving the dogs by van to prevent footage of the dogs being captured but, on this occasion, the Production Manager asked me to carry a small number of dogs between buildings. I was carrying a dog across the field when the drone came overhead. I could hear the buzz of the drone. I was wearing a facemask and sunglasses to protect my identity while carrying the dog. After the incident I saw the footage of me on the Camp Beagle Facebook page, being followed by the drone.

Being filmed by the drone was really invasive. It made me feel scared and anxious. The drones have become more common and they are spotted almost every day. I do not normally leave the buildings unless I have to because of the drones. If I do leave the buildings, I always wear a face mask."

(7) Employee V stated:

> "**The lowest I have seen a drone flying at the Wyton Site is approximately 3ft above the ground to capture information from dog travel boxes.**
>
> I am constantly concerned for my safety when drones are flown by the protestors, as a drone could cause a bad injury if it were to crash into something or someone. I hear the drone nearly every day, and on **average the drone flies at a 2-storey building height**. The protestors used to fly the drone much lower than this, but a couple of months ago this changed and it started to fly higher (but, as I say, it is still about the height of a 2-storey building).
>
> To stop the drones filming through windows, I have installed protective measures in all windows of the Wyton Site, for example frosting the glass, installing one way glass laminate or installing curtains.
>
> When there is a drone over the Wyton Site, I used to stop carrying out tasks outside, which meant that anything I needed to do was delayed. Now, as it was not possible to carry out the outside tasks required in the time the drone was not up, I have to wear my concealment clothing when working outside at the Wyton Site, as well as driving in and out. I do this to prevent the drones from capturing footage identifying me to the protestors, for the reasons that I have set out above. Having to cover up like this when working is particularly uncomfortable in summer time due to the heat.
>
> The drone sound has had a real effect on my mental health. I was once on holiday sitting on the beach and heard a stranger's drone. I thought that the protestors had found me and as a result I was concerned for my safety. I believe the use of drones is another form of psychological intimidation tactics used by the protestors. I used to immediately report the drones to security, now I just try to ignore it. The drones have a psychological and physical impact on my health."

261. I note the following things about this evidence:

(1) None of the evidence concerns (or supports) the single allegation of drone trespass made against Mr Curtin. None of the witnesses links his/her evidence to the use of a drone on any particular occasion. In relation to the harassment claim made against Mr Curtin, therefore, none of the witnesses says that the incident of the drone use on 21 June 2022 caused him/her distress or upset, or why it did on this particular occasion.

(2) Insofar as the witnesses complain of low-flying drones (see sections marked in bold), this cannot relate to the incident alleged against Mr Curtin as the drone was being flown by him at 50m.

(3) As the Claimants are not pursuing a harassment claim against "Persons Unknown" in relation to drone flying, the evidence from these witnesses about the impact on them is not relevant to trespass claim. Equally, whilst understandable, the concerns expressed about privacy infringement are equally irrelevant in the absence of a pleaded cause of action to which this evidence might have been relevant.

262. In short, the evidence of these witnesses, is not relevant to the claim brought against Mr Curtin personally.

263. When he was cross-examined, Mr Curtin agreed that, on 21 June 2022, he had operated a drone above the Wyton Site, and he had used it to observe what some of the workers were doing on site. The drone, he said, weighed 249 grammes and was flown by him at a height of 50m. His evidence was that it was better to fly the drone at a height at which it was not noticed by anyone at the Wyton Site. He said he can tell the height of the drone from its controls. The weight, Mr Curtin said, was important because there are regulations which govern the flying drones that weigh more than that. Those regulations were not explored at the trial. Mr Curtin said that his primary interest in using the drone was to monitor what was going on at the Wyton Site and specifically the movement of the dogs. Mr Curtin also accepted that, in the past, there had been occasions when the drone had crashed on the site.

264. In response to questions asked by me, Mr Curtin confirmed that he knew of 4 or 5 other people who had regularly flown drones over or in the vicinity of the Wyton Site and there were possibly between 30-50 people who had flown drones occasionally the identity of whom he did not know. He said that he did not start flying a drone until about a year into the protest activities (i.e. around June 2022).

265. Rather than concentrating on this single alleged incident on 21 June 2022, Ms Bolton's cross-examination ranged widely and included putting to Mr Curtin evidence from the Claimants' witnesses about use of drones generally. That was not helpful, not least because Mr Curtin is not the only person who has flown drones over the Wyton Site. It confused general evidence – which is only potentially relevant to the claim made for relief against "Persons Unknown" – and the specific evidence relating to Mr Curtin's drone use. Ms Bolton indicated that the Claimants do not have any evidence – beyond that relating to the incident on 21 June 2022 – of Mr Curtin operating a drone on any other occasion.

266. I accept that, as a matter of principle, it is legitimate for Ms Bolton to explore not only the past incident of drone usage on 21 June 2022 alleged against Mr Curtin but also whether, absent an injunction, Mr Curtin threatens to fly drones in the future that would amount to a civil wrong. But even that exercise needed to focus clearly upon the acts of Mr Curtin which give rise to the credible risk that, without an injunction, he will commit a civil wrong. What is impermissible is to attempt to advance a case against Mr Curtin based on historic drone usage when the Claimants cannot establish that the relevant incident was one in which he was operating the drone. The Claimants cannot, for example, establish that Mr Curtin was the person responsible for the incidents of drone flying – reported in the general evidence given by some of the witnesses (see [260] above) – where the drone was alleged to have been flown as low as head height.

267. On the contrary, Mr Curtin's evidence, which I accept, is that he typically flies the drone at 50 metres, not least because he hopes that, at that height, it goes unnoticed. In the Claimants' general evidence, advanced against "Persons Unknown", Ms Pressick produced evidence relating to a further drone incident where an image obtained from the camera on the drone was posted on the Camp Beagle Facebook page. That image showed some information which included "H 50m", which she interpreted (I believe correctly) that the drone was being flown at a height of 50 metres.

268. In answer to the Claimants' claim that flying the drone – generally – amounted to harassment of the workers at the Wyton Site, in cross-examination, Mr Curtin made the point that at no stage has footage from the drone been used to attempt to identify workers or images placed on the Camp Beagle website in a sort of 'rogues gallery'. And, indeed, the Claimants have adduced no evidence of the drone footage being used for that purpose. Again, on this point, the concerns of the employees are directed at what might happen rather than what has happened. At a prosaic level, if the workers are concerned about the risks of being potentially photographed whilst they are going about their duties outdoors at the Wyton Site, then that threat is ever-present because they could be photographed by someone standing at the perimeter fence or by a drone not flying directly over the Wyton Site. For the purposes of the case against Mr Curtin, the short point is that there is simply no evidence that Mr Curtin has been flying drones, or taking photographs, as part of an exercise to identify employees at the Wyton Site. I accept Mr Curtin's evidence that he has not sought to do so.

269. Mr Curtin accepted that footage from drones has been posted on the Facebook page of Camp Beagle. Mr Bolton suggested to Mr Curtin in cross-examination that his posting of drone footage of the Wyton Site might provide an opportunity for someone to learn more about the layout of the site and that this knowledge might assist someone who wanted to break into the site. Mr Curtin's immediate response to this suggestion was "*that's stretching it*", but he accepted that it might assist such a person. This section of cross-examination was hypothetical and not helpful – or relevant – to the issues I must decide.

270. As the Claimants have submitted – correctly – in relation to the main claim for trespass, the tort is simple and one of strict liability. The decision to be made is whether the flying of the drone is a trespass or not. What Mr Curtin hopes to achieve by flying the done, and the risks that might arise from publication of footage obtained from the use of the drone, are simply irrelevant. It is either a trespass or it is not. I identified the potential limits of the law of trespass – as it concerns drone use – in the Interim Injunction Judgment ([111]-[115]). Despite having ample opportunity to seek to amend their claim to do so, the Claimants have chosen not to seek to advance any alternative causes of action that might more effectively have addressed the concerns they have over drone use.

271. The final part of Ms Bolton's cross-examination was taken up with Mr Curtin being asked questions about other drone footage for which the Claimants had not alleged he was responsible. With the benefit of hindsight, and particularly considering the exchanges that followed (which consisted of little more than Mr Curtin being asked to comment on extracts from the drone footage and what it showed), I should have stopped the cross-examination. It quickly became speculative and, insofar as it was attempting to ascertain whether Mr Curtin was responsible for further drone flights beyond the specific example alleged against him, potentially unfair to him. I had wanted to ensure, in fairness to the Claimants, that they had an opportunity to develop as best they could their case (a) as to the threat of Mr Curtin carrying out further acts of alleged trespass/harassment with the drone; and (b) against Persons Unknown.

272. The Claimants have sought to adduce no expert evidence relating to drone usage, for example, based on the photographs and footage captured by the drones that have been put in evidence (a) at what height was the drone flying; and (b) whether the drone was immediately above the Wyton Site. Ms Bolton attempted to make up for this lack

of expert evidence by asking Mr Curtin to offer his view as to the height at which the relevant drone was being flown. That will not do. Mr Curtin may be a drone user, but he is not an expert qualified to comment on other drone use. He cannot offer an expert opinion, from a photograph or footage, as to how high the drone was flying when it was taken. I raised the issue of the need for expert evidence on the critical issue of the height at which drones were being flown during at least one interim hearing. The Claimants have chosen not to seek to advance any expert evidence in support of this aspect of their claim. Again, that is their choice.

273. The state of the evidence, at the conclusion of the trial, is that, in relation to the claim for trespass by drone usage against "Persons Unknown", I have no reliable evidence as to the height at which the drones were being flown in the incidents complained of in the evidence. In respect of the claim against Mr Curtin for trespass and/or harassment arising from his use of a drone on 21 June 2022, the only evidence that is available as to the height at which the drone was being flown is that given by Mr Curtin; i.e. at or around 50 metres.

274. Returning to the central issue, the question is whether Mr Curtin's flying of the drone on 21 June 2022 was a trespass on the land or alternatively part of the course of conduct involving harassment. My conclusions on this are as follows:

(1) Mr Curtin's use of the drone on 21 June 2022 was not a trespass.

(2) Based on the authority of ***Bernstein*** (see [64]-[71] above), the question is whether the incursion by Mr Curtin's drone into the air space above the Wyton Site was at a height that could interfere with the ordinary user of the land. Mr Curtin's drone was flying at or around 50 metres. To put that in context, a building that is 50 meters tall is likely to have between 15-16 storeys. Did flying a drone the size of Mr Curtin's drone, for a short period, at the height of a 15-16 storey building interfere with the First Claimant's ordinary user of the land. In my judgment plainly it did not. It is not possible – on the evidence – to conclude whether Mr Curtin's drone, flying at 50m on 21 June 2022, could even have been seen by the naked eye from the ground. Mr Manning's evidence was that it was very difficult to see smaller drones higher in the sky.

(3) On analysis, and in reality, the Claimants' real complaint is not about trespass of the drone at all. If the drone had not been fitted with a camera, the Claimants would not be pursuing a claim for trespass (or harassment). The Claimants have attempted to use the law of trespass to obtain a remedy for something that is unrelated to that which the law of trespass protects. The real object has been to seek to prevent filming or photographing the Wyton Site. The law of trespass was never likely to deliver that remedy (even had the claim succeeded on the facts), not least because it is likely that substantially similar photographs/footage of the Wyton Site could be obtained either by the drone avoiding direct flight over the site, flying at a greater height, or, even, the use of cameras on the ground around the perimeter. As I have noted (see [73] above), the civil law may provide remedies for someone who complains that s/he is effectively being placed under surveillance by drone use, but adequate remedies are unlikely to be found in the law of trespass.

(4) Turning to the harassment claim, the position is straightforward. There is no evidence that anyone was harassed by Mr Curtin's flight of the drone on 21 June 2022. It cannot therefore form any part of the alleged course of conduct involving harassment.

(5) Finally, considering whether the Claimants' evidence shows that, unless restrained, Mr Curtin is likely to use the drone to harass in the future, I am not persuaded on the evidence that the Claimants can demonstrate a credible threat that he will. I have accepted Mr Curtin's evidence that he flies the drone at 50 metres. Flown at that height, there is no credible basis to contend that future flights of the drone are likely to amount the harassment of any of the employees. There is no evidence that Mr Curtin is carrying out surveillance of individual employees, for example to be able to identify them. I appreciate that several witnesses expressed the fear that this was one of the objectives of the drone flights. But these are their subjective fears; they are not objectively substantiated on the evidence.

11 July 2022

275. The Claimants allege that Mr Curtin (and others) caused a public nuisance by obstructing the highway for a vehicle driven by Ms Read that had left the Wyton Site. Specifically, it is alleged that Mr Curtin stepped in front of and walked in front of the vehicle causing the vehicle to slow.

276. The incident is captured on CCTV. In her witness statement, Ms Read described the incident as follows:

> "On 11 July 2022 at 15.04, [Mr Curtin] walked in front of my car as I was driving along the main carriageway of the Highway… The incident happening as I was leaving the Wyton Site for the day; I left a few minutes later than everyone else on this day. I saw [Mr Curtin] walk across the Highway to the tent, and linger about, I had a feeling as I drove towards him that he was going to step out in front of me. [Mr Curtin], as I approached him in my car, he then walked in front of my car, causing me to slow down to avoid hitting him. He looked at me, and it felt like he was goading me – as if he was thinking 'I can do what I want away from the Access Road'. I found [Mr Curtin's] conduct very intimidating and I was fearful, as I did not know what he was planning to do."

277. Ms Read was not called to give evidence, and her evidence has been relied upon as hearsay by the Claimants. It is perhaps unfortunate that her evidence on this incident could not be explored and tested in cross-examination, particularly having regard to what can be seen of the incident from the CCTV recording. What that footage shows is little more than Mr Curtin crossing the B1090 road some 100 yards from the entrance to the Wyton Site.

278. Mr Curtin was cross-examined by Ms Bolton. She put to him that he had deliberately walked out in front of Ms Read's car because she had come from the Wyton Site. Mr Curtin disagreed, and maintained that he was simply crossing the road.

279. My conclusions in relation to this incident are as follows:

(1) In the CCTV footage, Mr Curtin can be seen to be crossing the road. There is nothing more to this incident than that. It caused Ms Read slightly to slow her vehicle. She did not stop, and she was caused no obstruction. There was no obstruction of the carriageway. There was no public nuisance

(2) I cannot accept Ms Read's evidence in relation to this incident. Having reviewed the footage – as apparently Ms Read also did when making her statement – I conclude that an element of paranoia must have contributed to Ms Read's perception of this incident. Like some other witnesses, Ms Read is clearly fearful of what Mr Curtin *might* do, rather than rationally assessing what he has *actually* done. There was nothing remotely intimidating in Mr Curtin's action of crossing the road. Objectively, there was nothing in the incident that should have caused her any fear.

(3) The inclusion of this incident in the Claimants' claim against Mr Curtin is remarkable. The evidence simply does not demonstrate, even arguably, any wrongdoing by Mr Curtin. Based on the evidence available to the Claimants, this allegation should not have been pleaded or pursued.

(2) Unpleaded allegations against Mr Curtin

280. There are three further incidents of alleged harassment that were raised in the Claimants' evidence and pursued in cross-examination with Mr Curtin that did not form part of the Claimants' pleaded case against him. I raised the lack of pleaded allegations with Ms Bolton during Mr Curtin's cross-examination. I expressed the provisional view that, if they were to be relied upon as part of the course of conduct alleged to amount to harassment against Mr Curtin, then they ought to be pleaded. Ms Bolton did not return to the issue until addressing the issue in her closing submissions. No application to amend was made by the Claimants.

281. In her closing submissions, Ms Bolton said that it was "*regrettable*" that the details of these three incidents had not been pleaded, they had only come to light when draft witness statements were received. The Claimants' position – as advanced in their closing submissions – is that "*whilst no 'claim' is brought in relation to these incidents, it is submitted that they are important incidents that should inform the Court's view of the strength of the pleaded harassment claim against Mr Curtin, and the likelihood of further acts of harassment occurring*".

282. I will return below to how I intend to deal with these unpleaded allegations after summarising them and the evidence that has been presented during the trial.

7 September 2021

283. This was an incident concerning Mr Manning. In his witness statement, Mr Manning said this:

> "… on 7 September 2021, [Mr Curtin] approached me at the Gate and said he had some personal details I would not want anyone else to see, which [Mr Curtin] had been given by a member of staff or security who passed it to [Mr Curtin] through the car window. He would not tell me what the details were or what he would do with them, but said that he could contact me at any time and that I would

> find out what he had at some point. I reported this incident to the police, and I felt really shaken up by it. Later that day, he approached me again, when I was by the perimeter fence. He said he would pass a piece of paper that was in his pocket with personal details of mine. I asked him to show the piece of paper. He looked through his pockets and said he thought it was in a folder. I walked away".

284. Mr Curtin did ask Mr Manning some questions about this incident when he was cross-examined. Mr Manning could recall few details. Mr Curtin suggested to Mr Manning that he had told him on this occasion that he had been given Mr Manning's telephone number by another security officer. Mr Manning replied that Mr Curtin had not told him what the information was.

285. As this is not a pleaded allegation against Mr Curtin said to form part of the alleged course of conduct involving harassment, I can deal with this shortly. Objectively judged, what Mr Curtin did (as described by Mr Manning) lacks the necessary qualities to amount to harassment. The incident has not been repeated, and therefore it sheds no light on whether, if the Claimants can prove a case of actual or threatened harassment against Mr Curtin, they can credibly suggest that this incident shows that there is need for an injunction to restrain future acts of harassment by Mr Curtin.

8 July 2022

286. The incident on 8 July 2022 concerned Mr Curtin and Employee V, a maintenance engineer at the Wyton Site. There was footage of the incident recorded by Mr Curtin. In his/her witness statement, Employee V stated that on 8 July 2022, s/he had been tasked with repairing a hole in the perimeter fence around the Wyton Site. As s/he was operating outside the perimeter, s/he was accompanied by a member of the First Claimant's security team. Mr Curtin followed Employee V, and the security officer, and Employee V alleged that Mr Curtin intimidated and harassed him/her whilst s/he undertook the repairs. Mr Curtin recorded the incident and livestreamed it to the Camp Beagle Instagram and Facebook pages. The video of the incident goes on for some 15-20 minutes, but the key parts, identified by Employee V in his/her witness statement, were the following:

(1) Mr Curtin said "*we are going to do our darndest to make sure some workers go to prison from here you deserve it you really do deserve it*". Employee F said that this upset him/her, because s/he had not done anything illegal.

(2) Mr Curtin said, "*how low can you go working here?*" Employee V regarded this as a "*psychological intimidation tactic*" as s/he was "*not working in a 'low job'*". Employee V felt that Mr Curtin was attempting to make him/her feel bad for what s/he did at the Wyton Site.

(3) Mr Curtin called Employee F a "*freak*". Employee V said that this upset him/her, as it portrayed him/her to be something that s/he was not.

(4) At one point during this incident, Employee V said that Mr Curtin was so close to him/her that he was nearly touching his/her face with his phone whilst livestreaming. Employee V said that s/he felt "*really threatened and uncomfortable*".

(5) Employee V said s/he felt "*constantly scared*" that Mr Curtin would pull down his/her mask and reveal his/her identity.

(6) Employee V felt that Mr Curtin's actions of being close to him/her, and abusing him/her for 15 to 20 minutes as s/he carried out his/her job was "*overwhelming*". S/he was "*very distressed*" after the incident and believed that it led to a deterioration in his/her mental health. "*I think this was a reaction to feeling so vulnerable (i.e. without a fence or car between me and [Mr Curtin]) and feeling degraded by not being able to retaliate or respond, as we have been advised by the police*".

287. In cross-examination, Employee V confirmed that s/he knew that Mr Curtin was livestreaming the encounter. In relation to the comment that s/he was a "*freak*", Employee V accepted that Mr Curtin had been reading out comments that had been received from people watching the livestream. Mr Curtin put to Employee V that the context of the encounter was him making a livestream during which he was offering a general commentary about the First Claimant. Employee V replied:

> "… you intensified your livestream to intimidate me. You got very close to me. I do agree you did not touch me, but at one point you became very close and you did everything possible to slow my work down."

288. In questioning, Employee V accepted that s/he had carried out research on Mr Curtin and this had coloured the impression s/he had of him. Employee V considered Mr Curtin to be one of the main leaders of the camp, who advised the other protestors on their tactics. S/he described the protestors as seeming to be very fanatical in their beliefs. Employee V said s/he had carried out internet research on the tactics used by protestors. This appears to have generated in Employee V a significant fear based not so much on what the protestors had actually done, but what Employee V believed they might be capable of doing.

289. This is not a pleaded allegation of harassment against Mr Curtin, so I intend to state my conclusions on this incident quite shortly.

290. It was clear from his/her evidence as a whole that Employee V had been significantly affected by the protests at the Wyton Site and not just this encounter with Mr Curtin. S/he was concerned that s/he might become a target away from the Wyton Site and expressed a fear, shared by several employees, at what the protestors might be capable of doing. I do not doubt that the particular encounter with Mr Curtin did upset him/her. I accept his/her evidence as to how s/he felt and how it affected him/her, but, in part, his/her sense of concern appears to have been elevated by his research on Mr Curtin rather than anything that Mr Curtin had actually done, whether during the incident or before.

291. Employee V appeared to me also to lack insight. S/he did not appreciate why protestors called the workers, generically, "*puppy killers*". S/he approached the issue simply on the basis that, as s/he personally had not been involved in the killing of any of the animals, it was wrong for the allegation to be made. That is to take literally the words used, and to fail to recognise that this was a protest message directed at the First Claimant's operation at the Wyton Site.

292. It is very important that Employee V was aware that Mr Curtin was livestreaming the encounter. To that extent it should have been immediately apparent to Employee V that this was not a normal conversation; there was an obvious element of performance by Mr Curtin that Employee V should have appreciated. I think it is likely that Employee V failed to appreciate this because of his/her elevated anxiety towards Mr Curtin and fears of what he might do. Whilst I recognise that, subjectively, Employee V did feel intimidated by the encounter, there was a significant element to which these fears were self-generated rather than being based on what Mr Curtin actually did or any threat that he realistically presented. Objectively judged, I am not persuaded that Mr Curtin's behaviour crossed the line between conduct that is unattractive, even unreasonable, and conduct which is oppressive and unacceptable.

293. Ms Bolton has relied upon this incident not as part of the alleged course of conduct involving harassment but as demonstrating Mr Curtin's propensity towards harassing behaviour, and therefore, supportive of the need for some form of injunctive relief. I will come on to consider the harassment claim advanced against Mr Curtin by the Claimants in due course, but I can reject now that this incident provides any evidence of "propensity". Far from demonstrating a tendency to act in a particular way – and compared to the repetitive incidents of obstructing the vehicles of employees leaving the Wyton Site in the 'ritual' – the incident with Employee V was a one off. It was the product of a particular set of circumstances, that had a unique dynamic. The only thing that really links it to the other activities about which the Claimants complain is that it could be said to be loosely part of the broader protest activities. But the issues raised in this incident are wholly different.

19 August 2022

294. This act of alleged harassment by Mr Curtin concerns an incident that took place on 19 August 2022 outside the Wyton Site, near to the notice board erected by the First Claimant. Mr Manning describes the event in his witness statement as follows:

> "… as I and another member of staff was [sic] putting the notice back up following it needing to be cleaned due to it being spray painted (and to put up new documents) on 19 August 2022 from 14.04 onwards [Mr Curtin] approached me and my colleague to film us, and came very close to me, almost touching me, multiple times. If someone came that close to me outside of work, I would tell them to get out of my personal space."

295. The incident is captured on CCTV. The footage does not support Mr Manning's description of Mr Curtin's physical proximity. Mr Manning must have misremembered how closely Mr Curtin came to him during this incident. From the video footage, there is nothing intimidating or harassing in Mr Curtin's physical closeness. I appreciate that, particularly given the long period over which Mr Manning has been dealing with Mr Curtin (and the other protestors), Mr Manning regards Mr Curtin as an irritant whose presence is not appreciated. But, judged objectively, Mr Curtin's behaviour on this occasion does not pass the threshold to amount to harassment under the law.

296. In cross-examination, Ms Bolton put to Mr Curtin that this incident was "*another example… of you targeting the staff as part of your actions to persuade the staff to leave MBR Acres*". Mr Curtin rejected that. I would simply note, by way of finding, that the incident does not remotely support the Claimants' characterisation of it.

297. As this is not a pleaded allegation against Mr Curtin said to form part of the alleged course of conduct involving harassment, I can deal with this shortly. Objectively judged, what Mr Curtin did (as described by Mr Manning and shown on the footage) lacks the necessary qualities to amount to harassment. The incident has not been repeated, and therefore it sheds no light on whether, if the Claimants can prove a case of actual or threatened harassment against Mr Curtin, they can credibly suggest that this incident shows that there is need for an injunction to restrain future acts of harassment by Mr Curtin.

(3) Conclusion on the claim of harassment against Mr Curtin

298. As noted above ([108]), the harassment claim brought against Mr Curtin is brought under s.1(1A) PfHA.

299. In the section above, I have stated my conclusions in respect of each of the acts alleged by the Claimants to constitute a course of conduct involving harassment of those in the Second Claimant class. I have not found that any of them, individually, were serious enough to amount to harassment applying the principles I have identified (see [99]-[108] above).

300. Nevertheless, I must step back and consider whether, taken together, these incidents do reach the required threshold of seriousness to amount to harassment. I am quite satisfied that they do not.

301. Although, in the pre-injunction phase, the repeated surrounding of vehicles of those entering and leaving the Wyton Site, has an element of repetition that might supply the necessary element of oppression, the same element of repetition meant that those in the vehicles should, objectively, quickly have become used to it. The 'ritual' did not change much. Although it was inconvenient, caused delay, and upset some employees, the 'ritual' was predictable and could not have failed to have been understood to be an expression of protest. Objectively, it was not targeted at any individual employee. Several witnesses were more concerned about what the protestors *might* do, rather than what they actually did.

302. As I am dealing with the claim made against Mr Curtin, it is necessary to concentrate on the evidence about what Mr Curtin did, not the actions of other protestors. At its height, the Claimants' evidence demonstrates that Mr Curtin participated in several 'rituals' and he expressed his protest message. It goes no further than that. Ms Bolton, in her final submissions, placed no reliance on the content of what Mr Curtin shouted at the employees.

303. I am not persuaded that this crosses the threshold between unattractive or unreasonable behaviour to that which is oppressive and unacceptable. In a democratic society, the Court must set this threshold with the requirements of Articles 10 and 11 clearly in mind. It would be a serious interference with these rights if those wishing to protest and express strongly held views could be silenced by actual or threatened proceedings for harassment based on subjective claims by individuals that they were caused distress or alarm. The context for alleged harassment will always be very important. In terms of whether the conduct supplies the necessary element of oppression to constitute harassment, there is a big difference between an employee of the First Claimant having to encounter, and withstand, a protest message with which s/he is confronted on his/her

journey to/from work and having the same protest message shouted through his/her letterbox at home at 3am.

304. My findings mean that the Claimants have failed to demonstrate the element of the tort required under s.1(1A)(a). In consequence, the claim in harassment brought against Mr Curtin will be dismissed.

305. In any event, I would also have found that the Claimants had failed to demonstrate the element of the tort required under s.1(1A)(c).

306. As part of the harassment claim against Mr Curtin, it is the Claimants' case that Mr Curtin's intention behind, or the underlying purpose of, the alleged acts of harassment of the First Claimant's employees (and others in the class of the Second Claimant) was to get them to sever their connection with the First Claimant (for employees to leave, for suppliers to cease business etc). Mr Curtin rejected this allegation on the several occasions when it was put to him during his long cross-examination.

307. I shall give one example of the answers he gave when this allegation was put to him, in the context of the unpleaded allegation of harassment of Mr Manning on 7 September 2021 (see [283]-[285] above):

> Q: … it was an attempt to intimidate [Mr Manning] because you want to persuade the officers, staff, workers of MBR not to work there, in pursuit of your goal to get MBR shut down?
>
> A: The case against me – you haven't spent millions of pounds to stop me trying to persuade people. I'm allowed to persuade people. It's a legal right for me to --- it's what protesting is, persuasion.
>
> Q: Your attempt to persuade Mr Curtin is done by intimidation?
>
> A: It's absolutely not my intention the way to close down MBR is to get Mr Manning to leave and then the maintenance man. That's not – that has never been the thrust of what's driven me behind my campaigning. It's going to be a lot more complicated than that to shut MBR down."

308. I accept Mr Curtin's evidence. I am not concerned with the evidence of what other protestors have done. Mr Curtin, in the protest methods he adopted, did not pursue the sort of crude intimidation of the First Claimant's staff that Ms Bolton ascribed to him. He was quite candid in accepting that he wished to see the First Claimant shut down, but he was equally clear about the ways in which that objective could be achieved.

K: The evidence at trial against "Persons Unknown"

(1) Trespass on the Wyton Site

309. It would be disproportionate to set out the evidence of all the incidents where "Persons Unknown" have trespassed on the First Claimant's land prior to the grant of the Interim Injunction. By dint of the fact that the First Claimant owns the Driveway at the Wyton Site and part of the Access Land, hundreds of people have potentially been guilty of trespass on this land. Basically, anyone who seeks to use the entry phone outside the

main gate could only do so by standing on the Driveway. Without a defence of implied licence, each and every person doing so would be a potential trespasser.

310. In addition, and during the currency of the proceedings, the understanding of where the public highway ended, and the First Claimant's land began significantly changed (see [22]-[23] above). This means that the number of unidentified individuals who arguably have trespassed on the First Claimant's land whilst protesting increases yet further. At the time of this alleged trespass, neither the individuals standing on the Access Land nor the Claimants would have been aware that this was an arguable trespass.

311. The incidents of more serious trespass – i.e. people accessing the Wyton Site by going beyond the entry gates or over the perimeter fence are very few. There were significant trespass incidents on 19-20 June 2022. On the first occasion, 25 people broke into the Wyton Site. On 20 June 2022, an unknown number of unidentified individuals broke into the Wyton Site and stole five dogs. There were several arrests.

312. Since the grant of the Interim Injunction, and specifically the imposition of the Exclusion Zone, the incidents of alleged trespass have significantly reduced (although not eliminated entirely). The Claimants' evidence shows that there have been isolated incidents of "Persons Unknown" entering the Exclusion Zone and/or trespassing on the First Claimant's land. For example, on 13 July 2022, 2 unidentified individuals chained themselves to the gate of the Wyton Site, delaying the departure of a van carrying dogs, and on 24 September 2022, 4 unidentified individuals glued themselves to the gate to the Wyton Site. They were removed by the police.

(2) Trespass by drone flying over the Wyton Site

313. I have dealt above with the specific allegations made against Mr Curtin relating to drone flying. The Claimants also maintain a claim, and seek a *contra mundum* injunction to prevent drone flying over the Wyton Site.

314. In the Claimants' pleaded case, the claim is advanced as follows

> "[Persons Unknown have]**,** without the licence or consent of the First Claimant, committed acts of trespass by flying drones:
>
> (1) directly over the Wyton Site; and/or
>
> (2) below 150 metres over the airspace of the Wyton Site; and/or
>
> (3) within 150 metres of the Wyton Site; and/or
>
> (4) below 50 metres over the airspace of the Wyton Site; and/or
>
> (5) within 50 metres of the Wyton Site; and/or
>
> (6) at a height that was not reasonable and interfered with the First Claimant's ordinary and quiet use of the Wyton Site.

315. Although this pleading is difficult to follow, the Claimants' position, at the end of the trial, was that they sought a *contra mundum* injunction to prohibit "*fly[ing] a drone or other unmanned aerial vehicle at a height of less than 100 meters over the Wyton Site*".

316. The claim in respect of alleged drone trespass can only be maintained in respect of direct *overflying.* The First Claimant has no arguable right, under the law of trespass, to prevent drones flying other than directly over the Wyton Site. For drones flown directly over the Wyton Site, the question is at what height does flying a drone represent a trespass on the land below (see [62]-[73] above).

317. The Claimants allege in the Particulars of Claim that "Persons Unknown" have flown a drone over the Wyton Site on 25 and 27 July 2021, 25 and 27 August 2021, 17 March 2022, 6 and 16 June 2022. Save for the incident on 27 July 2021, the allegation made in the Particulars of Claim is that the drone was flown "*at a height that was below 150m and/or 50m*". On 27 July 2021, the Claimants allege that the drone was flown "*at a height that was below 50m*". Again, for a sense of scale, the 'Walkie Talkie' building at 20 Fenchurch Street in London is 160m tall, with 38 floors. I have already summarised the Claimants' evidence about general drone usage (see [260] above).

318. In her witness statement of 19 March 2024, Ms Pressick provided some further evidence of drone use by "Persons Unknown":

> "Drones flown by the protestors are known to have crash landed on MBR's land on 5 occasions (10 May 2022, 12 May 2022, 3 July 2022, 3 February 2023, and 19 September 2023). This is indicative of drones being flown outside their operational parameters and/or by unsafe piloting. Where the drone has been recovered by the security team, it has been handed over to the police.
>
> I asked the security team to consider drone usage over a 5-month period, and this was closely monitored between 1 July and 30 November 2023. This is something that we had not done consistently previously. Staff tried to monitor use of the drone, noting days it was flown and the duration of the flight time over the Wyton Site. In that 5-month period, the security noted that at least 184 drone flights took place over the Wyton site, with an overall flight duration of at least 2,097 minutes (nearly 35 hours). I assume, but do not know, that the protestors filmed and recorded throughout each flight. During this period, there has been a notable increase in drone usage. There have been more drone flights, and the flight time appears to have increased over this period.
>
> In the period looked at in detail (1 July to 30 November 2023), the security team have tried to identify the protestors that fly the drone. Of the 89 flights noted by the security team, it has not been possible to identify a drone pilot in respect of 59 flights (this is equivalent to around 66% of the observed flights). Mr Curtin has been identified as the drone pilot on 18 occasions (or around 20% of the observed flights). The security team have identified a protestor known as [name redacted] as being the drone pilot on 12 occasions (or roughly 13.5% of the observed flights). It is generally understood from previous observations, and the footage uploaded to the Camp Beagle Facebook page, that Mr Curtin is the primary drone pilot…"

319. The evidence that Ms Pressick has included about Mr Curtin's drone flying I will not take into account in the claim against him. The opportunity to file further evidence was limited to the Claimants' claim for a *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction. It was not

an opportunity to supplement the evidence against Mr Curtin. The evidence against him was presented at the trial. Even had I taken this evidence into account, it would not have made any difference to my conclusions in relation to this aspect of the claim against Mr Curtin. He does not deny flying a drone. His evidence is that he flies it no lower than 50 metres. Ms Pressick's further evidence therefore takes the claim against him no further.

320. The evidence satisfies me that there is a risk that "Persons Unknown" may in the future fly drones over the Wyton Site. However, beyond the particular evidence of drone having crashed, the Claimants have failed to adduce reliable evidence as to the height at which any drone has been flown (or is likely in the future to be flown). Without that, it is impossible to conclude that there is a credible risk of trespass by drone flying.

(3) Threatened trespass at the B&K Site

321. In her witness statement, Ms Pressick included a section headed "*Protest activities at the B&K Hull Site*". She recognises, immediately, that the scale of protest activities has been much reduced at the B&K Site. Between June-July 2021, staff at the B&K Site received what Ms Pressick describes as "*threatening calls*" and there was a protest event held at the B&K Site on 15 August 2021 which was attended by some 40 people. The Claimants make no complaint about this demonstration. Much of Ms Pressick's evidence concerning the B&K Site was considered in the Interim Injunction Judgment (see [22]-[23]). At that stage, the evidence was being advanced in support of a claim for an interim injunction to restrain harassment. I refused to grant any injunction on that basis: [129(4)]. The Claimants have adduced no evidence that there has been any trespass at the B&K Site. Ms Pressick states in her evidence:

> "[The Third Claimant], its staff and myself apprehend that the protestors may focus, or refocus, on the B&K Site. Given that [the First and Third Claimants] are sister companies, there would be real benefit in the final injunction applying to both sites so that injunctive relief over the Wyton Site does not simply move the acts of unlawful protest over to the B&K Hull Site…
>
> [The Third Claimant] continues to receive nuisance calls. I understand from the staff on the switch board that sometimes the callers are silent and, on occasion, they express a negative view of the work that B&K does. It is therefore clear that the B&K Hull Site is still on the radar of animal rights protestors, and that it is reasonable for the Claimants to apprehend that acts of protest similar to those occurring at the Wyton Site may occur at the B&K Hull Site."

322. This evidence is very tenuous and involves a significant leap between the willingness of unidentified people to register displeasure with the activities of the Third Claimant in messages and calls and a real risk that, without an injunction, "Persons Unknown" will trespass upon the B&K Site. As I have noted, there is no evidence at anyone has trespassed at the B&K Site since the protests began in the summer of 2021. On the evidence, I am not satisfied that there is a credible threat of trespass at the B&K Site by "Persons Unknown".

(4) Interference with the right of access to the highway

323. Again, it would be disproportionate to identify all the occasions on which vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site had been obstructed prior to the grant of the Interim

Injunction. The 'ritual' was a regular and, at the height of the protests, almost daily occurrence. This inevitably meant that vehicles were obstructed getting from the Wyton Site to the highway.

324. On the evidence, I am satisfied that there is a real risk that "Persons Unknown" who are protesting about the activities of the First Claimant will engage in the obstruction of vehicles as they enter or leave the Wyton Site.

(5) Public nuisance by obstruction of the highway

325. Before the grant of the Interim Injunction, some large-scale demonstrations took place outside the Wyton Site. There were also some further isolated incidents of significant obstruction of the highway, primarily targeted at those going to or from the Wyton Site. The key events have been as follows:

(1) On 9 July 2021, a demonstration was attended by between 150-200 protestors. It lasted for nearly 2 hours.

(2) On 1 August 2021, there was another large-scale demonstration, numbering up to 260 protestors. The Claimants allege that the police struggled to contain the protestors and that reinforcements were required. Four protestors were arrested.

(3) On 13 August 2021, a convoy of staff cars was intercepted on the main carriageway around 70 metres from the entrance to the Wyton Site. It took 40 minutes for the vehicles to travel along the highway and to enter the Wyton Site.

(4) On 15 August 2021, approximately 250 people attended a large demonstration (see [192]-[198] above).

(5) On 1 July 2023, approximately 50 people attended the two-year anniversary of Camp Beagle. Ms Pressick described this as "*a relatively quiet event considering its significance*". Although she identified several alleged incidents of breach of the Interim Injunction (trespass and entry into the Exclusion Zone), there was no large scale obstruction of the highway.

326. There was also a significant protest event, on 20 November 2021, after the grant of the Interim Injunction. On that occasion, there was a significant obstruction of the highway. This incident was one of those included in the First Contempt Application, and it led subsequently to the variation of the Interim Injunction (see [39]-[40] above).

327. Whether any of these events amounted to a public nuisance is difficult to determine on the evidence. Perhaps because of their belief that any obstruction of the highway was a public nuisance, the Claimants have not provided evidence of the wider impact of the obstruction of the carriageway in each of the incidents I have identified above. On the evidence I have I can, I think, properly draw the inference that the incident on 15 August 2021, in terms of the length of the obstruction of the highway and its likely community impact, was a public nuisance. But the other incidents are not as clear cut, and, on the evidence, the Claimants have not proved that they were a public nuisance.

328. It is also important to note that in each of these incidents there was a significant police presence. In none of the incidents did the police seek to intervene or use their powers

to clear the obstruction of the highway. It appears to me that, in the incident on 15 August 2021, the police had closed the road. I am not criticising the decisions of the police in these incidents. It is an important part of policing demonstrations for police officers (both individual officers on the ground and senior officers in their strategic decision-making) to assess the extent to which the police need to use their undoubted powers to control what are essentially public order issues.

329. In summary, the evidence shows that this is some risk, perhaps diminished since the height of the demonstrations in 2021, that "Persons Unknown" will congregate in such numbers outside the Wyton Site that they cause a public nuisance. I will deal below whether the Court's response to that risk, in these proceedings, should be to grant any form of *contra mundum* order.

L: Evidence from the police

330. At an earlier stage of the proceedings, evidence was provided to the Court by a senior police officer, Superintendent Sissons, who was responsible for policing the protest activities at the Wyton Site. I set out this evidence in the Second Injunction Variation Judgment on 22 December 2022 [43]-[51] and Appendix.

331. Based in part on Superintendent Sissons evidence, I declined to vary the Interim Injunction:

> [76] … unless the Claimants can demonstrate a clear case for an injunction, in my judgment it is better to leave any alleged wrongdoing to be dealt with by the police. Officers on the ground are much better placed to make the difficult decisions as to the balancing of the competing rights (see Injunction Judgment [85] and [96]).
>
> [77] The evidence from Superintendent Sissons shows that this is precisely what the police are doing. There is no complaint from the Claimants that the police are failing in their duties or that the targeted measures taken by the police have been ineffective. Arrests are being made of some protestors, including it appears those engaged on protests at Impex, and several people have been charged. Appropriate use of bail conditions or, upon conviction, restraining orders will restrict further unlawful acts of individuals more effectively and on a targeted basis.
>
> [78] Arrests for offences under s.14 Public Order Act 1986 suggest that the police have already utilised their powers to impose conditions on public assemblies. I appreciate that the Claimants contend that, notwithstanding the efforts of the police, some people are continuing to break the law. The issue for the Claimants is that, before meaningful relief can be granted by way of civil injunction, it is necessary to identify the alleged wrongdoers so that they can be joined to the proceedings.

332. The Claimants' evidence at trial has not demonstrated that the police are failing to respond appropriately to any threats posed by the protestors. In my judgment, and as I have observed before, proportionate use, by police officers making decisions based on an assessment 'on-the-ground', of the powers available to them, adjudged to be necessary and targeted at particular individuals, is immeasurably more likely to strike the proper balance between the demonstrators' rights of freedom of

expression/assembly and the legitimate rights of others, than a Court attempting to frame a civil injunction prospectively against unknown "protestors".

M: *Wolverhampton* and its impact on this case

(1) Background

333. The context of the litigation that gave rise to the Supreme Court decision in ***Wolverhampton*** was a preponderance of cases in which Courts had granted injunctions against "Persons Unknown" (and in at least one case a *contra mundum* injunction) to restrain trespass on the land of local authorities by Gypsies and Travellers. The facts are set out in the first instance decision: ***LB Barking & Dagenham -v- Persons Unknown* [2021] EWHC 1201 (QB)**. Four issues of principle were resolved by me, the most significant being whether a "final injunction" against "Persons Unknown" could bind people who were not parties to the action at the date the injunction was granted (the so-called 'newcomers').

334. Based on established authorities, principally the decisions of the Supreme Court in ***Cameron -v- Liverpool Victoria Insurance Co Ltd* [2019] 1 WLR 1471** and the Court of Appeal in ***Canada Goose UK Retail Ltd -v- Persons Unknown* [2020] 1 WLR 2802**, I decided that it could not: [161]-[189]. I reached that conclusion based on the application of conventional principles of civil litigation and the established limits of those who were made subject to the Court's orders.

335. I also considered the question of whether *contra mundum* injunctions might provide an answer for restraining the actions of 'newcomers', but held that *contra mundum* orders were wholly exceptional and were reserved for cases (like those decided under the *Venables* jurisdiction) where the Court was effectively compelled to grant a *contra mundum* order to avoid a breach of s.6 Human Rights Act 1998: [224]-[238].

(2) The Court of Appeal decision

336. The Court of Appeal reversed my decision: [2023] QB 295. Disapproving the previous Court of Appeal decision in ***Canada Goose*** and applying ***South Cambridgeshire District Council -v- Gammell* [2006] 1 WLR 658**, the Court of Appeal held that that s.37 Senior Courts Act 1981 gave the court power to grant a final injunction that bound individuals who were not parties to the proceedings at the date when the injunction was granted. The Court held that there was no difference in jurisdictional terms between an interim and a final injunction, particularly in the context of those granted against "Persons Unknown". Where an injunction was granted, whether on an interim or a final basis, the court retained the right to supervise and enforce that injunction, including bringing before the court parties violating the injunction who thereby made themselves parties to the proceedings.

(3) The Supreme Court decision

337. Despite there being no defendants to appeal the Court of Appeal's decision, the Supreme Court nevertheless heard an appeal brought by the interveners.

338. The appeal from the Court of Appeal's decision was dismissed, but the Supreme Court disagreed with the Court of Appeal's reasoning. The Supreme Court held that the Court

had jurisdiction to grant a *contra mundum* injunction that restrained newcomers. The judgment concluded with this summary of the decision [238]:

> "(i) The court has jurisdiction (in the sense of power) to grant an injunction against 'newcomers', that is, persons who at the time of the grant of the injunction are neither defendants nor identifiable, and who are described in the order only as persons unknown. The injunction may be granted on an interim or final basis, necessarily on an application without notice.
>
> (ii) Such an injunction (a 'newcomer injunction') will be effective to bind anyone who has notice of it while it remains in force, even though that person had no intention and had made no threat to do the act prohibited at the time when the injunction was granted and was therefore someone against whom, at that time, the applicant had no cause of action. It is inherently an order with effect *contra mundum*, and is not to be justified on the basis that those who disobey it automatically become defendants.
>
> (iii) In deciding whether to grant a newcomer injunction and, if so, upon what terms, the court will be guided by principles of justice and equity and, in particular:
>
> (a) That equity provides a remedy where the others available under the law are inadequate to vindicate or protect the rights in issue.
>
> (b) That equity looks to the substance rather than to the form.
>
> (c) That equity takes an essentially flexible approach to the formulation of a remedy.
>
> (d) That equity has not been constrained by hard rules or procedure in fashioning a remedy to suit new circumstances.
>
> (e) These principles may be discerned in action in the remarkable development of the injunction as a remedy during the last 50 years.
>
> (iv) In deciding whether to grant a newcomer injunction, the application of those principles in the context of trespass and breach of planning control by Travellers will be likely to require an applicant:
>
> (a) to demonstrate a compelling need for the protection of civil rights or the enforcement of public law not adequately met by any other remedies (including statutory remedies) available to the applicant.
>
> (b) to build into the application and into the order sought procedural protection for the rights (including Convention rights) of the newcomers affected by the order, sufficient to overcome the potential for injustice arising from the fact that, as against newcomers, the application will necessarily be made without notice to them. Those protections are likely to include advertisement of an intended application so as to alert potentially affected Travellers and bodies which may be able to represent their interests at the hearing of the application, full provision for liberty to persons affected to apply to vary or discharge the order without having to show a change of

circumstances, together with temporal and geographical limits on the scope of the order so as to ensure that it is proportional to the rights and interests sought to be protected.

(c) to comply in full with the disclosure duty which attaches to the making of a without notice application, including bringing to the attention of the court any matter which (after due research) the applicant considers that a newcomer might wish to raise by way of opposition to the making of the order.

(d) to show that it is just and convenient in all the circumstances that the order sought should be made.

(v) If those considerations are adhered to, there is no reason in principle why newcomer injunctions should not be granted."

(a) The *Gammell* principle disapproved as the basis for newcomer injunctions

339. As noted in paragraph (ii) of the Supreme Court's summary, the 'newcomer' injunction it recognised was a *contra mundum* order. In disagreement with the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court disapproved of the previous basis upon which 'newcomer' injunctions had been granted using the principle from ***Gammell*** to treat 'newcomers', by their conduct, as having become defendants to the proceedings and bound to comply with the injunction: [127]-[132].

340. Ms Bolton submitted that the species of injunction newly sanctioned by the Supreme Court was "*analogous*" to a *contra mundum* injunction. Whilst the Supreme Court did use the word "*analogous*" in discussion of 'newcomer' injunctions ([132]), the new form of order that it ultimately approved is not analogous to a *contra mundum* order; it *is* a *contra mundum* order. That is plain from [238(ii)].

(b) The key features of, and justification for, a *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction

341. The Supreme Court identified the "*distinguishing features*" of a 'newcomer' injunction as follows [143]:

"(i) They are made against persons who are truly unknowable at the time of the grant, rather than (like Lord Sumption's class 1 in ***Cameron***) identifiable persons whose names are not known. They therefore apply potentially to anyone in the world.

(ii) They are always made, as against newcomers, on a without notice basis (see [139] above). However, as we explain below, informal notice of the application for such an injunction may nevertheless be given by advertisement.

(iii) In the context of Travellers and Gypsies they are made in cases where the persons restrained are unlikely to have any right or liberty to do that which is prohibited by the order, save perhaps Convention rights to be weighed in a proportionality balance. The conduct restrained is typically either a plain trespass or a plain breach of planning control, or both.

(iv) Accordingly, although there are exceptions, these injunctions are generally made in proceedings where there is unlikely to be a real dispute to be resolved, or triable issue of fact or law about the claimant's entitlement, even though the injunction sought is of course always discretionary. They and the proceedings in which they are made are generally more a form of enforcement of undisputed rights than a form of dispute resolution.

(v) Even in cases where there might in theory be such a dispute, or a real prospect that article 8 rights might prevail, the newcomers would in practice be unlikely to engage with the proceedings as active defendants, even if joined. This is not merely or even mainly because they are newcomers who may by complying with the injunction remain unidentified. Even if identified and joined as defendants, experience has shown that they generally decline to take any active part in the proceedings, whether because of lack of means, lack of pro bono representation, lack of a wish to undertake costs risk, lack of a perceived defence or simply because their wish to camp on any particular site is so short term that it makes more sense to move on than to go to court about continued camping at any particular site or locality.

(vi) By the same token the mischief against which the injunction is aimed, although cumulatively a serious threatened invasion of the claimant's rights (or the rights of the neighbouring public which the local authorities seek to protect), is usually short term and liable, if terminated, just to be repeated on a nearby site, or by different Travellers on the same site, so that the usual processes of eviction, or even injunction against named parties, are an inadequate means of protection.

(vii) For all those reasons the injunction (even when interim in form) is sought for its medium to long term effect even if time-limited, rather than as a means of holding the ring in an emergency, ahead of some later trial process, or even a renewed interim application on notice (and following service) in which any defendant is expected to be identified, let alone turn up and contest.

(viii) Nor is the injunction designed (like a freezing injunction, search order, *Norwich Pharmacal* or *Bankers Trust* order or even an anti-suit injunction) to protect from interference or abuse, or to enhance, some related process of the court. Its purpose, and no doubt the reason for its recent popularity, is simply to provide a more effective, possibly the only effective, means of vindication or protection of relevant rights than any other sanction currently available to the claimant local authorities."

342. Paragraph (iii) has particular importance in relation to some of the torts that are relied upon in relation to protest cases; e.g. public nuisance arising from an obstruction of the highway, interference with the right of access to the highway and harassment.

343. The Supreme Court was also very clear that this new form of *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction – "*a novel exercise of an equitable discretionary power*" – was only likely to be justified in the following circumstances [167]:

"(i) There is a compelling need, sufficiently demonstrated by the evidence, for the protection of civil rights (or, as the case may be, the enforcement of planning control, the prevention of anti-social behaviour, or such other

statutory objective as may be relied upon) in the locality which is not adequately met by any other measures available to the applicant local authorities (including the making of byelaws). This is a condition which would need to be met on the particular facts about unlawful Traveller activity within the applicant local authority's boundaries.

(ii) There is procedural protection for the rights (including Convention rights) of the affected newcomers, sufficient to overcome the strong prima facie objection of subjecting them to a without notice injunction otherwise than as an emergency measure to hold the ring. This will need to include an obligation to take all reasonable steps to draw the application and any order made to the attention of all those likely to be affected by it (see [226]-[231] below); and the most generous provision for liberty (i.e. permission) to apply to have the injunction varied or set aside, and on terms that the grant of the injunction in the meantime does not foreclose any objection of law, practice, justice or convenience which the newcomer so applying might wish to raise.

(iii) Applicant local authorities can be seen and trusted to comply with the most stringent form of disclosure duty on making an application, so as both to research for and then present to the court everything that might have been said by the targeted newcomers against the grant of injunctive relief.

(iv) The injunctions are constrained by both territorial and temporal limitations so as to ensure, as far as practicable, that they neither outflank nor outlast the compelling circumstances relied upon.

(v) It is, on the particular facts, just and convenient that such an injunction be granted. It might well not for example be just to grant an injunction restraining Travellers from using some sites as short-term transit camps if the applicant local authority has failed to exercise its power or, as the case may be, discharge its duty to provide authorised sites for that purpose within its boundaries."

344. The Supreme Court described the need to demonstrate a "*compelling justification*" for the order sought as an "*overarching principle that must guide the court at all stages of its consideration*" of such orders: [188].

(c) Protest cases

345. Necessarily, the factors identified by the Supreme Court were directed at the particular issue of unlawful encampments of Gypsies and Travellers on local authority land. So far as their potential application of *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunctions in protest cases, the Supreme Court said only this:

> [235] The emphasis in this discussion has been on newcomer injunctions in Gypsy and Traveller cases and nothing we have said should be taken as prescriptive in relation to newcomer injunctions in other cases, such as those directed at protestors who engage in direct action by, for example, blocking motorways, occupying motorway gantries or occupying HS2's land with the intention of disrupting construction. Each of these activities may, depending on all the circumstances, justify the grant of an injunction against persons unknown, including newcomers. Any of these persons who have notice of the order

> will be bound by it, just as effectively as the injunction in the proceedings the subject of this appeal has bound newcomer Gypsies and Travellers.
>
> [236] Counsel for the Secretary of State for Transport has submitted and we accept that each of these cases has called for a full and careful assessment of the justification for the order sought, the rights which are or may be interfered with by the grant of the order, and the proportionality of that interference. Again, in so far as the applicant seeks an injunction against newcomers, the judge must be satisfied there is a compelling need for the order. Often the circumstances of these cases vary significantly one from another in terms of the range and number of people who may be affected by the making or refusal of the injunction sought; the legal right to be protected; the illegality to be prevented; and the rights of the respondents to the application. The duration and geographical scope of the injunction necessary to protect the applicant's rights in any particular case are ultimately matters for the judge having regard to the general principles we have explained.

346. Whilst the matters addressed by the Supreme Court were specific to the particular context of Gypsies and Travellers' encampments (see [190]-[217]), what emerges is that, before *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunctions are granted, the Court must consider "*whether the [applicant] has exhausted all reasonable alternatives to the grant of an injunction*". Of course, in the context of the problems of unlawful encampments of land, a local authority has a range of other options available to it – ranging from byelaws, public space protection orders to directions made under s.77 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.

347. Private litigants, such as the Claimants in this case, do not have access to similar powers. The fact that an applicant for a *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction can demonstrate infringements of the civil law does not mean that they can have immediate recourse to a *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction. Consideration of both whether the applicant has demonstrated a compelling justification for the remedy and whether it is just and convenient to grant such an order will require the Court to consider what other (and potentially better) solutions may be available, particularly in the context of protests.

348. In the context of protest cases, the Court is entitled to and must have regard to (a) the extensive powers the police have to deal with protest activities, including, from 28 June 2022, the new statutory offence of public nuisance in s.78 Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022 (see [81] above); and (in relation to potential exclusion zones) (b) the powers of local authorities to impose public space protection orders under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (see ***Wolverhampton*** [204]).

349. In ***Canada Goose -v- Persons Unknown*** **[2020] WLR 417**, a protest case, I said this:

> [100] The evidence in the current case shows that there have been few arrests by the police of demonstrators prior to the grant of the injunction. I was told at the hearing that the Claimants know of no prosecutions of any protestors. Evidence before Teare J suggested that the cost of policing the demonstrations was around £108,000. Of course, individuals and companies are entitled to pursue such private law remedies as are available to them and to seek interim injunctions where appropriate, but this case (and ***Ineos*** and ***Astellas*** – see [119] below) perhaps demonstrate the

difficulties and limits of trying to fashion civil injunctions into quasi-public order restrictions.

[101] When considering whether it is *necessary* to impose civil injunctions (even if they can be precisely defined and properly limited to prohibit only unlawful conduct) the Court must be entitled to look at the overall picture and the extent to which the law provides other remedies that may be equally if not more effective.

[102] The police play an essential and important role in striking the appropriate balance between facilitating lawful demonstration and preventing activities that are unlawful. Consistent with the proper respect for the Article 10/11 rights (see [99(viii)] above), it is only those engaged upon or intent on violence (or other criminal activity) who are liable to arrest and removal, leaving others to demonstrate peacefully. The police have available an extensive array of resources and powers to keep protests within lawful bounds, including:

i) their presence; often itself a deterrent to unlawful activities;

ii) the power of arrest, in particular for breach of the peace, harassment, public order offences (under Public Order Act 1986), obstruction of the highway (see [107] below), criminal damage, aggravated trespass (contrary to s.68 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994) and assault;

iii) the use of dispersal powers under Part 3 of the Anti-social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014;

iv) the imposition of conditions on public assembly under s.14 Public Order Act 1986; and/or

v) an application for a prohibition of trespassory assembly under s.14A Public Order Act 1986.

[103] Selected and proportionate use of these powers, adjudged to be necessary and targeted at particular individuals, by police officers making decisions based on an assessment 'on-the-ground', is immeasurably more likely to strike the proper balance between the demonstrators' rights of freedom of expression/assembly and the legitimate rights of others, than a Court attempting to frame a civil injunction prospectively against unknown "protestors".

[104] Parliament has also provided local authorities powers to make public space protection orders which can restrict the right to demonstrate. Chapter 2 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 empowers local authorities to make such orders if the conditions in s.59 are met: see ***Dulgheriu -v- London Borough of Ealing*** **[2020] 1 WLR 609**.

350. The Court of Appeal in ***Canada Goose*** **[2020] 1 WLR 2802** [93] agreed:

"… Canada Goose's problem is that it seeks to invoke the civil jurisdiction of the courts as a means of permanently controlling ongoing public demonstrations by a

> continually fluctuating body of protestors. It wishes to use remedies in private litigation in effect to prevent what is sees as public disorder. Private law remedies are not well suited to such a task. As the present case shows, what are appropriate permanent controls on such demonstrations involve complex considerations of private rights, civil liberties, public expectations and local authority policies. Those affected are not confined to Canada Goose, its customers and suppliers and protestors. They include, most graphically in the case of an exclusion zone, the impact on neighbouring properties and businesses, local residents, workers and shoppers. It is notable that the powers conferred by Parliament on local authorities, for example to make a public spaces protection order under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, require the local authority to take into account various matters, including rights of freedom of assembly and expression, and to carry out extensive consultation: see, for example, ***Dulgheriu -v- Ealing London Borough Council*** **[2020] 1 WLR 609**. The civil justice process is a far blunter instrument intended to resolve disputes between parties to litigation, who have had a fair opportunity to participate in it."

351. Although the Supreme Court in ***Wolverhampton*** disagreed with the Court of Appeal's decision in ***Canada Goose*** (see [133]-[138]), that was on the ground that Court of Appeal was wrong to find that a final injunction could not bind 'newcomers'. The Supreme Court did not specifically address – or contradict – the Court of Appeal's identification of the problems of attempting to use civil injunctions to control public protest. The decision found that *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunctions can, as a matter of principle, be granted in protest cases, but says nothing (beyond what is noted in [235]-[236]) about the particular issues that arise in such cases, other than to acknowledge the different issues that will call for decision and that, with all *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunctions, a compelling justification for the order must be demonstrated.

(d) The need to identify the prohibited acts clearly in the terms of any injunction

352. The Supreme Court set out the requirements of any *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction:

> [222] It is always important that an injunction spells out clearly and in everyday terms the full extent of the acts it prohibits, and this is particularly so where it is sought against persons unknown, including newcomers. The terms of the injunction – and therefore the prohibited acts – must correspond as closely as possible to the actual or threatened unlawful conduct. Further, the order should extend no further than the minimum necessary to achieve the purpose for which it was granted; and the terms of the order must be sufficiently clear and precise to enable persons affected by it to know what they must not do.
>
> [223] Further, if and in so far as the authority seeks to enjoin any conduct which is lawful viewed on its own, this must also be made absolutely clear, and the authority must be prepared to satisfy the court that there is no other more proportionate way of protecting its rights or those of others.
>
> [224] It follows but we would nevertheless emphasise that the prohibited acts should not be described in terms of a legal cause of action, such as trespass or nuisance, unless this is unavoidable. They should be defined, so far as

> possible, in non-technical and readily comprehensible language which a person served with or given notice of the order is capable of understanding without recourse to professional legal advisers.

(4) Other consequences of *contra mundum* litigation

353. There are further implications of the move to *contra mundum* orders. In despatching the ***Gammell*** principle as the jurisdictional basis to bind newcomers, the Supreme Court did away with the notion that the people bound by a 'newcomer' injunction are parties to the litigation. They are not bound as a party; they are bound because the injunction is framed as a prohibition generally on the identified act(s) that, subject to notice of the injunction, binds everyone: "*anyone who knowingly breaches the injunction is liable to be held in contempt, whether or not they have been served with the proceedings*": [132].

354. The Supreme Court did not really address the issue of service of a Claim Form in a wholly *contra mundum* claim (i.e. one in which there are no named defendants). All that was said was [56]:

> "Conventional methods of service may be impractical where defendants cannot be identified. However, alternative methods of service can be permitted under CPR r 6.15. In exceptional circumstances (for example, where the defendant has deliberately avoided identification and substituted service is impractical), the court has the power to dispense with service, under CPR r 6.16."

355. In litigation brought solely *contra mundum* there can be no expectation or requirement to serve the Claim Form on the putative defendant. In *contra mundum* litigation, "*there is, in reality no defendant*": ***Wolverhampton*** [115]. There is therefore no one upon whom the Claim Form can be served. If, exceptionally, the Court is satisfied that it is appropriate to proceed to without a defendant, the Court can dispense with the service of the Claim Form under CPR 6.16. That was the course adopted in ***In the matter of the persons formerly known as Winch*** **[2021] EMLR 20** [31].

356. The absence of any defendant(s) also means that, whilst the Court must ensure that the terms of any *contra mundum* injunction are (a) clear as to what conduct is prohibited (see [352] above), and (b) compellingly shown to be necessary, there is now no need carefully to define the category of "Persons Unknown" who are to be defendants to the claim; there are no defendants in such a claim.

357. I note that the Supreme Court said the following about the description of those who are to be restrained by a *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction:

> [132] … Although the persons enjoined by a newcomer injunction should be described as precisely as may be possible in the circumstances, they potentially embrace the whole of humanity…
>
> [221] The actual or intended respondents to the application must be defined as precisely as possible. In so far as it is possible actually to identify persons to whom the order is directed (and who will be enjoined by its terms) by name or in some other way, as Lord Sumption explained in ***Cameron*** **[2019] 1 WLR 1471**, the local authority ought to do so. The fact that a precautionary injunction is also sought against newcomers or other persons unknown is not of itself a justification for failing properly to identify these

> persons when it is possible to do so, and serving them with the proceedings and order, if necessary, by seeking an order for substituted service. It is only permissible to seek or maintain an order directed to newcomers or other persons unknown where it is impossible to name or identify them in some other and more precise way. Even where the persons sought to be subjected to the injunction are newcomers, the possibility of identifying them as a class by reference to conduct prior to what would be a breach (and, if necessary, by reference to intention) should be explored and adopted if possible."

358. Of course, every case will have to be decided on its facts. In a case of unlawful encampment on land, it may very well be possible to identify, if not to name, (a) those currently on the land; (b) those immediately threatening to move onto the land; and (c) newcomers who might at some future point move onto the land. I read the Supreme Court's guidance as a reminder that the fact that the injunction sought includes a *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction against (c), does not relieve the local authority for taking such steps as are available to identify, and serve the Claim Form upon, those in categories (a) and (b) (if necessary, by an alternative service order).

359. But there can be no question of service of a Claim Form on those in category (c). These people cannot be identified. They cannot be served, not even under the terms of an alternative service order. As against them, the *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction is made, necessarily, without notice. For persons in category (c), the Supreme Court regarded their interests adequately safeguarded by their ability to apply to vary or discharge the order.

360. Ms Bolton had advanced, as an alternative to the *contra mundum* order, what might be regarded as the pre-***Wolverhampton*** form of "Persons Unknown" injunction. Reflecting the need to identify, clearly, the categories of "Persons Unknown" defendants (c.f. ***Canada Goose*** [82(4)]), the injunction sought restrain particular categories of defendants. Following ***Wolverhampton***, this is no longer necessary, nor appropriate for *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunctions. Indeed, one benefit of the ***Wolverhampton*** decision is that the form of the injunction order, if granted, can be much simplified. The experience that I have gained in this case suggests that, if there is an opportunity to simplify injunction orders directed at those who are not parties to the proceedings, it should be grasped.

361. The form of the Interim Injunction Order that has been in force since 2 August 2022 lists a total of 33 Defendants, of which there are 10 separate categories of "Persons Unknown" (the various descriptions can be seen in Annex 1). It is not until page 4 of the 8-page document that a person reading it would get to the actual terms of the injunction. Even then, s/he would have to refer back to the defined categories of "Persons Unknown" to understand (a) whether s/he now fell (or, if s/he did an act prohibited by the injunction, would fall) within this category; and, if so (b) what s/he was therefore prohibited from doing. During these proceedings, I have become increasingly concerned that the Interim Injunction Order in this case has become an impenetrable legal thicket, likely to be beyond the comprehension of most ordinary people. That was an unavoidable product of the complicated legal basis on which "Persons Unknown" injunctions were granted. Courts should always strive to ensure that its orders are clear, but in a case concerning protest, it is especially important to avoid uncertainty as to what is and is not permitted. Such uncertainty is likely to chill lawful exercise of important rights under Articles 10 and 11.

362. Now that the Supreme Court has despatched the legal thicket, in favour of *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunctions, all of these historic complications can (and in my view should) be swept away. I would also suggest, and it will be the practice I shall adopt in this case, that the *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction should be contained in a separate order from any injunction made against parties to the litigation. In that way, the terms of the *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction can state, clearly and simply, what acts the Court is prohibiting by *anyone*. It is particularly important that injunctions that place limits on a citizen's right to demonstrate must be spelled out in clear and readily comprehensible terms so that there is no inadvertent chilling effect.

(5) *Contra mundum* injunctions as a form of legislation?

363. In ***LB Barking & Dagenham*** (the first instance decision in ***Wolverhampton***), I had expressed the concern that, by granting *contra mundum* injunctions, the Court risked moving from its constitutionally legitimate role of resolving disputes raised by the parties before it, to an arguably constitutionally illegitimate role of using injunctive powers effectively to legislate to prohibit behaviour generally [260]:

> "If these established principles and the limits they impose on civil litigation are not observed, the Court risks moving from its proper role in adjudicating upon disputes between parties into, effectively, legislating to prohibit behaviour generally by use of a combination of injunctions and the Court's powers of enforcement. There may be good arguments - and Mr Anderson QC's submissions made points that could have been made by all of the Cohort Claimants - as to why such behaviour ought to be prohibited, but it is not the job of the Court, through civil injunctions granted *contra mundum*, to venture into that territory. Stepping back, the injunction that Wolverhampton was granted, with a power of arrest attached, effectively achieved the criminalisation of trespass on the 60 or so sites covered by the injunction. In a democracy, legislation is the exclusive province of elected representatives. A court operating in an adversarial system of civil litigation simply does not have procedures that are well-suited or designed to prohibit, by injunction, conduct generally…"

364. The view the Court of Appeal took as to the availability of "Persons Unknown" injunctions meant that the point did not arise.

365. The appellants in the Supreme Court did argue that *contra mundum* orders were objectionable on the ground that they were, effectively, a form of legislation (see [154]). The Supreme Court rejected the argument:

> [169] We have already mentioned the objection that an injunction of this type looks more like a species of local law than an in personam remedy between civil litigants. It is said that the courts have neither the skills, the capacity for consultation nor the democratic credentials for making what is in substance legislation binding everyone. In other words, the courts are acting outside their proper constitutional role and are making what are, in effect, local laws. The more appropriate response, it is argued, is for local authorities to use their powers to make byelaws or to exercise their other statutory powers to intervene.
>
> [170] We do not accept that the granting of injunctions of this kind is constitutionally improper. In so far as the local authorities are seeking to

> prevent the commission of civil wrongs such as trespass, they are entitled to apply to the civil courts for any relief allowed by law. In particular, they are entitled to invoke the equitable jurisdiction of the court so as to obtain an injunction against potential trespassers. For the reasons we have explained, courts have jurisdiction to make such orders against persons who are not parties to the action, i.e. newcomers. In so far as the local authorities are seeking to prevent breaches of public law, including planning law and the law relating to highways, they are empowered to seek injunctions by statutory provisions such as those mentioned in para 45 above. They can accordingly invoke the equitable jurisdiction of the court, which extends, as we have explained, to the granting of newcomer injunctions. The possibility of an alternative non-judicial remedy does not deprive the courts of jurisdiction.
>
> [171] Although we reject the constitutional objection, we accept that the availability of non-judicial remedies, such as the making of byelaws and the exercise of other statutory powers, may bear on questions (i) and (v) in para 167 above: that is to say, whether there is a compelling need for an injunction, and whether it is, on the facts, just and convenient to grant one…

366. I note that in ***Valero Ltd -v- Persons Unknown*** **[2024] EWHC 124 (KB)** [57]**,** Ritchie J described *contra mundum* injunctions as "*a nuclear option in civil law akin to a temporary piece of legislation affecting all citizens in England and Wales for the future*".

367. As a first instance Judge, my obligation is clear. I must faithfully follow and apply the law as declared by the Supreme Court. But I remain troubled by the Courts seeking to set the boundaries upon lawful protest by *contra mundum* injunctions. I remain concerned that, constitutionally, the prohibition of conduct by citizens generally, with the threat of punishment (including imprisonment) for contravention, ought to be a matter for Parliament.

368. Prior to ***Wolverhampton***, the grant of *contra mundum* injunctions was limited to exceptional cases where the court was "*driven in each case to make the order by a perception that the risk to the claimants' Convention rights placed it under a positive duty to act*": ***Wolverhampton*** [110]. As that duty was imposed by Parliament, by s.6 Human Rights Act 1998, there could be no suggestion that by granting the order, the Court was arrogating to itself a power of legislation that was exclusively the province of Parliament.

369. As recognised by Richie J in ***Valero***, the reality of the imposition of *contra mundum* injunction, with the threat of sanctions including fines and imprisonment for breach, is that it is akin to the creation of a criminal offence. It is a prohibition on conduct generally that has been imposed by a Court, not by the democratic process in Parliament.

370. Further, a *contra mundum* injunction is a prohibition, the alleged breach of which has none of the safeguards that are present in the criminal justice process. If a protestor is alleged to have broken the criminal law, unless exceptionally the prosecution is brought privately, it falls to the Crown Prosecution Service to decide whether to institute criminal proceedings against the protestor and to decide what charge(s) s/he should face. That involves the independent assessment of the evidence and an independent

decision whether it is in the public interest to prosecute. Those important safeguards – in addition to the safeguards in the substantive criminal law – ensure that in our society proper respect is afforded to protest rights under Article 10/11. Even if a private prosecution were brought in a protest case, the Director of Public Prosecutions has the power to take over and discontinue the prosecution.

371. In protest cases, there are additional reasons to be concerned at the risk of abuse. The Court may well grant the injunction (and its enforcement) to a private individual, often the very person against whom the protest is directed.

372. These concerns are not speculative. As the experience in this case has demonstrated, the risks of abuse are real. In the Second Contempt Application, the Claimants actively sought the imposition of a sanction on Ms McGivern, a solicitor, as a "Person Unknown", for behaviour that was either not a civil wrong at all, or a breach of the civil law that was utterly trivial. Yet, because of the terms of the Interim Injunction Order, and the imposition of the Exclusion Zone, the Claimants were able to pursue contempt application against her leading to a 2-day hearing. In the contempt application against Mr Curtin – the Third Contempt Application – the Claimants brought an application that sought to punish Mr Curtin for lending his footwear to a person in a dinosaur costume whom Mr Curtin was alleged to have encouraged to enter the Exclusion Zone. Such a claim would be laughable, if it did not have such serious implications. Apart from Ground 2, the other grounds advanced against Mr Curtin were trivial. None of actions alleged against Mr Curtin amounted to civil wrongs.

373. Had the Crown Prosecution Service been responsible for deciding whether to bring criminal proceedings against Ms McGivern or Mr Curtin for causing or authorising a person in a dinosaur costume to enter the Exclusion Zone, I am confident that a decision would have been made that it was not in the public interest to prosecute. The Claimants, however, are not subject to any analogous requirement to consider whether it is necessary or proportionate to bring a contempt application. On two separate occasions, therefore, they have shown themselves incapable of exercising any sense of proportionality in launching and pursuing the contempt applications in respect of alleged breaches of the Interim Injunction. As a result of the Second Contempt Application, the Court imposed the Contempt Application Permission Requirement (see [49] above) to protect against the abuse of using the Interim Injunction as a weapon.

374. All but one of the allegations brought in the Third Contempt Application against Mr Curtin were trivial. This immediately raises the question as to why the Claimants would pursue trivial breaches of the Interim Injunction. As the Claimants have not had an opportunity to address this specific issue, I shall leave its final resolution, if necessary, to the hearing at which this judgment will be handed down and the Court makes all consequential orders.

M: The relief sought by the Claimants

(1) Against Mr Curtin

375. The Claimants do not seek damages against Mr Curtin.

376. The terms of the final injunction order sought by the Claimants against Mr Curtin are set out in Annex 2 to the judgment.

(2) *Contra mundum*

377. The terms of the *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction sought by the Claimants are set out in Annex 3 to the judgment.

O: Decision

378. In this final section of the judgment, I will set out my decision. The final form of the orders that will be made consequent upon the judgment will be finalised at the hearing at which the judgment is handed down. As the only represented parties, I invite the Claimants' team to provide the first draft. The orders that the Court ultimately makes will be posted on the Judiciary website: www.judiciary.uk.

(1) The claim against Mr Curtin

379. Based on my factual findings, the First Claimant is entitled to judgment against Mr Curtin in respect of its claims against him for (1) trespass on the physical land at the Wyton Site; and (2) interference with the right of access from the Wyton Site to/from the public highway caused by obstructing of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site.

380. The First Claimant's claims against Mr Curtin for public nuisance, harassment and trespass by drone flying are dismissed. The claims of the remaining Claimants against Mr Curtin will be dismissed.

381. Consequent upon the judgment that the First Claimant has been granted, I am satisfied that it is necessary that an injunction should be granted to restrain Mr Curtin from (a) any physical trespass on the land owned by the First Claimant at the Wyton Site; and (b) any direct and deliberate obstruction of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site. The injunction will not include any restrictions in relation to the B&K Site.

382. I have considered carefully whether to continue the prohibition on Mr Curtin's entering the Exclusion Zone. I have concluded that I should not. The Exclusion Zone was a temporary expedient to resolve the flashpoint of vehicles being surrounded. The objectionable, and unlawful, conduct is obstructing vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site. The injunction should target that behaviour directly. Continuation of the Exclusion Zone would subject Mr Curtin to restrictions on activities that are not unlawful, for example if Mr Curtin wanted simply to stand on that part of the grass verge that is presently within the Exclusion Zone. The Claimants have not demonstrated that such a restriction is the only way of protecting their legitimate interests. Mr Curtin should not be exposed to the risk of proceedings for contempt by doing acts that are not themselves a civil wrong.

383. The restriction on obstructing vehicles will be drafted in a way that is clear and specific. It will not include the word "*approach*" or the concept of "*slowing*" a vehicle. Approaching a vehicle in a way that is not an obstruction of that vehicle is not an act that the First Claimant is entitled to restrain. The incident on 11 July 2022 (see [275]-[279] above) demonstrates the risks that an injunction framed in these terms risks capturing behaviour that the Court never intended to restrain. Mr Curtin, and the Claimants, now know what acts amount to obstructing a vehicle.

384. The words "*direct and deliberate*" will be included in the injunction to ensure that indirect or inadvertent obstruction is not caught. A disproportionate amount of time was spent at the time considering the extent to which Mr Curtin's simply standing at the side of the Access Road obstructed the view of the driver of a vehicle leaving the Wyton Site, and therefore amounted to an obstruction of the "*free passage*" of the vehicle. As I have held (see [80] above), the First Claimant's common law right of access to the highway is not unqualified. If Mr Curtin simply walks across the Access Road, to get from one side of the entrance of the Wyton Site to the other, he does not interfere with the First Claimant's right of access to the highway if a vehicle attempting to enter or leave the Wyton Site momentarily has to give way to Mr Curtin. Deliberately standing in front of a vehicle to prevent it entering or leaving the Wyton Site is different, and obviously so. The injunction will prohibit the latter, but not the former. An injunction framed in these terms will also enable Mr Curtin to invite drivers of vehicles to stop, to speak to them and to offer them leaflets about the protest.

385. As a result, the injunction granted against Mr Curtin will consist of Paragraph (1)(a) of the Claimants' draft (in Annex 2) together with a new paragraph (2) which will prohibit Mr Curtin from directly and deliberately obstructing vehicles entering or leaving the public highway outside the Wyton Site.

(2) *Contra mundum* claim

386. Based on my factual findings, I am satisfied that the First Claimant has proved that persons who cannot be identified threaten to (a) trespass upon the First Claimant's land at the Wyton Site; and/or (b) interfere with the right of access from the Wyton Site to/from the public highway caused by obstructing of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site.

387. The First Claimant has failed to prove that persons who cannot be identified threaten to fly drones over the Wyton Site at a height that amounts to trespass upon the First Claimant's land. In any event, the First Claimant has not made out a compelling case for the grant of a *contra mundum* injunction or that such an order would be just and convenient. The Claimants have adduced no evidence as to the height at which flying a drone interferes with its user of the First Claimant's land. 100 meters (and indeed the other heights that have variously been proposed by the Claimants) are simply arbitrary. The Claimants have been forced to choose a height (albeit without supporting evidence) because they are seeking to rely upon trespass. In reality the Claimants want to prohibit all drone flying over the Wyton Site (at whatever height) because it is not the trespass that it represents but the filming opportunity that it provides. As I have explained, there is a palpable disconnect between the tort relied upon and the wrong that that the Claimants are seeking to address.

388. I am satisfied that there is a compelling need, convincingly demonstrated by the First Claimant's evidence of repeated infringements of its civil rights, for the Court to grant a *contra mundum* injunction to restrain future acts by protestors of (a) trespass at the Wyton Site; and (b) interference with the right of access from the Wyton Site to/from the public highway caused by the obstruction of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site.

389. I considered carefully whether it was just and convenient to grant an injunction *contra mundum* to restrain future trespass. On the one hand, the First Claimant is particularly

vulnerable to deliberate acts of trespass by protestors targeted against it because of the nature of its business. Leaving the First Claimant to pursue ad hoc civil remedies against individual trespassers would be likely to provide inadequate protection for its civil rights. On the other hand, I have real concerns that this form of order is potentially open to abuse by the First Claimant. It threatens to expose people who do nothing more than step momentarily on the First Claimant's land at the Wyton Site to the threat of proceedings for contempt of court. However, I have decided that these risks are adequately mitigated by the following factors:

(1) First, a contempt application would only be successful if the First Claimant demonstrates that the alleged trespasser had notice of the terms of the *contra mundum* injunction. It is quite clear from the Supreme Court's decision in ***Wolverhampton*** that notice is an essential pre-requisite of liability for breach of the new *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunction that it has sanctioned. (I say nothing about what, if any, notice is required for the sort of *contra mundum* injunction made under the *Venables* jurisdiction, which appear to me to raise very different questions, and upon which I have received no submissions).

(2) Second, the First Claimant is subject and will remain subject to the Contempt Application Permission Requirement that was imposed on 2 August 2022 (see [49] above). This will mean that the First Claimant will have to make an application to the Court for permission to bring a contempt application alleging breach of the *contra mundum* order. The evidence in support of the application for permission would need to demonstrate that the proposed contempt application (a) is one that has a real prospect of success; (b) is not one that relies upon wholly technical or insubstantial breaches; and (c) is supported by evidence that the respondent had actual knowledge of the terms of the injunction before being alleged to have breached it. Ms Bolton accepted that the continuation of the Contempt Application Permission Requirement was appropriate if the Court were prepared to grant a *contra mundum* injunction. The *contra mundum* order will record, again, the Contempt Application Permission Requirement, and what the First Claimant must demonstrate in order to be granted permission.

390. Based on my experience in this case, and my concerns about potential abuse of such injunctions (see [370]-[374] above), it is my very clear view that all *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunctions, particularly those in protest cases, should include a requirement that the Court's permission be obtained before a contempt application can be instituted. This would reduce the risks of a *contra mundum* injunction being used as a weapon against perceived adversaries for trivial infringements.

391. The decision in relation to granting a *contra mundum* injunction to restrain interference with the right of access from the Wyton Site to/from the public highway caused by obstructing of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site is more straightforward. If the injunction focuses, as it should, on direct and deliberate obstruction, then unlike trespass, this is unlikely to be an unintentional act or one committed by inadvertence. On the contrary, people who attend the Wyton Site to protest will quickly come to understand that the Court has prohibited direct and deliberate obstruction of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site.

392. The inclusion of the words "*direct and deliberate*" is also required in the *contra mundum* injunction, for the same reasons as they are needed in the injunction against Mr Curtin (see [384] above). There is a further important reason why these words are required in the *contra mundum* order. They will ensure that if a group of protestors lawfully processed along the B1090, and past the entrance of the Wyton Site, for the time they were passing the entrance they would probably prevent a vehicle leaving or entering the Wyton Site. It would be a serious interference to the right of lawful protest, for the *contra mundum* injunction (by an unintended side wind) to prohibit such a procession. This is to be contrasted with a group of protestors assembling outside the Wyton Site (as has happened in the past) which deliberately and directly obstructs vehicles attempting to leave or enter the Wyton Site. This conduct the injunction intends to prevent.

393. Although the First Claimant has demonstrated that there is a continuing risk that large scale demonstrations may be of such a size and duration that they may amount to a public nuisance, it has not demonstrated a compelling case that a *contra mundum* injunction is needed to tackle this risk or that it is just and convenient to make an order in these terms.

394. First, a public nuisance on this scale is primarily a matter for the police, who have ample powers to deal with both obstruction of the highway and public nuisance. I am satisfied that the police are using their powers appropriately and, in doing so, are setting the right balance between the legitimate interests of the First Claimant and the rights of protestors.

395. Second, whether the obstruction of a highway amounts to a public nuisance is entirely dependent upon a factual assessment of what happened on a particular occasion. It clearly does not fit into the category identified by the Supreme Court in ***Wolverhampton*** [143(iv)]. It is virtually impossible to fashion an injunction to restrain public nuisance that complies with the requirements reiterated by the Supreme Court (see [352] above). There is an obvious risk that granting an injunction that was targeted at prohibiting public nuisance would in fact chill perfectly lawful protest activity.

396. The First Claimant has not demonstrated that there is a compelling need for an Exclusion Zone to be imposed *contra mundum*. Even if such an order was directed specifically at protestors, it would still be very problematic. As I have already noted in the context of Mr Curtin's claim, the Exclusion Zone was a temporary expedient granted as an interim measure. It has largely had the desired effect of removing the main flashpoint in the demonstrations. I understand, therefore, why the First Claimant wishes to see it maintained. However, the central objection to this being continued *contra mundum* is that it restrains acts that are not even arguably unlawful. When it is remembered that the Court is going to prohibit obstruction of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site, it is also difficult to argue that this further restriction is necessary. For that part of the Exclusion Zone that is part of the highway, it is, in my judgment, for the police to deal with obstructions of the highway that are anything more than transitory. There may be scope for an Exclusion Zone to be imposed in protest cases (c.f. those imposed around abortion clinics), but that is best done by a Public Spaces Protection Order, not a civil injunction.

397. For vehicles that are leaving or entering the Wyton Site via the public highway, obstruction of those vehicles will be prohibited. That aspect of the "*flashpoint*" will

continue to be restrained. I accept that the Claimants have provided evidence of at least one occasion where there has been significant surrounding, obstruction and delay of vehicles further down the B1090 highway. However, none of the Claimants has demonstrated a legal entitlement to restrain that activity. Save in the most extreme cases, it is unlikely to amount to a public nuisance, and I have explained above why I am not prepared to grant a *contra mundum* injunction to restrain public nuisance. For understandable reasons, the Claimants did not pursue a harassment claim against "Persons Unknown". It suffers from the same problem as public nuisance; the tort is so fact sensitive as to whether the threshold has been crossed into unlawful behaviour as to make it almost impossible to fashion a *contra mundum* injunction in acceptable terms. In my judgment, these are simply the inevitable limits of what can be achieved in attempting to control public order issues by civil injunction.

398. For these reasons, I shall grant to the First Claimant a more limited form of *contra mundum* injunction than that sought by the Claimants. It will restrain future acts by protestors of (a) trespass at the Wyton Site; and (b) interference with the right of access from the Wyton Site to/from the public highway caused by obstructing of vehicles entering or leaving the Wyton Site. Given that *contra mundum* 'newcomer' injunctions remain relatively uncharted waters, I am going to provide that the injunction shall last initially for a period of 2 years, at which point the Court will consider whether it should be renewed, discharged, or potentially extended.

399. Turning to paragraphs 3-5 of the Claimants' proposed order.

(1) It is very important to ensure that those affected by the order are made aware of their right to apply to the Court to vary or discharge it. Anyone affected by the order, which would embrace anyone who is protesting at the Wyton Site, or is intending to do so, is entitled to apply to the Court or vary or discharge the order. For that purpose, they must have an immediately available and effective method of being provided with all of the evidence that was relied upon by the Claimants to obtain the *contra mundum* order.

(2) It is not appropriate to provide for any sort of alternative service of the injunction order. It is for the First Claimant to decide how best to give notice of the injunction to those who need to be aware of its terms. In terms of any subsequent enforcement action, the burden will fall on the First Claimant to demonstrate that the terms of the injunction have come sufficiently to the attention of the person against whom the First Claimant wants to bring contempt proceedings. The effect of paragraphs 3-5 of the Claimants' proposed order would be that, once the relevant steps were completed, the whole world would be deemed to have received notice of the injunction. That would be a palpable fiction. It could even embrace people who are not yet born. Subject to proof of breach of the injunction, it would deliver, practically, a strict liability regime. That is not what remotely what the Supreme Court envisaged, and it is not fair.

(3) Mr Curtin's penalty in the Third Contempt Application

400. When deciding the appropriate penalty for contempt of court, the Court assesses the contemnor's culpability and the harm caused by the breach. The concept of harm, in contempt cases, includes not only direct harm caused to those who the injunction was

designed to protect, but also the harm to the administration of justice by the contemnor's disobedience to an order of the Court.

401. As to Mr Curtin's culpability, I have already found that, in his admitted breach of the Interim Injunction that formed Ground 2, he did not deliberately flout the Court's order; he got partly carried away by his emotions. I accept that, when the breach was committed, he was engaged on protest activities reflecting his sincerely held beliefs. Overall, I assess his culpability as low.

402. As to harm, the breach was in respect of a protective order that was designed to prevent the sort of behaviour in which Mr Curtin engaged. However, against that, the van was only fleetingly obstructed as it attempted to leave the Wyton Site. The incident had none of the significantly aggravating factors that had led to the imposition of the Interim injunction. Overall, this was not a serious breach of the injunction, and it has no other aggravating features. I assess the harm to be low.

403. Mr Curtin accepted the breach represented by Ground 2 at the substantive hearing. By analogy with criminal proceedings, it is fair to reflect the equivalent of a guilty plea with a 10% reduction in the sentence.

404. I am quite satisfied that seriousness of Mr Curtin's breach of the Interim Injunction is not so serious that only a custodial sentence is appropriate. I indicated as much at the conclusion of the hearing on 23 June 2023. I am satisfied that, reflecting upon the culpability and harm, it is appropriate to deal with this breach by way of a fine. In terms of mitigation, this is the first breach of the Interim Injunction and there has been no repetition since the incident almost 3 years ago. I also accept Mr Curtin's evidence that he has always tried to abide by the terms of the Court's order.

405. I have considered the sentencing guidelines for the less serious public order offences as a useful cross reference. On the Sentencing Council Guidelines for disorderly behaviour, in breach of s.5 Public Order Act 1986, Mr Curtin's conduct would appear to fall into category 2B, which gives a starting point of a Band A fine, with a range from discharge to a Band B fine. A Band A fine, is between 25-75% of the defendant's weekly wage, with a Band B fine range of 75-125% of weekly wage. I have also reminded myself of Superintendent Sissons' evidence of penalties that have been imposed on protestors following conviction in the Magistrates' Court. Although not a precise analogue, in my judgment it would be wrong if the penalty I imposed were to be out of all proportion to the penalties that have been imposed by the Magistrates' Court for offences arising out of similar protest activities.

406. Of course, when sentencing for contempt, there is an important element – usually absent from most criminal sentencing – that the conduct is a breach of a court's order. A breach of a protective order is a further aggravating factor.

407. In my judgment, the appropriate penalty for Mr Curtin's breach of the Interim Injunction under Ground 2 would have been a fine of £100. I will reduce that to £90 to reflect his admission of liability at the substantive hearing. When the judgment is handed down, I will invite submissions as the time Mr Curtin might need to pay this sum.

Annex 1: **Full list of Defendants to the claim**

(1) FREE THE MBR BEAGLES (formerly Stop Animal Cruelty Huntingdon) (an unincorporated association by its representative Mel Broughton on behalf of the members of Free the MBR Beagles who are protesting within the area marked in blue on the Plan attached at Annex 1 of the Claim Form and/or engaging in unlawful activities against the Claimants and/or trespassing on the First Claimant's Land at MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT and/or posting on social media images and details of the officers and employees of MBR Acres Ltd, and the officers and employees of third party suppliers and service providers to MBR Acres Ltd)

(2) CAMP BEAGLE (an unincorporated association by its representative Bethany Mayflower on behalf of the members of Camp Beagle who are protesting within the area marked in blue on the Plan attached at Annex 1 of the Claim Form and/or engaging in unlawful activities against the Claimants and/or trespassing on the First Claimant's Land at MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT and/or posting on social media images and details of the officers and employees of MBR Acres Ltd, and the officers and employees of third party suppliers and service providers to MBR Acres Ltd)

(3) MEL BROUGHTON

(4) RONAN FALSEY

(5) BETHANY MAYFLOWER (also known as Bethany May and/or Alexandra Taylor)

(6) SCOTT PATERSON

(7) HELEN DURANT

(8) BERNADETTE GREEN

(9) SAM MORLEY

(10) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are protesting within the area marked in blue on the Plan attached at Annex 1 of the Claim Form and/or engaging in unlawful activities against the Claimants and/or trespassing on the First Claimant's Land at MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT and/or posting on social media images and details of the officers and employees of MBR Acres Ltd, and the officers and employees of third party suppliers and service providers to MBR Acres Ltd)

(11) JOHN CURTIN

(12) MICHAEL MAHER (also known as John Thibeault)

(13) SAMMI LAIDLAW

(14) PAULINE HODSON

(15) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are entering or remaining without the consent of the First Claimant on the land and in buildings outlined in red on the plan at Annex 1 of the Amended Claim Form, that land known as MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT)

(16) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are interfering with the rights of way enjoyed by the First Claimant over the access road on the land shown in purple at Annex 3 of the Amended Claim Form and enjoyed by the Second Claimant as an implied or express licensee of the First Claimant)

(17) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are obstructing vehicles of the Second Claimant entering or exiting the access road shown in purple Annex 3 of the Amended Claim Form and/or entering the First Claimant's land at MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT)

(18) LOU MARLEY (also known as Louise Yvonne Firth)

(19) LUCY WINDLER (also known as Lucy Lukins)

(20) LISA JAFFRAY

(21) JOANNE SHAW

(22) AMANDA JAMES

(23) VICTORIA ASPLIN

(24) AMANDEEP SINGH

(25) PERSON UNKNOWN 70

(26) PERSON UNKNOWN 74

(27) [Not used]

(28) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are, without the consent of the First Claimant, entering or remaining on land and in buildings outlined in red on the plans at Annex 1 to the Amended Claim Form, those being land and buildings owned by the First Claimant, at MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT)

(29) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are interfering, without lawful excuse, with the First Claimant's staff and Second Claimants' right to pass and repass with or without vehicles, materials and equipment along the Highway known as the B1090)

(30) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are obstructing vehicles exiting the First Claimant's land at MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT and accessing the Highway known as the B1090)

(31) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are protesting outside the premises of the First Claimant and/or against the First Claimant's lawful business activities and pursuing a course of conduct causing alarm and/or distress to the Second Claimant and/or the staff of the First Claimant for the purpose of convincing the Second Claimant and/or the staff of the First Claimant not to: (a) work for the First Claimant; and/or (b) provide services to the First Claimant; and/or (c) supply goods to the First Claimant; and/or (d) to stop the First Claimants' lawful business activities at MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT)

(32) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are photographing and/or videoing/recording the First Claimant's staff and members of the Second Claimant and/or their vehicles and vehicle registration numbers as they enter and exit and/or work on the First Claimant's land outlined in red at Annex 1 to the Amended Claim Form for the purpose of causing alarm and/or distress by threatening to use and/or in fact using the images and/or recordings to identify members of the Second Claimant, follow the Second Claimant or ascertain the home addresses of the Second Claimant for the purpose of convincing the Second Claimant not to: (a) work for the First Claimant; and/or (b) not to provide services to the First Claimant; and/or (c) not to supply goods to the First Claimant)

(33) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are, without the consent of the First Claimant, trespassing on the First Claimant's land by flying drones over the First Claimant's land and buildings outlined in red on the plans at Annex 1 to the Amended Claim Form, that being land and buildings owned by MBR Acres Ltd, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT)

(34) LAUREN GARDNER

(35) LOUISE BOYLE

(36) PERSON(S) UNKNOWN (who are, without the consent of the First Claimant, entering or remaining on the land shaded in orange on the plans at Annex 1 to the re-re-re-Amended Claim Form – which land measures 2.85 metres from the boundary outlined in red on the plans at Annex 1 to the re-re-re-Amended Claim Form, that boundary marking those land and buildings owned by the First Claimant, at MBR Acres Limited, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT, and only where that boundary runs adjacent to the Highway known as the B1090)

Annex 2: The relief sought by the Claimants against Mr Curtin

In the draft order provided to the Court as part of their closing submissions, the Claimants seek the following by way of injunction against Mr Curtin:

> "The Eleventh Defendant, Mr John Curtin **MUST NOT** whether by himself or by instructing or encouraging any other person, group, or organisation do the same:
>
> (1) Enter the following land:
>
> (a) The First Claimant's Land at MBR Acres Limited, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT as set out in Annex 1 ('the Wyton Site');
>
> (b) The Third Claimant's premises known as B&K Universal Limited, Field Station, Grimston, Aldbrough, Hull, East Yorkshire HU11 4QE as set out in Annex 2 ('the Hull Site');
>
> (2) Enter into or remain upon or park any vehicle or place any other item (including, but not limited to, banners) in the area marked with black hatch lines on the plan at Annexes 1 and 2 [which includes all the land up to the midpoint of the highway that is adjacent to the Claimants (sic) property at the Wyton Site]. Save that nothing in this prohibition shall prevent the Defendant from Accessing the highway whilst in a vehicle, for the purpose of passing along the highway only and without stopping in the area marked with black hatching, save for when they are stopped by traffic congestion or any traffic management arranged by or on behalf of the Highways Authority, or to prevent a collision or road accident.
>
> (3) Approach and/or obstruct the path of any vehicle directly entering or exiting the area marked in black hatching (save that for the avoidance of doubt it will not be a breach of this Injunction Order where a vehicle is obstructed as a result of an emergency)
>
> (4) Approach, slow down, or obstruct any vehicle which is travelling to or from the First Claimant's Land along the B1090 Abbots Ripton Road, or within 1 mile in either direction of the First Claimant's Land at the Wyton Site;
>
> (5) Fly a drone or other unmanned aerial vehicle over the Wyton Site as marked on the Plan at Annex 1 [at a height below 50 metres, 100 meters, 150 metres]
>
> (6) Record or use other surveillance equipment (including drones, camera phones and CCTV) to record individual staff members at the Wyton Site, or when staff are carrying out work on the permitter fence of the Wyton Site. Save that nothing shall prohibit the filming of activities at the gates of the Wyton Site other than the filming of staff cars."

Annex 3: The relief sought by the Claimants *contra mundum*

In the draft order provided to the Court as part of their closing submissions, the Claimants seek the following by way of *contra mundum* injunction:

> "UNTIL AND SUBJECT TO ANY FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT OR UNTIL AND INCLUDING [date – 3 years from the date of grant] (WHICHEVER IS SOONER) IT IS ORDERED THAT:
>
> 1. Any person with notice of this Order **MUST NOT**
>
> (1) Enter the following land:
>
> (a) The First Claimant's land at MBR Acres Limited, Wyton, Huntingdon PE28 2DT as set out in Annex 1 ('the Wyton Site');
>
> (b) The Third Claimant's land known as B&K Universal Limited, Field Station, Grimston, Aldbrough, Hull, East Yorkshire HU11 4QE as set out in Annex 2 ('the Hull Site');
>
> (2) approach, slow down or otherwise obstruct any vehicle entering or exiting the Wyton Site
>
> (3) during the course of protesting against the First Claimant's business activities, enter into, remain upon or park any vehicle or place any other item (including, but not limited to, banners) in the area marked with black hatching on the plan at Annexe 1 ("the Exclusion Zone"). For the avoidance of doubt, the Exclusion Zone extends to 20 metres on both sides of the gate to the Wyton Site, measured from the centre of the gate, and extends from the boundary of the Wyton Site up to the midpoint of the B1090 Sawtry Way that runs adjacent to the Wyton Site. Nothing in this prohibition shall prevent any person from accessing the areas of the Exclusion Zone comprising adopted highway in a manner unconnected with protesting and for the purpose of passing and re-passing along the highway, or for any purpose incidental thereto and otherwise permitted by law;
>
> (4) during the course of protesting against the First Claimant's business activities, approach, slow down or otherwise obstruct any vehicle that is entering or exiting the Exclusion Zone;
>
> (5) during the course of protesting against the First Claimant's business activities, approach, slow down or otherwise obstruct any vehicle that is travelling to or from the Wyton Site and is within a one-mile radius of the Wyton Site;
>
> (6) fly a drone or other unmanned aerial vehicle at a height of less than 100 meters over the Wyton Site.

FURTHER APPILICATIONS ABOUT THIS ORDER

2. Any person affected by the injunction in paragraph 1 above may make an application to vary or discharge the injunction to a High Court Judge on not less than 48 hours' notice to the Claimants.

SERVICE OF THIS ORDER

3. A copy of this Order will be placed on the Judiciary Website.

4. Pursuant to CPR 6.15 and CPR 6.27, the Claimants are permitted to serve this Order endorsed with a penal notice as follows (with the following to be treated conjunctively)

   (1) by uploading a copy to the dedicated share file website at https://apps.fliplet.com/mbr-injunctionwebapp/

   (2) by affixing copies (as opposed to originals) to the notice board opposite the Wyton Site. A covering letter shall accompany the Order explaining that copies of all documents in the Claim, including the evidence in support of the Claim and the skeleton argument and note of the hearing at which this Order was made, can be accessed at the designated share file website: https://apps.fliplet.com/mbr-injunctionwebapp/. The cover letter will also include an email address and telephone number at which the Claimants' solicitors can be contacted, and advise that hard copy documents can be provided upon request;

   (3) by affixing in a prominent position around the perimeter of the Wyton Site signs advising that an injunction that places restrictions on protest activity is in force in the area. The signs shall include a link to the designated share file website: https://apps.fliplet.com/mbr-injunctionwebapp/ and a QR code through which the designated share file website may also be accessed;

   (4) by affixing in a prominent position at the Hull Site signs advising that an injunction. that places restrictions on protest activity is in force in the area. The signs shall include a link to the designated share file website: https://apps.fliplet.com/mbr-injunctionwebapp/ and a QR code through which the designated share file website may also be accessed;

   (5) by positioning four signs adjacent to toe main carriageway of the public highway known as the B1090 Sawtry Way within a one-mile radius of the Wyton Site. Those signs shall advise that an injunction that places restrictions on protest activity is in force in the area. The signs shall include a link to the designated share file website: https://apps.fliplet.com/mbr-injunctionwebapp/ and a QR code through which the designated share file website may also be accessed.

5. The deemed date of service of this Order shall be one working day after service is completed in accordance with all of the steps set out in paragraph 4 above.

ANNUAL REVIEW

6. The Claimants shall, by 4.30pm on [date – 12 months from the grant of this Order] make an Application to the Court (accompanied by any evidence in support) and seek the listing of a review hearing at which the continuation of the injunction in paragraph 1 above will be considered. The Claimants must by the same date serve that Application and any evidence in support on Persons Unknown in accordance with paragraph 4 above…"