

IN THE COUNTY COURT AT HIGH WYCOMBE

Claim No. L01RG709

DATE: 16 September 2025

BEFORE

DISTRICT JUDGE TALBOT-PONSONBY

BETWEEN

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL

Claimant

and

MR LEE DAVIS

Defendant

Raoul Downey (instructed by Buckinghamshire Council Legal Services) for the Claimant

No appearance by the Defendant

JUDGMENT

Background

1. This is an application by the claimant for the committal of the defendant for alleged contempt of court for breach of an injunction made by District Judge Matthews (sitting in retirement) on 14 November 2024.
2. The injunction was made under Part I of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.
3. The injunction includes the following definitions:
 - (a) “Begging” is defined as either approaching people for money or goods, or being stationary and directly asking for money or goods, or positioned on the floor to invite the offer of money or goods or drawing attention to yourself in order to entice people to part with money or goods.

(b) “Bus station” is to include bus stops

4. The injunction order then provides as follows:

“1 The Defendant, Lee Davis, is forbidden

a) From begging, as defined above

b) from entering the area marked in red on the attached map without proof of attendance at a pre-arranged appointment with a professional agency, which is within 30 minutes of entering the area. The appointment should be for one of the following purposes:

i) his physical health, including collection of prescribed medication

ii) his mental health

iii) his housing needs, including resolving any state benefit entitlements

iv) his substance misuse

v) obtaining legal advice or representation

vi) appearing at a court hearing involving the defendant

vii) applying for or attending work

viii) collecting any prescribed medication

c) The defendant is permitted to leave or return to High Wycombe by either bus or train, provided that when he enters the area marked in red on the attached map, he goes directly and immediately to the train or bus station, and upon returning to High Wycombe, leaves the area marked in red on the attached map in accordance with paragraph 1(b) above

2 A penal notice is attached to paragraph 1 above.

[...]

5 This order shall remain in force until 6pm on 14 November 2026.”

5. The claimant asserts that the defendant has breached the injunction on multiple occasions and has therefore brought this application.

Procedural history

6. The defendant was not present in court when the injunction was granted. The injunction was personally served on the defendant by Mr Nick Adkins, an anti-social behaviour team leader who works for the claimant. The injunction was served on the defendant by Mr Adkins on 26 November 2024. Mr Adkins has confirmed to the court that he served it on

the defendant, who swore at him, and threw the papers on the ground; but that, on reviewing CCTV of the area, the defendant picked up the paperwork from the ground and put it in his bag before leaving. Service was effected at 9.10 am; Mr Adkins explained that he would give the defendant until 11.00 to leave the exclusion zone. The CCTV showed that the defendant left the area where he was served at approximately 9.30 am.

7. The first application was dated 29 January 2025 and relates to 10 alleged breaches of the injunction from 26 November 2024 to 23 January 2025.
8. On 3 February 2025, DDJ French considered the application and directed the claimant to effect personal service of the application and supporting documentation on the defendant in accordance with CPR 81.5. The committal application was listed on 31 March 2025 at the East Berkshire Magistrates' Court, Slough, and DDJ French directed the claimant to file a certificate of service not less than 48 hours before the hearing.
9. By letter dated 4 March 2025, the claimant asked that the hearing be relisted in High Wycombe to make it easier for the defendant to attend.
10. On 14 March 2025, Mr Adkins attended at the defendant's residence at 237 Desborough Road, High Wycombe HP11 2QW. The security guard confirmed that the defendant lived at that address but that he had gone out earlier that day. Mr Adkins went to the defendant's room and left the court papers in the floor just inside the door. A witness statement from Mr Adkins confirming this is in the court bundle.
11. On 27 March 2025, Ms Garin Christie, an anti-social behaviour officer employed by the claimant, went to the defendant's residence at 237 Desborough Road, High Wycombe HP11 2QW, together with Mr Ben Moat, a street warden employed by the claimant. Again, the security guard confirmed that the defendant lived at the address but had gone out. Ms Christie placed the court bundle, together with train tickets to Slough, on the desk in the defendant's room. A witness statement from Ms Christie confirming this is in the court bundle.
12. The first hearing was on 31 March 2025 before HHJ Andrew Davies on 31 March 2025. The defendant did not attend. HHJ Andrew Davies noted that the application and evidence had not been personally served on the defendant as required by CPR 81.5(1), and declined to make an order for service by an alternative method. He adjourned the application to the first available date after 28 days.
13. On 30 April 2025, the claimant made a further application for contempt, in respect of a further 6 alleged breaches of the injunction, between 21 February and 8 April 2025.
14. On 9 June 2025, Mr Adkins attended 44 Hughenden Road, High Wycombe, which the claimant's records showed had been the defendant's address since 30 May 2025. The defendant was present and Mr Adkins served the two contempt applications and supporting evidence on the defendant. A witness statement confirming the service was

included in the bundle available to the court. Mr Adkins confirmed that he informed the defendant that the hearing was to take place in the High Wycombe Magistrates court on 27 June 2025.

15. The claimant then prepared a supplemental bundle which included the order of HHJ Andrew Davis dated 31 March 2025, and an updating affidavit from Mr Adkins. This was served personally on the defendant on 19 June 2025.
16. Mr Adkins confirmed that he had spoken to the defendant, who was aware of the hearing, and had indicated that he intended to attend the hearing. In fact, the defendant did not attend and Mr Adkins had no information as to why he had not.
17. I was satisfied that all relevant papers had been served on the defendant, that he was aware of the hearing on 27 June 2025, and that the warning notice given with the form N600 and the notice of hearing both warned the defendant that, if he did not attend, the hearing may go ahead in his absence.
18. In the light of this, I considered it appropriate to proceed in the absence of the defendant. I also considered it appropriate to consider all 16 alleged breaches in the 2 forms N600.
19. I heard sworn evidence from Mr Adkins, in particular by reference to his three affidavits dated 28 January 2025, 22 April 2025 and 13 June 2025. I also had a witness statement from PC Metcalf of Thames Valley Police and affidavits from George Rockell (dated 21 January 2025), Charles Seager (dated 22 January 2025) and Nicola Wells (dated 24 January 2025). None of PC Metcalf, Mr Rockell, Mr Seager and Ms Wells attended court to give evidence.
20. I accepted the evidence of Mr Adkins, as the defendant had not attended court to challenge it. I also accepted the evidence of Mr Rockell, Mr Seager and Ms Wells, again because the defendant had not attended court to challenge this.
21. On the basis of the claimant's evidence as listed above, I found, beyond reasonable doubt, that the defendant had breached the injunction on 16 occasions, as set out in the note of my judgment at that hearing. I have attached that judgment as an appendix to this judgment.
22. The defendant was not present at the time that I made my findings. In considering sentence, and without at that stage having heard from the defendant, I considered briefly the sentencing guidelines in Lovett v Wigan BC [2023] 1 WLR 1443. It appeared to me that there was a real possibility that I would be considering a custodial sentence for the defendant.
23. Accordingly, and having regard to the decision of the Court of Appeal in the case of LL v Lord Chancellor [2017] EWCA Civ 237, I decided that I should not do so without first giving the defendant a further opportunity to attend court and give his version of events.

Accordingly, I adjourned the case, to be heard in the County Court at High Wycombe, before me.

24. The case was relisted, to be heard on 16 September 2025. A notice of hearing was prepared and, on 17 July 2025, Mr Adkins served on the defendant the notice of hearing, the order made consequential on the hearing including the finding of liability, a note of my judgment at the hearing, and a note reminding the defendant of his entitlement to legal aid and giving details of local solicitors who could advise him. Mr Adkins provided a statement to the court confirming service of these documents and attended the sentencing hearing.
25. Mr Adkins also prepared an additional witness statement, dated 27 August 2025, giving an update information about further apparent breaches of the injunction and its effects since the previous hearing.
26. The defendant did not attend the sentencing hearing. I was satisfied that he had been informed of the hearing and that, if he did not attend, an order could be made in his absence. I considered adjourning the hearing and issuing a bench warrant for his arrest to ensure that he was present for the hearing. I considered that it was not in the interests of justice to do this. This would introduce a further delay, during which time the defendant would almost certainly commit further breaches of the injunction, with the consequent effects on the residents of High Wycombe. I was satisfied that the defendant had been given every reasonable opportunity to attend and present any mitigating circumstances. The hearing had been listed in High Wycombe to ensure it was easy for him to attend. The decision of the Court of Appeal in LL v Lord Chancellor [2017] EWCA Civ 237 requires that I give the defendant an opportunity to do so, which I have done by adjourning the sentencing; it does not require that I give him a yet further opportunity by ensuring he attends by having him arrested. Accordingly, I decided to proceed with the sentencing in his absence.
27. I heard submissions from Mr Downey, counsel for the claimant, and I am grateful to him for his assistance.

Approach to sentencing

28. In the case of Wigan Borough Council v Lovett [2022] EWCA Civ 1631, the Court of Appeal gave detailed guidelines for the approach to sentencing for civil contempt, following a report by the Civil Justice Council dated July 2020 entitled *Anti-Social Behaviour and the Civil Courts*. The guidelines are contained at paragraphs 39 to 57 of the judgment of the court handed down by Birss LJ. I considered the entirety of the guidelines, and set out a summary in this judgment.
29. The objectives of sentencing for civil contempt are, in order of importance:
 - (a) Ensuring future compliance with the order;

- (b) Punishment; and
 - (c) Rehabilitation.
30. The five options available to the court are:
- (a) An immediate order for committal to prison.
 - (b) A suspended order for committal to prison, with conditions.
 - (c) Adjourning the consideration of a penalty.
 - (d) A fine.
 - (e) No order.
31. If custody is appropriate, the length of the sentence should be decided without reference to whether or not it is to be suspended. It has been observed that suspension is usually the first way of attempting to secure compliance with the underlying order (Hale v Tanner [2000] 1 WLR 2377, 2381D). However, another first option in many cases will be to adjourn the consideration of a sentence.
32. The court should consider the harm caused or at risk of being caused by the offence, and the culpability of the defendant, bearing in mind that cases are fact sensitive.
33. The three levels of culpability are:
- (a) A High culpability; very serious breach or persistent serious breaches.
 - (b) B Deliberate breach falling between A and C.
 - (c) C Lower culpability; minor breach or breaches.
34. The level of harm is determined by weighing up all the factors of the case to determine the harm that was caused or was at risk of being caused by the breach or breaches. In assessing any risk of harm posed by the breach(es), consideration should be given to the facts or activity which led to the order being made. The three levels of harm are:
- (a) Category 1: Breach causes very serious harm or distress.
 - (b) Category 2: Cases falling between categories 1 and 3.
 - (c) Category 3: Breach causes little or no harm or distress.
35. Having identified the culpability and harm, the guidelines provide a matrix with a starting point and a range for the sentence, which can be adjusted taking into account the aggravating or mitigating factors. The Court of Appeal gave, as an inexhaustive set of examples of aggravating factors, a history of disobedience and the particular vulnerability

of any victim of the behaviour concerned, and persistent breaches of the injunction. Mitigating factors will include genuine remorse, ill-health, and age or lack of maturity when it affects the responsibility of the contemnor, or an early admission of contempt (together with an appropriate apology).

Sentencing in this case

36. Considering first the culpability of the defendant, I note the following:
- (a) The injunction was made by DJ Matthews (siR) on 14 November 2024, in the absence of the defendant. It was personally served on the defendant on 26 November 2024 by Mr Adkins.
 - (b) 16 breaches of the injunction were proved, from 26 November 2024 to and including 8 April 2025.
37. There was evidence, both at the hearing on 27 June and before me today, of a further 39 apparent breaches of the injunction of which the claimant was aware, and it was very likely that there were many more breaches of which it was not aware.
38. When the defendant was first informed of the injunction, Mr Adkins explained the effect of the injunction and showed him the map delineating the exclusion area. On being told the duration of the injunction, he then told Mr Adkins to “fuck off” before throwing the paperwork to the ground. Mr Adkins noted on reviewing CCTV of the incident that the defendant subsequently picked up the envelope containing the court paperwork before leaving the area.
39. I am therefore satisfied that the defendant was fully aware of the terms of the injunction and his persistent breaches of it were deliberate in that he intended to carry out the relevant behaviour, coming onto the town centre and begging, irrespective of the order forbidding him to do so.
40. In addition, taking into account the additional 39 apparent breaches following the latest proven breach, there appears to be no lessening of the frequency of breaches following the issue of proceedings or the finding of liability.
41. Accordingly, I find that the defendant’s behaviour amounts to the highest level of culpability category A: there are persistent serious breaches of the injunction.
42. Turning to the question of harm, I note that, in the 16 proven breaches for which I am sentencing the defendant, there is no evidence before me of actual physical harm. However, the guidelines require me to take into account the harm that was caused or was at risk of being caused by the breach or breaches. In this context, I take into account that, on 4 and 6 June 2025, there was a robbery and assault respectively, in relation to each of which the police are investigating the defendant as a suspect. In addition, the evidence

before me is that the defendant is not a “passive” beggar, sitting down and hoping for people to give him money; he approaches people, both those on foot and in their cars, he follows them; one email to the claimant describes him as “he walks with you shoulder to shoulder, not giving up. I walk with a crutch and do not feel safe with my handbag [...] You walk out of the store and he still comes back to you begging and walking to your car with you”. This indicates a vulnerable victim of his behaviour. Several other people also referred to being scared to come into the town centre because of his behaviour.

43. Accordingly, taking all of this into account, I find that the behaviour of the defendant causes, or is at risk of causing, very serious harm and distress, i.e. Category 1.
44. The starting point for breaches falling into Category A1 is a custodial sentence of 6 months, with a range of 8 weeks to 18 months. I therefore turn to the aggravating and mitigating factors that will affect the sentence
45. The aggravating factors are:
 - (a) The length of time this has gone on. I do not have before me the evidence that was before DJ Matthews (SiR), but it is clear that the behaviour had been going on for some time prior to the grant of the injunction, else it would not have been ordered. I do have evidence from PC Elliot that the defendant had been persisting in this behaviour for several years.
 - (b) As noted when considering the defendant’s culpability the fact that there has been no apparent lessening of the frequency of the breaches despite the issue and continuance of these court proceedings
 - (c) The defendant’s apparent disregard of the court process, as shown by his failure to attend any of the hearings, despite knowing of them all, and in throwing the court documents to the ground on being presented with the injunction in November 2024.
46. The defendant did not attend court to present any plea in mitigation. As noted by Mr Downey in his submissions, there is evidence before the court that the defendant has an addiction to heroin, and is believed to beg in order to fund this habit. This could be considered to be a mitigating factor but for the fact that he has been offered assistance to address his addiction and has refused all offers of help.
47. I have considered the alternatives to a custodial sentence. Making no order, or imposing a fine (which the defendant would have no means of paying) are unlikely to deter or prevent him from future breaches of the injunction. I had already adjourned sentencing to allow him to attend, 2½ months had passed since the hearing in June at which the breaches were found proved, and the defendant has persisted in his breaches.

48. Similarly, it appears to me that to pass a suspended sentence, especially in the absence of the defendant so that it could be explained, would not have a meaningful deterrent effect.
49. Considering the aggravating and mitigating factors as set out above, I consider that it is appropriate to increase the defendant's sentence from the starting point of 6 months, and that the appropriate sentence is an immediate custodial sentence of 1 year.
50. I will prepare the warrant for his arrest and committal and will arrange for this sentencing judgment to be published in accordance with CPR 81.8(8).

District Judge Talbot-Ponsonby
16 September 2025

APPENDIX: JUDGMENT GIVEN ON 27 JUNE 2025

IN THE COUNTY COURT AT HIGH WYCOMBE

Claim No. L01RG709

DATE: 27 June 2025

BEFORE

DISTRICT JUDGE TALBOT-PONSONBY

BETWEEN

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL

Claimant

and

MR LEE DAVIS

Defendant

Raoul Downey (instructed by Buckinghamshire Council Legal Services) for the Claimant

No appearance by the Defendant

JUDGMENT

Background

1. This is an application by the claimant for the committal of the defendant for alleged contempt of court for breach of an injunction made by District Judge Matthews (sitting in retirement) on 14 November 2024.
2. The injunction was made under Part I of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.
3. The injunction includes the following definitions:
 - (a) “Begging” is defined as either approaching people for money or goods, or being stationary and directly asking for money or goods, or positioned on the floor to

invite the offer of money or goods or drawing attention to yourself in order to entice people to part with money or goods.

(b) “Bus station” is to include bus stops

4. The injunction order then provides as follows:

“1 *The Defendant, Lee Davis, is forbidden*

a) From begging, as defined above

b) from entering the area marked in red on the attached map without proof of attendance at a pre-arranged appointment with a professional agency, which is within 30 minutes of entering the area. The appointment should be for one of the following purposes:

i) his physical health, including collection of prescribed medication

ii) his mental health

iii) his housing needs, including resolving any state benefit entitlements

iv) his substance misuse

v) obtaining legal advice or representation

vi) appearing at a court hearing involving the defendant

vii) applying for or attending work

viii) collecting any prescribed medication

c) The defendant is permitted to leave or return to High Wycombe by either bus or train, provided that when he enters the area marked in red on the attached map, he goes directly and immediately to the train or bus station, and upon returning to High Wycombe, leaves the area marked in red on the attached map in accordance with paragraph 1(b) above

2 *A penal notice is attached to paragraph 1 above.*

[...]

5 *This order shall remain in force until 6pm on 14 November 2026.”*

5. The claimant asserts that the defendant has breached the injunction on multiple occasions and has therefore brought this application.

Procedural history

6. The defendant was not present in court when the injunction was granted. The injunction was personally served on the defendant by Mr Nick Adkins, an anti-social behaviour team leader who works for the claimant. The injunction was served on the defendant by Mr Adkins on 26 November 2024. Mr Adkins has confirmed to the court that he served it on the defendant, who swore at him, and threw the papers on the ground; but that, on reviewing CCTV of the area, the defendant picked up the paperwork from the ground and put it in his bag before leaving. Service was effected at 9.10 am; Mr Adkins explained that he would give the defendant until 11.00 to leave the exclusion zone. The CCTV showed that the defendant left the area where he was served at approximately 9.30 am.
7. The first application was dated 29 January 2025 and relates to 10 alleged breaches of the injunction from 26 November 2024 to 23 January 2025.
8. On 3 February 2025, DDJ French considered the application and directed the claimant to effect personal service of the application and supporting documentation on the defendant in accordance with CPR 81.5. The committal application was listed on 31 March 2025 at the East Berkshire Magistrates' Court, Slough, and DDJ French directed the claimant to file a certificate of service not less than 48 hours before the hearing.
9. By letter dated 4 March 2025, the claimant asked that the hearing be relisted in High Wycombe to make it easier for the defendant to attend.
10. On 14 March 2025, Mr Adkins attended at the defendant's residence at 237 Desborough Road, High Wycombe HP11 2QW. The security guard confirmed that the defendant lived at that address but that he had gone out earlier that day. Mr Adkins went to the defendant's room and left the court papers in the floor just inside the door. A witness statement from Mr Adkins confirming this is in the court bundle.
11. On 27 March 2025, Ms Garin Christie, an anti-social behaviour officer employed by the claimant, went to the defendant's residence at 237 Desborough Road, High Wycombe HP11 2QW, together with Mr Ben Moat, a street warden employed by the claimant. Again, the security guard confirmed that the defendant lived at the address but had gone out. Ms Christie placed the court bundle, together with train tickets to Slough, on the desk in the defendant's room. A witness statement from Ms Christie confirming this is in the court bundle.
12. The first hearing was on 31 March 2025 before HHJ Andrew Davies on 31 March 2025. The defendant did not attend. HHJ Andrew Davies noted that the application and evidence had not been personally served on the defendant as required by CPR 81.5(1), and declined to make an order for service by an alternative method. He adjourned the application to the first available date after 28 days.

13. On 30 April 2025, the claimant made a further application for contempt, in respect of a further 6 alleged breaches of the injunction, between 21 February and 8 April 2025. This application does not yet appear to have been sealed by the court.
14. On 9 June 2025, Mr Adkins attended 44 Hughenden Road, High Wycombe, which the claimant's records showed had been the defendant's address since 30 May 2025. The defendant was present and Mr Adkins served the two contempt applications and supporting evidence on the defendant. A witness statement confirming the service was included in the bundle available to the court. Mr Adkins confirmed that he informed the defendant that the hearing was to take place in the High Wycombe Magistrates court on 27 June 2025.
15. The claimant then prepared a supplemental bundle which included the order of HHJ Andrew Davis dated 31 March 2025, and an updating affidavit from Mr Adkins. This was served personally on the defendant on 19 June 2025.
16. Mr Adkins confirmed that he had spoken to the defendant, who was aware of today's hearing, and had indicated that he intended to attend the hearing. In fact, the defendant did not attend and Mr Adkins had no information as to why he had not.
17. I was satisfied that all relevant papers had been served on the defendant, that he was aware of the hearing, and that the warning notice given with the form N600 and the notice of hearing both warned the defendant that, if he did not attend, the hearing may go ahead in his absence.
18. In the light of this, I considered it appropriate to proceed in the absence of the defendant.
19. I also considered it appropriate to consider all 16 alleged breaches, in the 2 forms N600.

Evidence

20. I heard sworn evidence from Mr Adkins, in particular by reference to his three affidavits dated 28 January 2025, 22 April 2025 and 13 June 2025. I also had a witness statement from PC Metcalf of Thames Valley Police and affidavits from George Rockell (dated 21 January 2025), Charles Seager (dated 22 January 2025) and Nicola Wells (dated 24 January 2025). None of PC Metcalf, Mr Rockell, Mr Seager and Ms Wells attended court to give evidence.
21. I accepted the evidence of Mr Adkins, as the defendant had not attended court to challenge it. I also accepted the evidence of Mr Rockell, Mr Seager and Ms Wells, again because the defendant had not attended court to challenge this.

Findings

22. On the basis of the claimant's evidence as listed above, I am satisfied, beyond reasonable doubt, that the defendant has breached the injunction on 16 occasions. These are set out below.
23. The first breach was on 26 November 2024, the day on which the injunction was served, at approximately 11.40 am. The defendant was seen by the claimant's street wardens team inside the exclusion zone on Church Street, High Wycombe. CCTV evidence of this is also available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins, and stills from the CCTV were provided to the court. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone.
24. The second breach was on 26 November 2024 at approximately 2pm. PC Metcalf saw the defendant inside the exclusion zone, on High Street heading towards Easton Street. PC Metcalf confirms in his statement that he knows the defendant and can easily recognise him. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone.
25. The third breach was on 27 November 2024 at approximately 10.30 am. PC Metcalf saw the defendant inside the exclusion zone, outside Coral's bookmakers. PC Metcalf confirms in his statement that he knows the defendant and can easily recognise him. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins, and stills from this footage were provided to the court. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone.
26. The fourth breach was on 29 November 2024, at 6.46 am. The defendant was seen with a female friend, talking to a member of the public inside the Macdonald's drive-through restaurant on Premier Way, High Wycombe, which is inside the exclusion zone. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins, and stills from this footage were provided to the court. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone.
27. The fifth breach was on 3 December 2024. The defendant was seen at the London Road Retail Park. This is outside the exclusion zone, but the defendant was seen begging. This

is confirmed by Mr Charles Seager, the deputy manager of the Pets at Home branch at the retail park. Mr Seager recognised the defendant from the leaflets circulated by Thames Valley Police and confirms that the defendant regularly begs from his customers. On the particular occasion on 3 December 2024, the defendant asked Mr Seager for money. I am satisfied that this amounts to begging as defined in the injunction and that that this amounts to a breach of the injunction.

28. The sixth breach was on 5 December 2024. Mr Seager confirms that the defendant was again seen begging at the London Road Retail Park. On this occasion, the defendant was also seen by Ms Nicola Wells, the assistant manager at Hobbycraft. Ms Wells recognised the defendant from the police leaflets, saw him approaching people, and heard him asking for money. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins, and stills from this footage were provided to the court. I am satisfied that this amounts to begging as defined in the injunction and that that this amounts to a breach of the injunction.
29. The seventh breach was on 10 December 2024, when Ms Wells again saw the defendant at the retail park, approaching people in their cars. Although Ms Wells did not hear what the defendant said to any of the people, I infer from all the other evidence of his behaviour at the retail park that he was asking for money. I am satisfied that this amounts to begging as defined in the injunction and that that this amounts to a breach of the injunction.
30. The eighth breach was on 14 January 2025, when the defendant was found unconscious in the churchyard at All Saints Church, Castle Street, High Wycombe, which is within the exclusion zone, at approximately 10.30 am. Mr Rockell, a street warden employed by the claimant, attended the churchyard and recognised the defendant. Owing to concerns for his health, Mr Rockall took the defendant indoors and subsequently called an ambulance. The defendant eventually recovered and was able to leave the exclusion zone at approximately 1.30 pm. Mr Rockell has given an affidavit to confirm the relevant details. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone.
31. The ninth breach was on 22 January 2025, at 9.25 pm. The defendant was seen with a female friend, outside Macdonald's restaurant on the High Street, and then close to a kebab van. This is inside the exclusion zone. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins, and stills from this footage were provided to the court. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone.

32. The tenth breach was on 23 January 2025 at 2.02 pm. The defendant was seen by the claimant's CCTV operatives on Oxford Street, High Wycombe, walking towards the town centre. He was monitored on the CCTV from 2.02 until 2.12, when he left the view of the at the junction of Corporation Street. All the locations at which he was seen are inside the exclusion zone. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins, and stills from this footage were provided to the court. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone.
33. The eleventh breach was on 21 February 2025. The defendant was seen by the claimant's CCTV operatives begging on High Street, High Wycombe, outside the Eden Shopping centre, at 2.25 pm. This is inside the exclusion zone. The defendant can be seen to be approaching people and was handed what appeared to be money by a female member of the public at 2.25 pm. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone and was also begging. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone and by begging.
34. The twelfth breach was on 22 February 2025. The defendant was seen by the claimant's CCTV operatives begging on Paul's Row and White Hart Street, High Wycombe, at 3.10 am. This is inside the exclusion zone. The defendant can be seen to be approaching people as they leave bars and nightclubs and was handed what appeared to be money by a male member of the public at 3.11 pm. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone and was also begging. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone and by begging.
35. The thirteenth breach was on 2 March 2025. The defendant was seen by the claimant's CCTV operatives begging on High Street, High Wycombe, at 12.18 am. This is inside the exclusion zone. The defendant can be seen to be approaching people near a kebab van. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins. Although there is no footage showing anybody handing the defendant any money, I infer from all the other evidence of his behaviour in the town centre that he was asking for money I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone and was also begging. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone and by begging.

36. The fourteenth breach was on 19 March 2025 at 3.02 pm. The defendant was seen by the claimant's CCTV operatives on High Street, High Wycombe, where he went into Nationwide Bank, then into a newsagent, and then back along the High Street. This is inside the exclusion zone. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone.
37. The fifteenth breach was on 23 March 2025. The defendant was seen by the claimant's CCTV operatives at the Macdonald's drive-through restaurant on Premier Way, High Wycombe, at 6.11 pm. This is inside the exclusion zone. The defendant can be seen to be approaching people, including two different vehicles at the drive-through order point. He then left the MacDonalds and continued up Archway towards Oxford Road, where he approached several members of the public and appeared to be begging. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins. Although there is no footage showing anybody handing the defendant any money and the CCTV is silent, I infer from the circumstance and from all the other evidence of his behaviour in the town centre that he was asking for money I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone and was also begging. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone and by begging.
38. The sixteenth breach was on 8 April 2025. The defendant was seen by the claimant's CCTV operatives begging in Queen's Square, High Wycombe, at 11.48 am. This is inside the exclusion zone. The defendant can be seen to be approaching people in Queen's Square and White Hart Street and was handed what appeared to be money by a female member of the public at 11.58 am. CCTV evidence is available and has been reviewed by Mr Adkins. I am satisfied that the defendant was present inside the exclusion zone and was also begging. He has not provided any explanation for his presence that would permit him to be there in accordance with the terms of the injunction and I am therefore satisfied that this amounts to a breach of the injunction by reason of being in the exclusion zone and by begging.

Next steps

39. The defendant is not present at the time that I make these findings.
40. In considering sentence, and without at this stage having heard from the defendant, I consider briefly the sentencing guidelines in Lovett v Wigan BC [2023] 1 WLR 1443. It appears to me that there is a real possibility that I will be considering a custodial sentence for the defendant.

41. Accordingly, and having regard to the decision of the Court of Appeal in the case of LL v Lord Chancellor [2017] EWCA Civ 237, I should not do so without first giving the defendant a further opportunity to attend court and give his version of events.
42. Accordingly, I will adjourn the case, to be heard in the County Court at High Wycombe (but sitting in the Magistrates' Court there) on the first available date after 28 days, before me.

District Judge Talbot-Ponsonby
27 June 2025