

IN THE HIGH COURTS OF JUSTICE – FAMILY DIVISION

SITTING AT LEEDS

Case No. SE22C50343

Courtroom No. 18

Westgate
Leeds
LS1 3BY

Tuesday, 9th September 2025

Before:
MR RECORDER HOWE KC
Sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge

B E T W E E N:

THE LOCAL AUTHORITY

and

D S

MR A LORD appeared on behalf of the Applicant Local Authority
NO APPEARANCE by or on behalf of the Defendant

JUDGMENT
(For Approval)

This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part, other than in accordance with relevant licence or with the express consent of the Authority. All rights are reserved.

This judgment was delivered in private. The judge has given leave for this version of the judgment to be published on condition that (irrespective of what is contained in the judgment) in any published version of the judgment the anonymity of the children and members of their family must be strictly preserved. All persons, including representatives of the media, must ensure that this condition is strictly complied with. Failure to do so will be a contempt of court.

RECORDER HOWE KC:

1. This is an application made by the Local Authority, who I shall not name for the purpose of this judgment. At the commencement of this hearing, I made a direction, pursuant to FPR 2010 r37.8(4), that the hearing must be held in private, as the order of this court that the Defendant is alleged to have breached is an order that sought to protect the anonymity of a child and the confidentiality of proceedings concerning that child. To hold this contempt hearing in public would be contrary to the purposes for which the original order had been made.
2. This is an application, pursuant to section 37 of the *Family Procedure Rules*, 2010, for the Defendant to be committed for contempt of court. The Defendant was a respondent father in care proceedings concerning his child.
3. During the concurrency of those proceedings, an order was made, on 19 December 2023, by Mr Recorder Stoner KC sitting as a judge at the High Court. It is an order made under the inherent jurisdiction of the High Court and it contains a penal notice. That penal notice says “if you do not obey this order, you will be guilty of contempt of court and you may be sent to prison, fined, or have your assets seized”. This is an order directed to the Defendant and it gives his, then, address.
4. The order, at paragraph nine, says the following:

“(The defendant’s name is given) must not:

(a) post or place any pictures or any information about the child or proceedings relating to [the child] on Facebook, TikTok, or any other social media.

(b) must not post or place any pictures or information about [the child] or proceedings relating to the child in any other public place.
5. That order is to last until the child reaches the age of 18, in some years’ time, I need not give a date of birth for the purposes of this judgment.
6. That order, dated 19 December 2023, was served personally on the Defendant on 22 December 2023. It was served at quarter past two in the afternoon. I have seen the statement of service dated 2 January. I accept the statement of service as proving service of the order on the Defendant.
7. On 18 June 2025, the Local Authority issued this contempt application. The application contains 47 alleged breaches of the order of 19 December 2023; the first alleged breach being on 23 December 2023 and the most recent breach being on 22 May 2025.

8. On 3 July 2025, the High Court sitting at the Royal Courts of Justice, issued a notice of a hearing for 29 July 2025. The Local Authority attempted to serve the Defendant and I have read an affidavit of attempted service dated 17 July 2025. The process server attended at the Defendant's property; he had made phone calls to the Defendant, leaving voicemails and had no responses. The process server did receive a text from the Defendant on 16 July that said this:

"If they're arranging to return my daughter, you are welcome to bring them otherwise tell them to go get fucked. If you step foot on my property without my permission, which you don't have, it will be aggravated trespass. Sorry for the late reply, they arrested me again, just got home, CPS won't charge me, go figure."

9. On the following day, 17 July, the statement of service reports a further message received from the Defendant saying:

"Just heard your voicemail, that bundle is probably the one I just received prior to my last hearing on 8 July, so my rights were violated by them yet again, the hearing was illegal anyway, tell them that and I want my daughter back or I will see them in the secret court."

10. There was then a further text which I need not read.
11. The Local Authority contacted the Royal Courts of Justice and were informed on 18 July that a Judge had granted them permission to serve by email. That email service was effected on 22 July. I have read the certificate of service dated 24 July. That certificate records that the notice of hearing, and the full bundle that had been prepared for the committal application, was served on the Defendant.
12. On 24 July, the Defendant emailed the Local Authority requesting the hearing on 29 July to be adjourned.
13. At the hearing on 29 July 2025, and I have seen the order, the committal application was heard by Henke J. The Defendant did not attend. No formal application to adjourn had been made. The order records that the Judge was satisfied the Defendant was on notice. That order directed this hearing to take place today, and there was a direction for the Local Authority to file some further evidence.
14. The order required:

"The Local Authority shall, by 4pm on 6 August, file and serve a further affidavit from a member of its staff explaining why it is

alleged that the social media postings, said to be breaches of the order of 19 December 2023 are postings made by the defendant and further to explain how it is they are said to offend the order of the Recorder.”

15. In addition, paragraph seven of the order of 29 July, says:

“The Local Authority shall file and serve by 4pm on 2 September, an affidavit of service confirming it served a copy of this order upon the defendant and a copy of the further affidavit.”

16. The order of 29 July, and the further affidavit, were served on the Defendant. I have seen the affidavit of service, that I accept, and it proves that the Defendant was served by email on 26 August 2025. He was also served by WhatsApp, and although no date is show on the screen shots, it is clear from the affidavit that both methods of service were on the same date.
17. There was a response from the Defendant on 26 August 2025. The Defendant used an email address he had to communicate with the Local Authority. His email of 26 August is timed at 17:11:

“As usual, you have failed to send me court documents in a timely manner, you failed to even send any documents for the hearing on 8 July, which deems the order null and void by way of fraud on behalf of the Local Authority. The hearing on 8 July was not a hearing for this contempt application. In this I am requesting the hearing on 9 September be adjourned or declared null and void as well as the care orders which were borne from the previous proceedings on the grounds the judge made a fraudulent judgment. The hearing should have been declared null and void and a mistrial on the grounds of Mr Recorder Stoner allowing (the defendant) voices his concern about how that hearing was conducted.”

18. In addition, the Defendant says that the hearing was “totally unfair violating absolute rights and points of law and Article 6 of the Human Rights Act, 1998.” He continues:

“You have relied on this fraudulent order to bring your present application to court and all subsequent applications, making them all null and void and the Local Authority along with judges, barristers, and social workers guilty of obstruction, perverting the course of justice and fraud, misfeasance and child-related crimes, including kidnapping and false imprisonment in my opinion. I advise you to withdraw all applications relating to (names the child) and (gives his own name) as per status quo prior to these cases.”

19. There is a further response the next day, on 27 August. The timings are not clear. It is either 23:39 on 26th or 03:48 on 27th August. It appears to be an email that was constructed and sent

earlier at 23:39 on 26th but then forwarded onto others including the Local Authority on 27th at 03:48. Nothing turns on the differences in those timings. Again, in this email, the Defendant makes a complaint about the previous proceedings and about the judges involved in those proceedings. In relation to this application, the Defendant says this:

“Please find attached email received from (the Local Authority) notifying me of a court hearing they are aware of 29 July 2025. I received this email, as you can see on 26 August 2025, four weeks later, giving me two weeks to obtain legal counsel and prepare a defence.”

20. Later on in the email, the Defendant says:

“The Local Authority have purposefully delayed informing me of the hearing to prevent me obtaining legal representation and time to prepare a defence. I request the court either adjourn the hearing on 9 September for a minimum of six weeks to allow me time to prepare a defence or declare the hearing and all related orders stemming from the previous proceedings null and void.”

21. Later on in the same email, the Defendant says:

“I requested a stay and rehearing and was ignored by the court yet again, violating my rights under Article 6 of the Human Rights Act. It seems courts ignore the Human Rights Act as a matter of course, punishing the innocent. I request that the hearing is adjourned to give me time to obtain legal counsel essential to a defence or is deemed null and void. Please notify, as required that I have made the requests on an official application form as I am a litigant in person until I can obtain legal representation.”

22. Therefore, that was an email made following receipt of the order of Henke J. I am told by Counsel for the Local Authority that the Local Authority did not reply to that email.

23. There was a further email on 27 August at 14:51. Again this is to the Local Authority, but this time a court email address was also added, and it was a different court email address to the court email address that was being used for the earlier email. This next email says:

“Dear Sirs, further to my request, if this case continues, I would request a transparency order as I believe it is in the public interest to be informed of the corruption with the family courts.”

24. The Defendant then expresses his criticisms of how he has been treated and how his child has been treated. He expresses his criticisms of judges who have heard proceedings and indeed of social workers. He says:

“I have a substantial amount of evidence exposing the Local Authority for abuse of court procedures, co-conspiring with exposed judges to ensure they obtain the desired result at the expense of children and family. If this hearing is to go ahead, I need more time to obtain legal representation and time to prepare all the said evidence.”

25. He then ends the email saying: “As stated I require a transparency order and journalists to be invited to the hearing, whenever that may be.” Again, there was no response to that email by the Local Authority.
26. Yesterday, when these emails and this additional bundle came before me and it was clear from the correspondence that the Defendant had been informed by the Local Authority that this hearing was taking place today, as a face-to-face hearing at “Leeds Combined Court Centre”, I required the Local Authority to inform the Defendant that the hearing was taking place at the Leeds Family and Magistrates’ Court, a building next door to the Combined Court Centre. That email was sent at 16:17 by the Local Authority and the Defendant responded at 18:33 on 8 September. That email to the Local Authority says:

“I hope you enjoy your time there. Since I have not been contacted by the court and you as a corporation have not only no standing in law, but you have no power over me, you would need a contract of consent as would the court. My communications with both yourselves and the court have been totally ignored, violating absolute Article 6 of the Human Rights Act, 1998. My right to defend myself and obtain legal representation.”

27. He then talks about the previous proceedings and a corrupt judge. He then names a number of judges who he considers to have not handled his case concerning his child appropriately. He says the investigation is ongoing and any hearing pertaining to the previous proceedings is invalid and he intends to press charges against a judge who, it is said in this email, conspired to falsely imprison his daughter. The Defendant says:

“As stated, you have not followed proper court procedure, have no standing in law, as such there is no hearing and my sovereign rights have been breached. You do not observe my rights under the constitution, I have no contract with you or the courts, both an integral part of the UK government which violates a citizen’s rights in family courts using children for profit and other abusive behaviours. Given the above, you are illegally holding my daughter prisoner, slandered myself and my family and have provided no actual factual evidence, relying on corrupt judges and justice system to enact your crimes. As such, I demand my daughter is returned. Your allegations of contempt are fraudulent. I shut down all my

social media accounts some time ago when police contacted me regarding content which was changed and posted without my knowledge. I believe, given your fabricating evidence in the past you refuse my contact so you could psychologically manipulate and abuse my daughter, gaslighting her whilst parentally alienating her, which I can easily prove with her testimony which you refuse knowing you will be exposed.”

28. Then, importantly, the Defendant says this:

“If you want me to attend court, I will be happy to, once my daughter is confirmed as a witness and a promissory note that if she does not attend court all related cases will be declared void, mistrials, which after my daughter testified would be the end result, along with quite a few council employees being incarcerated. This is to avoid any doubt that you believe you can continue to abuse and make false allegations about me. I am taking private criminal action against the Local Authority. If you listen to the evidence on the flash drives, I sent you some time ago which prove your fraud beyond doubt.”

29. The Defendant then talks about other evidence that he says he has against local authority employees and judges, and he talks about producing that evidence. He then says:

“Don’t worry, it’s going to happen, I have all my evidence backed up and I got thousands of sheets of evidence whereby you lied to abuse my family. Judicial review, request for a Supreme Court retrial on the grounds my rights to defence were breached, my human rights breached, and I have a boatload of new evidence. Good day (and then the defendant gives his name).”

30. As I have already explained, the Defendant was validly served with the notice for this hearing. He was served with notice for the hearing on 29 July. The Defendant did not attend. He had not been informed that the hearing was adjourned. He then received an order for this hearing. When he requested an adjournment of the earlier hearing by email, there was no response from the Local Authority. There was no order granting the adjournment, and there was no formal application to the Court seeking an adjournment.
31. Similarly for this hearing, the Defendant sent emails seeking an adjournment and then what was, in my judgment, an email that was inconsistent with any belief by him that this hearing was adjourned as he was seeking a transparency order so journalists could attend. Then in his email of yesterday, he stated that he would not attend unless the assurances that he requested in that email were given. Those assurances were not given and he has not attended.
32. I am satisfied the Defendant is fully aware of this hearing. I am also satisfied, as he was informed yesterday by the Local Authority that this hearing was going ahead, that he is aware

that I am sitting to determine the committal application today. He made demands to secure his attendance that, in my judgment, are not a proper basis for seeking an adjournment.

33. What the Defendant should have done is attended this hearing, made any application he had to adjourn, on whatever basis, be that his desire to obtain legal representation, or his desire to voluntarily file evidence. I note that in committal proceedings, the defendant has a right to silence and cannot be compelled to respond or cannot be sanctioned for failing to comply with any directions to file evidence. In addition, there is long-standing authority that any evidence that a Defendant in committal proceedings does file cannot actually be relied upon by an applicant until it is deployed by the defendant.
34. The Defendant has not attended, indicating very clearly in his email of yesterday, that I have read out almost in full, that he was not intending to come today.
35. In these circumstances, this not being the first hearing that the Defendant has failed to attend, the Local Authority invited me to proceed to hear the case in the absence of the Defendant.
36. In the position statement filed on behalf of the applicant by instructing counsel, Mr Lord, I am referred to the decision of Cobb J, as he was then, in the case of *Sanchez v Oboz* [2015] EWHC 235, in which at paragraph five, Cobb J provides a checklist of matters for the Court to consider in deciding whether to proceed in the absence of a defendant.
37. Looking at those matters listed, the first to consider is whether the Defendant has been served with the relevant documents, including notice of hearing. For the reasons I have already given, I am satisfied that he has.
38. The next matter is whether the Defendant has had sufficient notice to enable him to prepare for the hearing. I am satisfied he did. He was served as I have said, in compliance with the order made on 29 July 2025. He was served on the 26 August. The matters that are before the court today are fully known to the Defendant and have been since he was served by substituted service on 22 July. Therefore, it has been fourteen days since he was served with the last order and the very short supplemental affidavit of the staff member from the Local Authority. It has been a number of weeks, seven weeks I think, since the bundle was served on him. In my judgment, that is ample time for the Defendant to have prepared his case in response to this application.
39. Have any reasons been advanced for the defendant's non-appearance? Well, he has not attended nor given any reason to this Court for why he did not attend today to make any application to adjourn that he wished to make. Whilst I recognise he had emailed the court on the 26th and 27 August and did not receive a response, he was informed yesterday that the

hearing was going ahead. However, he then placed conditions on his attendance. As I said earlier, those conditions are that he would attend court once his daughter was confirmed to be a witness, and all the related cases concerning his daughter were declared void. As I have said, those are not proper grounds for a refusal to attend when properly served, and are not grounds for the adjournment of this application.

40. The next factor from Cobb J's checklist, is whether an adjournment would be likely to secure the attendance of the Defendant or representation on his behalf. As I said, this is the second hearing that the Defendant not attended and, given his demands that I have summarised, I am not satisfied that any adjournment would secure his attendance or indeed his representation.
41. The next factor to consider is the extent of the disadvantage to the Defendant in not being able to present his account of events. The Defendant has had seven weeks' notice of the allegations relied upon by the Local Authority. The Defendant has exercised his right not to respond in full. He has sent no explanation other than his allegations of corruption, and stating that he has records of that corruption, but his emails do not actually link the evidence he says he has with the breaches that are alleged. He says in one email that he has closed his social medial accounts and seems to allege that the Local Authority is manufacturing false evidence against him. He has had ample opportunity to be here. He is not here. Had he attended he would have had the opportunity to address the court and provide evidence to support his allegations. Those are serious allegations against the Local Authority which, if they are to be considered, the Defendant should have attended to present them. He has not. The disadvantage to him of his non-attendance is self-generated and has to be considered alongside all other matters.
42. The next factor is whether undue prejudice would be caused to the Applicant by delay or to the court process if the application proceeded in the Defendant's absence. As I have said, the substance of this committal application was served seven weeks ago. I am not satisfied that a further adjournment would lead to the Defendant participating. In addition, although some of the allegations made are now many months old, some are more recent and I have to consider the possibility of further breaches during any period of adjournment. I also take into account the resources of the Court, and that this is the second time the Defendant has failed to attend. I am satisfied that it is appropriate to proceed to determine the allegations in the absence of the defendant, him having ample opportunity to attend and failing to do so, quite deliberately in my judgment, given the contents of his emails.

43. The Local Authority's application raises 47 allegations. Quite properly, during the course of the hearing today, the Local Authority agreed to limit those allegations considerably, now relying on 16 dates when it says there has been breaches of the order.
44. I will deal with each of these allegations in turn. They all appear in section 13 of the application form properly used by the Local Authority in bringing this application. The form describes, at section 8, the order that was made by the Recorder and fully sets out in section 13, the actions that it alleges were taken by the Defendant in breach of that order and, of course, I take into account, that the supplemental affidavit directed by Henke J further explains the alleged breaches. I will deal with them in date order.
45. The first allegation is of breaching the order by posting online on 23 December 2023, that is a posting of a photograph of a child standing with her father. The order prohibited the father posting a photograph. I am satisfied from the evidence contained in the affidavits filed by the social work manager that this is a photograph of the Father's child. It is in, in my finding, a photograph from Facebook, made in the name of the father and it is dated. The post under that Facebook identity has very similar content to the content of the emails that I have read in relation to the complaints about the previous proceedings, the conduct of those previous proceedings, and the judges that are named. I am satisfied on the criminal standard, so I am satisfied that I am sure, that this is a Facebook account in the name of the Defendant, that is used by the Defendant. His language in his emails to the Local Authority, and indeed to the court, corroborate the Local Authority's case that this is his Facebook account and I so find on the criminal standard. I therefore find on 23 December 2023, the Defendant posted a photograph of the child in breach of the order of the Recorder, indeed just within days of that order being made.
46. The next allegation is on 19 January 2024, that is a posting on social media that is at page 33 of the bundle. This is another photograph of the Defendant with his child. I am satisfied, for the reasons already given that this is the Defendant's Facebook account. I am satisfied that is a photograph of his child, and I am satisfied, because of the commentary that comes with the photographs that these were posted by the Defendant.
47. The next allegation is 26 April 2024. That posting appears at page 36 of the bundle. Again, the same Facebook account and a picture of the same child. I am satisfied to the criminal standard that the Defendant posted this photograph on his Facebook account in breach of the order of the Recorder.

48. The next allegation is 10 May 2024. That posting is at PDF 37 of the bundle. This is in fact a screenshot of a wallpaper photograph on a phone. It is posted on the same Facebook account. It is a photograph of the same child. I am satisfied that this is the Defendant again, in breach of the order of the Recorder, and I am satisfied, so that, I am sure.
49. The next allegation is 16 November 2024 at PDF 38. This is a posting of the child that is accompanied with a text box that says:

“I want to expose social services for child abuse as they are, but they lock away, don’t let me speak for myself or take notice of what I want. I have been asked to be returned to my family, and they don’t even allow me to see them.”

50. It is on the same Facebook account. I am satisfied this is the Defendant’s child. I am satisfied that this is a posting that has been made or reposted by the Defendant and I am satisfied to the criminal standard that this is a breach of the Recorder’s order.
51. The next date relied upon by the Local Authority is 16 June 2024. That appears at page 64 of the bundle. It is in fact the same photograph as the previous breach, with the same text box.
52. The next date complained of is 22 November 2024 at PDF 62. This is another posting using the same account of the Defendant. It is a posting that produces a photograph of Peter Jackson LJ, naming Mr Recorder Stoner, and making allegations about him having violated the defendant’s Article 6 rights, when ordering a child to be put in care after lying in a fraudulent judgment and abusing court protocols. This posting of its own, it not a posting that identifies the child. It identifies that there have been proceedings concerning the child, but it does not actually directly refer to the child’s name in the proceedings. However, when looking through the posting for 25 November, at PDF 62, that posting produces a photograph of the child and then names judges, accusing them of committing perjury. It names Mr Recorder Stoner KC, it names Her Honour Pemberton, Poole J, and Cobb J as he was then. In my judgment, this is a posting of a photograph of the child that is referring directly to the proceedings, which links in with the photograph of Peter Jackson LJ on 22 November.
53. I take myself back to the wording of the prohibition in the order, where the Defendant was prohibited from “posting or placing any picture or any information about the child or proceedings relating to the child on Facebook.” It is perhaps a widely drawn injunction, but in my judgment, the postings that I have just identified from the 22nd and 24 November are clear breaches of that order. They directly connect the child, using a photograph, and named the judges, and complained of the conduct of the proceedings. I am satisfied to the criminal

standard these are postings made by the Defendant on his same account and is a breach of the order.

54. The next allegation is one of 21 December, which is on PDF 62. Now this posting on its own may not be a breach of the order. It names [*company name redacted from judgment*]. It states:

“They parentally alienate children emotionally and mentally abuse them, pushing children to have no self-esteem. The children then self-harm, attempt suicide and then claim the child needs more therapy for conditions they purposely caused.”

55. There is no connection made between that posting and proceedings or the child. Whilst it appears, in a social media account that does, however, contain postings of the type I have already described that do breach the order, in my judgment this posting of itself does not. As I said during the course of the hearing, individuals are entitled to complain about court service, complain about judges, and complain about providers of private children’s homes. However, because this post does not refer to the proceedings or directly to the child, I am not satisfied to the criminal standard that this is a breach of the order.
56. The next allegation is dated 15 January 2025, which is at PDF 57. It is a posting of the scales of justice and it says: “I have overwhelming evidence to put five child trafficking and corrupt judges in prison. Police refused to do anything. Law for them. Law for us.” That is not a posting that, in my judgment, offends the terms of the order and is not a breach of it.
57. Turning to the next date, 27 January 2025, this is a posting from the same account. It has a headline that says: “(Local Authority) Metropolitan Borough Council, child abusers and liars.” It then says “after asking father to talk to a suicidal child”, it names the social worker, names the Local Authority and says she ignored the child’s wishes to voluntarily have treatment as long as the father was present. The post states “she put the child to sleep without consent and then it alleges the social worker “removed a Tampax the child had used attempting suicide because they won’t let her go home”. Although this is a posting that does not explicitly name the child, nor does it explicitly refer to the proceedings, it refers to and names the Local Authority and the social worker. Given the broadly drawn terms of the order, I am satisfied to the criminal standard that this is a breach of the order as the this is posting provides information about the child and the child’s involvement with the Local Authority.
58. The next date is 19 March, at PDF 49. This is a posting from the same account. It refers to corrupt judges profiting from stealing children on behalf of local authorities. It names four judges: Judge Pemberton, Recorder Stoner, Poole J and Cobb J, stating they:

“made orders and injunctions to prevent me fighting for my child and meant to stop me from exposing them for child trafficking and exploitation, slavery, sex abuse, profiteering by stealing children, falsely incriminating parents, paedophiles, leads to investigation.”

59. This is posting that directly refer to the proceedings concerning the child. In my judgment, it is a breach of the terms of the injunction that was made, and I am satisfied on that to the criminal standard.
60. The next date relied upon is 20 March at PDF 49. Again, this is a posting referring directly to the proceedings, directly naming Judge Pemberton, and complaining about corruption “preventing me fighting for my child.” This is direct reference to the proceedings that is prohibited by the order of 19 December 2023, and I am satisfied of that to the criminal standard.
61. The next date referred to is 8 April 2025 at PDF 44. This is a similar posting to the last. “Judges refused the right to justice as it will expose them as criminals” is the headline on the posting, naming Judge Pemberton and other judges,

“...who traffic children and put orders on me that makes it impossible to obtain justice and the freedom of my child. The court ignores legitimate applications giving no reason for my violation of constitutional rights, journalists can now expose them.”

62. This is direct reference to the proceedings. However, it does not identify the child concerned but given that it is the same social media account where the child is directly identified, and indeed just on 8 May, there is a post naming the social worker and the child’s brother, clearly connecting this post to the child, I am satisfied that this is a breach of the wide terms of the injunction that was ordered, and I am satisfied on the criminal standard.
63. The next date relied upon is 8 May 2025 at PDF 42 and 43. This is a posting in which, as previously, the Defendant refers to the company providing accommodation to the child by way of a residential unit. The Defendant has posted a photograph of the unit, where I am told the child resides, with text that says:

“*[Name of company redacted from judgment]* steal children, misdiagnosing them to keep them in care, they parentally alienate the children to turn them against their family, gaslighting them, claiming it is their family’s fault.”

64. In addition, the post below of the same date states “Still being ignored by (Local Authority) violating their responsibility.” Another text below on the same date, names the social worker and the child. I have taken myself back, as I must, to the words of the order, and the words of

the order are “not to post or place any pictures or information about the child or proceedings.” These posts on 8 May post information about where the child lives and the Defendant’s allegations about the treatment the child receives there. On an open reading of the words of the injunction, that is posting “any information” about the child. Whilst in individual posting they do not name the child, the information posted on this date must, in my judgment all be considered together. The injunction, as I have already described, is widely drawn. The child is not named but the Local Authority is named as is a social worker. Therefore, there is a direct connection, in my judgment, that the reader of this social media account would readily make between the child who was the subject of the proceedings, who is the child of the defendant and is the child accommodated at that unit. Therefore, in my judgment, I am satisfied to the criminal standard that those postings on 8 May 2025 were in breach of paragraph 9(a) of the order of 19 December.

65. The last of the allegations relied upon by the Local Authority is dated 22 May 2025, and that is PDF 41. This is a picture posted of the scales of justice. It says, “justice must be seen to be done” and “Article 6 right to a fair trial”. There is accompanying text posted, I am satisfied, on the Defendant’s account by the Defendant that says:

“My daughter complains of sexual abuse in care, police refuse to do anything, social worker [*named*] encourages the abuse, and refuses contact between father and daughter causing extreme emotional and mental distress to the 13-year-old, being told that she has no family and will always be in care, gaslighted, gives up on life, sees no future. They just want profit, don’t care what happens to the child or the destruction of the family.”

66. I return myself, as I must, to the wording of the order. This is clearly posting information about the child. It is referring to social workers and the refusal of contact. It is clearly, in my judgment, a breach of the order for the same reason as the breaches on 8 May, a breach of the order. The connection between this post, the proceedings and the child referred to and seen in photographs on this Facebook account is clear.
67. I, therefore, find, save where indicated during the course of this judgment, that the Defendant has on numerous occasions between 23 December 2023 and 22 May 2025 breached the terms of paragraph 9(a) of the order of 19 December, and I am satisfied of that on the criminal standard.
68. Ordinarily, at this stage in a committal hearing, the Defendant would have the opportunity to make submissions concerning what punishment, if any, the court should impose for the contempt of court that arises as a result of the breaches of the order I have found to be proved.

The Defendant has not attended today, and I am reluctant to move to a sentencing stage until the Defendant has had a further opportunity to attend to present whatever explanation he wishes to present in mitigation, if any, for the conduct I have found that he has engaged in that is in breach of the order.

69. I will, therefore, adjourn sentencing to a further date with a warning that if the Defendant fails to attend at that hearing, he may be to sentenced in his absence.

End of Judgment.

Transcript of a recording by Acolad UK Ltd
291-299 Borough High Street, London SE1 1JG
Tel: 020 7269 0370
legal@ubiquis.com

Acolad UK Ltd hereby certify that the above is an accurate and complete record of the
proceedings or part thereof.