



COURT OF APPEAL  
CIVIL DIVISION

**In the matter of contempt proceedings against  
Rajiv Menon KC**

*Before:*

Lord Justice Bean (Vice President, Court of Appeal, Civil Division)

Lord Justice Dingemans (Senior President of Tribunals)

Lord Justice Stuart-Smith

**PRESS SUMMARY OF THE DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEAL HANDED  
DOWN ON 12 MAY 2026**

**This summary does not form part of the Court of Appeal's Judgment**

**Factual Background**

1. In December 2025 a trial was taking place in the Crown Court at Woolwich. Six defendants were charged with offences arising out of an incident on 6 August 2024 at a factory in Filton, Bristol, occupied and operated by Elbit Systems Ltd. Mr Rajiv Menon KC was leading counsel representing Charlotte Head, one of the defendants.
2. During the course of the trial, the trial judge gave various rulings about what evidence could and could not be placed before the Jury. Specifically, on 22 December 2025 the trial judge said that no counsel was permitted in their closing speeches to invite the jury to disregard the court's rulings of law or to disregard their juror oaths or to apply what has been described as the principle of jury equity or to inform them of it.
3. Mr Menon made his closing speech to the jury on 8 January 2026. On 12 January 2026 the trial judge ruled that Mr Menon had, during his closing speech, disobeyed the Court's directions about what counsel were permitted to say in their closing speeches. On 4 February 2026 the trial came to an end with a mixture of acquittals and non-agreement on verdicts.
4. On or about 18 February 2026 the trial judge referred Mr Menon's conduct to a Divisional Court.

5. On 11 March 2026 the Administrative Court held a directions hearing. After the hearing, without ruling on whether or not it had jurisdiction to do so, the Administrative Court directed that a summons be drawn up and served on Mr Menon and gave directions intended to lead to a hearing of substantive allegations of contempt of court in June 2026.

### **Mr Menon's Application for Permission to Appeal**

6. Mr Menon applied to the Court of Appeal for permission to appeal against the order of the Administrative Court. His central submission was that the Administrative Court did not have jurisdiction to make the orders that it had made.

### **The Court of Appeal's Decision**

7. For the reasons set out in a judgment handed down today ([2026] EWCA Civ \* the Court of Appeal gave Mr Menon permission to appeal on the jurisdiction issue and allowed his appeal against the order of the Administrative Court. The Court of Appeal set aside the order of the Administrative Court and granted a declaration that the Administrative Court and/or the Divisional Court have no jurisdiction, in the absence of an application from the Attorney General, to consider the allegation of contempt against Mr Menon.
8. The consequence of the Court of Appeal's decision is that the matter should be reconsidered by the Trial Judge who may then, subject to any further points that may be made on Mr Menon's behalf, decide what action to take in the light of the Court of Appeal's ruling.
9. Reporting of the facts and matters relating to the allegations against Mr Menon was restricted by an order made pursuant to section 4(2) of the Contempt of Court Act 1981 until conclusion of the retrial of Ms Head and other defendants, which occurred on 6 May 2026.

**NOTE: This summary is provided to assist in understanding the Court's decision. It does not form part of the reasons for the decision. The full judgment of the Court is the only authoritative document. Judgments are public documents and are available at: [Find Case Law - The National Archives](#)**