

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
BUSINESS AND PROPERTY COURTS IN MANCHESTER  
BUSINESS LIST (ChD)

Case No. BL-2024-MAN-000088

Courtroom No. 47

1 Bridge Street West  
Manchester  
M60 9DJ

Wednesday, 4<sup>th</sup> February 2026

Before:  
HIS HONOUR JUDGE PEARCE

B E T W E E N:

P GILL LTD  
& ORS

and

KHILJI  
& ANOR

MR G BLAKER KC (instructed by EMW Law) appeared on behalf of the Claimants  
MR J SCOTT appeared on behalf of the Defendants

JUDGMENT TWO  
(Approved)

*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.*

*WARNING: reporting restrictions may apply to the contents transcribed in this document, particularly if the case concerned a sexual offence or involved a child. Reporting restrictions prohibit the publication of the applicable information to the public or any section of the public, in writing, in a broadcast or by means of the internet, including social media. Anyone who receives a copy of this transcript is responsible in law for making sure that applicable restrictions are not breached. A person who breaches a reporting restriction is liable to a fine and/or imprisonment. For guidance on whether reporting restrictions apply, and to what information, ask at the court office or take legal advice.*

HHJ PEARCE:

1. The question arises as to the listing of the further hearing consequent upon my findings in respect of the contempt of court that I made this morning. Mr Scott, on behalf of the defendants, invites me to avoid any date earlier than 8 May 2026. The reason for this is a little opaque, but, in broad terms, it relates to Mr Khilji's imminent operation and the difficulty with him attending earlier than that.
2. Mr Scott points out that the obtaining of the transcript is likely to take a little time. It will then need to be considered. I think the implication of Mr Scott's argument, aside the defendants' own convenience, is that one could not list this case much before the end of March and, even then, that might be a little early, and one might, in terms of first available dates, be looking at just after Easter in or around mid-April. For reasons that need not trouble us, I will not be available in the first half of April. The hearing clearly needs to come back in front of me, so there is a little issue of listing practicality that arises here.
3. Mr Blaker KC points out that the defendants, for whatever reason and without, for the moment, descending into the detail of where they are and why they have not attended the court on other occasions, are hardly in the position to crave the indulgence of the Court when they have not attended the court before, even though they have been ordered to attend. He points out how vague the explanation is, and he points out the obvious and true need to deal with the case with reasonable dispatch.
4. What people often miss in terms of delay is that, as well as it causing memories to fade and altogether blunting the effect of hearings being dealt with as soon as reasonably practical, it is also almost always the case that delay incurs extra expense. Anybody who has lawyers acting for them is inevitably in a situation where those lawyers have to review the case from time to time, and the mere fact that the case takes longer, even if there are no more hearings, or the hearings themselves are not any lengthier, will tend to lead to an increase in costs. That is a legitimate consideration in this case.
5. Nevertheless, I will, on balance, accede to the defendants' request. It seems to me that it might be a little too tight to list the case any earlier than Easter, and for reasons I have explained relating to my own availability, I will not be available before mid-April. All things being equal, I would very happy to list then. The additional delay in not listing until after 8 May seems to me to be sufficiently minor as to be justified in the circumstances where I am ordering the defendants to attend, and where it would appear that the chance of that happening is improved if there was a slightly longer delay.
6. Accordingly, I will list after 8 May. The case should be listed as soon as possible, and I remain of the view expressed before the short adjournment that counsel should liaise with my clerk, Ms Yates, to fix a date as soon as possible after 8 May, with an estimated length of one day.

**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.

This transcript has been approved by the judge.