

Neutral Citation Number: EWHC 3538 (KB)

Case No: KB-2024-004175

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand
London WC2A 2LL

Friday 20 December 2024

BEFORE:

MR JUSTICE BOURNE

BETWEEN:

TELEDYNE UK LIMITED

Claimant

- and -

(1) JULIAN ALLEN GAO

(2) RUBY HAMILL

(3) DANIEL JONES

(4) NAJAM SHAH

(5) RICKY SOUTHALL

(6) AMAREEN AFZAL

(7) SERENA FENTON

**(8) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO ARE WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE
CLAIMANT ENTERING OR REMAINING ON LAND AND IN OR ON
BUILDINGS ON ANY OF THE SITES LISTED IN SCHEDULE 2 TO THE
CLAIM FORM, THOSE BEING:**

**A. THE 'SHIPLEY SITE' (TELEDYNE UK LIMITED, AIREDALE
HOUSE, ACORN PARK, SHIPLEY BD17 7SW);**

**B. THE 'LINCOLN SITE' (TELEDYNE UK LIMITED, 168 SADLER
ROAD, LINCOLN LN6 3RS);**

**C. THE 'WIRRAL SITE' (TELEDYNE UK LIMITED, UNIT A, 6 TEBAY
ROAD, BROMBOROUGH, BIRKENHEAD, WIRRAL CH62 3PA);**

**D. THE 'CHELMSFORD SITE' (TELEDYNE UK LIMITED, 106
WATERHOUSE LANE, CHELMSFORD CM1 2QU);**

**E. THE 'PRESTEIGNE SITE' (TELEDYNE UK LIMITED, BROADAXE
BUSINESS PARK, PRESTEIGNE LD8 2UH); AND**

**F. THE 'NEWBURY SITE' (TELEDYNE UK LIMITED, REYNOLDS
NAVIGATION HOUSE, CANAL VIEW ROAD, NEWBURY RG14
5UR).**

**(9) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTESTING ARE
OBSTRUCTING ANY VEHICLE ACCESSING THE 'SHIPLEY SITE'
(TELEDYNE UK LIMITED, AIREDALE HOUSE, ACORN PARK, SHIPLEY
BD17 7SW) FROM THE HIGHWAY**

**(10) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTESTING
ARE OBSTRUCTING ANY VEHICLE ACCESSING THE HIGHWAY FROM
THE 'SHIPLEY SITE' (TELEDYNE UK LIMITED, AIREDALE HOUSE,
ACORN PARK, SHIPLEY BD17 7SW)**

**(11) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTESTING
ARE CAUSING THE BLOCKING, SLOWING DOWN, OBSTRUCTING OR
OTHERWISE INTERFERING WITH THE FREE FLOW OF TRAFFIC ON
TO, OFF OR ALONG THE ROADS LISTED AT SCHEDULE 3 TO THE
CLAIM FORM**

Defendants

MS N PRATT appeared on behalf of the Claimant.
The Defendants did not attend and were not represented

JUDGMENT
(Approved)

Digital Transcription by Epiq Europe Ltd,
Lower Ground, 46 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JE
Web: www.epiqglobal.com/en-gb/ Email: civil@epiqglobal.co.uk
(Official Shorthand Writers to the Court)

*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.*

MR JUSTICE BOURNE:

Introduction

1. This is an application for an interim injunction against seven named defendants and four categories of persons unknown. It is also a without notice application, although short informal notice has been given. I also have before me an application for third-party disclosure, seeking information from West Yorkshire Police about some of the matters to which I shall refer below.
2. The claimant is a company which produces components and systems for commercial use in a range of industrial markets, including defence and aerospace. Some products have military end-uses and are manufactured for use by the UK Ministry of Defence, NATO member states and other allied nations. Some products are exported under licence to Israel.
3. In the course of 2024, acts of protest have taken place at the premises of the claimant at six sites in England and Wales, where the claimant is freeholder in some cases and leaseholder in others. These have included acts by individuals protesting about the conflict in the Middle East. The claimant claims that these protests have included acts of (aggravated) trespass and criminal damage by individuals connected with groups known as Palestine Action and Bradford Friends of Palestine. It fears that there will be further such acts during the Christmas holiday period.
4. The named defendants are all individuals who have been arrested at one of the claimant's sites during 2024 in connection with alleged acts of unlawful protest. The persons unknown are identified by reference to their committing unlawful acts of the type specified in each category set out in the claim.
5. Interim relief is requested until a return date on 24 January 2025. The claimants have put forward a draft order, including some amendments made just before the hearing, which would restrain acts of trespass at the six sites and would restrain interference with the claimant's right to access the highway from its land, and public nuisance, consisting of obstruction of the highway at its site at Shipley ("the Shipley site").

The law

6. I accept the summary of the relevant law put forward by the claimant's counsel Natalie Pratt, which I now set out in brief.
7. The tort of trespass is committed where a person intrudes on the land of another without legal justification. It is a tort of strict liability and is actionable without proof of damage. A trespass cannot normally be justified by the fact that the trespasser is exercising rights under the European Convention of Human Rights articles 10 and 11.
8. The owner of land adjoining the highway has an actionable right of access to the highway from any part of his premises, and the public's rights to pass over the highway are subject to that right: see *Marshall v Blackpool Corporation* [1935] AC 16.
9. The law on obstruction of the highway was summarised by Julian Knowles J in *Thurrock Council & Anor v Adams & Ors* [2024] EWHC 2576 KB ("Thurrock") at [64]:

"a. There is a right to peaceful assembly on the highway, but it must be remembered that the highway is more than just the carriageway. The assembly on the highway in *Jones* was concerned with the grass verge;

"b. That right does not extend so far as to allow the committing of a public nuisance;

c. While the right to use the highway comprises activities such as assembly on the highway, such activities are subsidiary to the use for passage, and they must be not only usual and reasonable but consistent with the primary use of the highway to pass and repass, if a person is deliberately interfering with the primary use to pass and repass, they are obstructing the highway;

d. That public nuisance may arise by the unreasonable obstruction of the highway, such as unreasonably impeding the primary right of the public to pass and repass;

e. Whether an obstruction of the highway is unreasonable is a question of fact, but will generally require that the obstruction is more than de minimis, and it must be wilful."

10. In an application for an injunction to restrain obstruction of the highway, the court must ask five questions, identified in *Director of Public Prosecutions v Ziegler and others* [2021] UKSC 23; [2022] AC 408 ("Ziegler"):

"(1) Is what the defendant did in exercise of one of the rights in articles 10 or 11?

(2) If so, is there an interference by a public authority with that right?

(3) If there is an interference, is it 'prescribed by law'?

(4) If so, is the interference in pursuit of a legitimate aim as set out in paragraph (2) of article 10 or article 11, for example the protection of the rights of others?

(5) If so, is the interference 'necessary in a democratic society' to achieve that legitimate aim?"

11. The fifth of those questions requires four sub-questions to be asked (see [16] of *Ziegler*):

"(1) Is the aim sufficiently important to justify interference with a fundamental right?

(2) Is there a rational connection between the means chosen and the aim in view?

(3) Are there less restrictive alternative means available to achieve that aim?

(4) Is there a fair balance between the rights of the individual and the general interest of the community, including the rights of others?"

12. When considering this question of proportionality, the court should also consider relevant factors, including the following (see *Ziegler* at [72], following *City of London v Samede & Ors* [2012] EWCA Civ 160; [2012] PTSR 1624 ("*Samede*") at [39] to [41]):

(1) The extent to which the continuation of the protest would breach domestic law.

(2) The importance of the precise location to the protesters.

(3) The duration of the protest.

(4) The degree to which the protesters occupy the land.

(5) The extent of the actual interference the protest causes to the rights of others, including the property rights of the owners of the land and the rights of any members of the public.

(6) Whether the views giving rise to the protest relate to "very important issues" and whether they are "views which many would see as being of considerable breadth, depth and relevance".

(7) Whether the protesters "believed in the views that they were expressing".

13. Injunctive relief may be granted wherever the court considers it "just and convenient" (Senior Courts Act 1981, section 37).

14. When considering whether to grant an interim injunction against the named defendants, it is necessary to apply the familiar *American Cyanamid* test:

(1) Is there a serious question to be tried? If yes,

(2) Would damages be an adequate remedy for a party injured by the court's grant of, or its failure to grant, an injunction?

(3) If not, where does the balance of convenience lie?

15. Where "precautionary" relief is sought, further guidance is to be taken from the judgment of Marcus Smith J in *Vastint Leeds BV v Persons Unknown* [2018] EWHC 2456 (Ch); [2019] 4 WLR 2 ("*Vastint*") as approved by Lord Vos MR in *Barking and Dagenham London Borough Council v Persons Unknown* [2022] EWCA Civ 13; [2023] QB 295 at [83]. The court will consider whether there is a strong possibility that, unless restrained by an injunction, the defendant will act in breach of the claimant's rights and, if so, whether the resulting harm would be so grave and irreparable that damages would be inadequate even if an injunction were granted immediately after the actual infringement.

16. It seems to me that, as Ms Pratt has submitted, the more stringent test set out in section 12(3) of the Human Rights Act 1998 does not apply because, on the face of it, the order sought would not restrain anything in the nature of a publication to which ECHR article 10 would apply.
17. In the case of the unnamed defendants, the claimant must show a "compelling need" for the order sought: *Wolverhampton City Council and Others v London Gypsies and Travellers and Others* [2024] 2 WLR 45 ("*Wolverhampton*") [167(i) and 188].
18. Following *Wolverhampton*, the requirements for an injunction against persons unknown are as summarised by Ritchie J in *Valero Energy Ltd & Ors v Persons Unknown & Ors* [2024] EWHC 134 (KB) ("*Valero*"). These include substantive requirements:
- (1) There must be a cause of action.
 - (2) There must be full and frank disclosure by the claimant.
 - (3) There must be sufficient evidence to prove the claim (although this requirement appears to be granted with the summary judgment application in mind).
 - (4) There must be no realistic defence.
 - (5) There must be a compelling justification for the remedy sought, and the court must take into account any balancing exercise that may be required if article 10 and 11 rights are engaged.
 - (6) Damages must not be an adequate remedy.
19. They also include procedural requirements:
- (1) Persons unknown must be clearly and plainly identified by reference to the tortious conduct to be prohibited and clearly defined and with clearly defined geographical boundaries, if possible.

- (2) The prohibitions in the injunction must be set out in clear words and avoid legal terminology. Further, if any lawful conduct is sought to be prohibited, that must be made clear, and the court must be satisfied that there is no other more proportionate way of protecting the claimant's rights.
- (3) The prohibitions must match the torts claimed.
- (4) The prohibitions must be defined by clear geographic boundaries, if possible.
- (5) The duration of the injunction should be limited to that which is reasonably necessary to protect the claimant's rights.
- (6) The proceedings and any order made must be served by alternative means, having regard to the Human Rights Act 1998, section 12(2).
- (7) There must be a right to apply to set aside or vary any order made.
- (8) Provision should be made for the review of the injunction in the future.

The evidence in support of the application

- 20. The claimant relies on a witness statement dated 13 December 2024 by its director, Nicholas Wargent.
- 21. The statement explains the nature of the claimant's business in more detail. One aspect is that three of its sites, including the Shipley site, have "FSC", or facility security clearance status, which is required because the claimant has contracts with the UK Ministry of Defence which require it to safeguard assets classified as secret or above on its premises. Mr Wargent states that the sites therefore form a critical part of the UK defence supply chain, affecting the UK's ability to protect its security and advance national interests and the security of the UK's allies. Disruption to production at the claimant's sites therefore may threaten national security.

22. At some sites, areas must be kept sterile, and hazardous materials and chemicals are stored. Some contain specialised equipment requiring special skills and knowledge for safe operation.
23. The Shipley site can be accessed only at one point to the north west, via an electronically controlled gate from a road called Acorn Park, which is also the sole access to some adjoining properties and businesses.
24. Mr Wargent describes Palestine Action as promoting acts of unlawful direct action protest at sites belonging to the claimant and at sites of other companies_ which it associates with the conflict in the Middle East. Its website has a "News" section which refers to actions including spray painting of buildings, the smashing of windows, the occupation of buildings and the blockading of sites. He states that the addresses of the claimant's six sites are published on that website and are listed as targets for direct action protest. That is why those sites are the subject of this application. The claimant does also operate from other locations, which are not covered.
25. A pdf document entitled "The underground manual" is published on that website, which advises, encourages and instructs activists on how to conduct direct action protest. It suggests types of protest actions, all of which are unlawful and are not acts of peaceful protest, with phrases like "with an efficient sledgehammer in your hand, you can cause quite a bit of damage!". The manual also contains other instructions under a heading "How to get to the site and leave undetected" and advises activists to cover their faces and wear plain baggy clothing and, after any action, to destroy evidence and cover their tracks.
26. According to Mr Wargent, activists associated with Bradford Friends of Palestine were responsible for protest incidents at the Shipley site on 30 October and 20 and 28 November 2024, when access to the site was obstructed for several hours. This group has also conducted peaceful protest at the Shipley site.
27. Mr Wargent also refers to Palestine Solidarity Campaign as an association upon whom case papers may be served, in order to give notice to the persons unknown defendants, but he does not suggest that that association has been involved in any unlawful action.

28. Mr Wargent gives details of unlawful acts of protest, which he says have occurred since December 2022:

(a) On 9 December 2022, at least four individuals referred to in social media posts by Palestine Action broke into the claimant's site at Presteigne and, over several hours, caused extensive damage to the premises and to equipment. The site did not fully reopen for ten days, and repairs lasted for several months. Four individuals were convicted of offences and given custodial sentences. There were six-figure losses to the claimant.

(b) On 28 September 2023, the day of an open day for graduates, an individual associated with Palestine Action splashed paint across the front of the building at the Chelmsford site.

(c) On 26 December 2023, an individual entered the Shipley site by climbing the fence and started a fire, causing damage valued at £35,000.

(d) On 2 April 2024, about 20 protesters wearing red overalls often worn by Palestine Action protesters, climbed onto the roof of the premises at the Shipley site and caused damage over about 16 hours. The first, second, third and fourth defendants were arrested. They await a retrial on various charges in February 2026. The business returned to full production after a week. About half of the main building was closed for repairs for about two weeks, and other repair and refurbishment continued for several weeks after that. The claimant's loss is estimated at £871,000.

(e) On 15 May 2024, four individuals seen in social media posts of Palestine Action accessed the roof of the premises at the Shipley site and caused damage. They included the fifth, sixth and seventh named defendants, who have been charged with various offences. The claimant's loss is estimated at around £128,000.

(f) On 5 July 2024, three individuals accessed the Wirral site by ramming the gates with a van and sprayed red paint over the building. They were associated with Palestine Action by social media posts and by their red overalls. They are on bail and awaiting trial for unidentified offences. The incident lasted around four hours and the claimant's loss is estimated at around £7,400.

(g) On 2 October 2024, three individuals gained access to the Wirral site and climbed onto the roof of the premises. They caused damage to the roof and to the production floor in the building underneath. Social media posts from Palestine Action said that they had accessed the "clean room", contamination of which could stop production for up to 12 months and disrupt production for 18 months. That information had been contained in a witness statement given by a senior employee of the claimant in criminal proceedings. The incident lasted five hours and caused damage of around £497,000. The individuals are on bail and awaiting trial for unidentified offences.

(h) On 30 October 2024, the entrance gate to the Shipley site was obstructed by approximately 20 protesters for around five hours, preventing around 100 employees from entering. The incident appears on a video on the Instagram page for Bradford Friends of Palestine.

(i) On 20 November 2024, the entrance gate to the Shipley site was obstructed by approximately 12 protesters for around two hours, again delaying employees entering the site. The incident is documented in a post made to the Instagram account of Bradford Friends of Palestine.

(j) On 28 November 2024 the entrance gate to the Shipley site was again blockaded. On this occasion, a group of approximately 20 protesters attended the site and obstructed the gate and therefore access to the site for approximately three hours. A group called Yorkshire Palestine Collective expressed solidarity with this incident on social media, although it is alleged that the protesters were associated with Bradford Friends of Palestine.

29. The claimant states and accepts that there have also been many lawful protests at the site. It makes no complaint about peaceful and lawful protest activities, but concentrates only on the incidents which it says are unlawful.

30. It is apparent from the evidence that it has not been possible to identify all those who have been involved in the incidents. The unnamed defendants are therefore described in the application as persons who enter or remain on the claimant's relevant land without their consent, and as those who, for the purpose of protesting, are obstructing any vehicle

accessing the Shipley site or accessing the highway from the Shipley site, or are blocking, slowing down, obstructing or otherwise interfering with the free flow of traffic on to, off or along a number of named roads.

31. Mr Wargent states that the claimant reasonably apprehends imminent future acts of unlawful protest because of these past acts, because Palestine Action continues to recruit activists and organise activity, because of the continued prominence of the conflict in the Middle East and because of the approaching Christmas holiday period when people may have more time to engage in protest. The company apprehends suffering further harm of the types already suffered, and that disruption at the sites may weaken the UK's ability to protect its security and can place serving personnel at risk.
32. He also testifies that the claimant maintains and, in response to the above incidents, has increased the use of comprehensive and sophisticated security arrangements at the sites. Additional security measures have cost around \$2.7 million for the 2024 financial year. Some of the sites are identified as "prohibited places" under the National Security Act 2023, which provides the police with powers to deter, capture and prosecute harmful activity in and around prohibited places, and to order a person to cease their activity or move away from the place.
33. The claimant also relies on the witness statement dated 13 December 2024 by Manan Singh, a partner in the firm of solicitors representing the claimant.
34. Manan Singh explains that only 24 hours informal notice of the application has been given to the named defendants, because longer notice could spur protest groups into further protest action before any injunction can be granted. There has been a recent increase in the relevant activity, and protesters could mobilise at short notice. They may have more time to do so during the Christmas holidays, noting that there was an incident on Boxing Day last year and two incidents during school holiday periods this year.
35. Manan Singh explains that unnamed defendants are sued because it has not been possible to identify all those involved in the incidents above. Palestine Action publishes material which instructs individuals on how to hide their identity. The membership of that group is

liable to fluctuate, and newcomers may join at any time. Relief against persons unknown is necessary to deter unidentified individuals or newcomers from unlawful conduct.

36. Manan Singh points out that an injunction which only restrains unlawful conduct, rather than peaceful protest, cannot be expected to cause any loss to the defendants, but any such loss could be compensated in damages and the claimant offers an undertaking in the sum of £50,000. But if further unlawful acts cause loss and damage to the claimant on the scale of some of the previous incidents, where accumulated loss can be measured in millions, the defendants are unlikely to have the means to pay the damages.

37. Furthermore, unauthorised access to classified assets could not be adequately compensated by an award of damages. The claimant could also suffer unfair reputational damage. And, activities such as climbing on buildings, arson, smashing windows and skylights, and entering sites which house hazardous and sensitive materials and equipment may also cause physical danger to the protesters themselves and to others. Surrounding businesses may also suffer loss from disruption to the highway outside the Shipley site.

38. Manan Singh also notes that applications have been made for disclosure by the police for address details to facilitate the giving of notice to named persons.

39. Finally, the claimant has filed a further witness statement from Mr Wargent dated 19 December 2024, the day before this hearing. It describes two incidents which occurred on that day at the Shipley site. It seems that on or around 10 December, the group known as Bradford Friends of Palestine published an Instagram post asking supporters to assemble on the corner of Acorn Park at noon on 19 December. At or around that time, a peaceful demonstration took place, and the claimant makes no criticism of it. After it had ended, at about 2 pm, a lone male drove on to the claimant's property just outside the gate of the Shipley site, in a car with "free Gaza" painted on the side. It is said that he unfurled a Palestinian flag, shouted slogans, abused the claimant's staff with insults such as "murderous bastards", played loud music and then used a chain to lock himself to the steering wheel of the car. The police attended, unlocked him and arrested him. Overall, staff were prevented from leaving the site for about 40 minutes at the end of their working day. In the car, the police found two knives, a sledgehammer and cans of red paint. At present, the claimant does not know the identity of the lone male.

Discussion

40. I begin with the application for disclosure to be given by West Yorkshire Police. That application is intended to obtain contact details for any of the individuals who have been arrested by police, and persons who were asked to leave the Shipley site by the police during allegedly unlawful protest incidents to which I have referred above. It refers to inspection of documents such as police logs and photographic and other relevant evidence obtained by the police. It also seeks details of conditions or restrictions imposed by the police on any relevant individuals as a result of any grant of bail. There is a power to make the order sought under section 24 of the Senior Courts Act 1981 and procedural requirements are found in CPR 31.17. It is necessary to balance the competing interests of the applicant (that is to say, the claimant) on the one hand and the police on the other, who may have privacy or confidentiality interests.
41. I have seen a witness statement in response by Stephen Simpson, a solicitor in West Yorkshire Police legal services. He says that the police are neutral on this disclosure application, and has asked to be excused attendance at this hearing. He notes the claimant's proposal to pay the costs of the disclosure application and has no objection to the terms of the draft disclosure order, subject to the court determining that disclosure is necessary.
42. The draft disclosure order has been updated by Ms Pratt so as to cover information about the incident of 19 December, as well as earlier incidents. In my judgment, the order sought is necessary. Its purpose is for the claimant to be able to verify the identity of the individuals who are proper defendants to the claim, so that it can add individuals who, it alleges, have committed the unlawful acts in the past, effect service on them and commence any necessary proceedings against them in future. I will therefore make the disclosure order in the form of today's draft.
43. As I have said, there is another application in the same or very similar terms against Merseyside Police. It is in the process of being issued. I confirm that it can be dealt with by me or by another judge of the King's Bench Division on paper.

44. Ms Pratt, in her written and oral submissions, has taken me through her case as to compliance with the various legal requirements which are set out above relating to the terms of the order which she seeks. There has been no attendance on behalf of any of the defendants.
45. Having reviewed those submissions and the evidence, I am satisfied that on the information currently before the court, it is right to grant the injunction in the terms sought by the claimant. In what is intended to be a concise judgment on an interim application, I shall mention only some of the salient points.
46. To the extent that section 12(2) of the Human Rights Act 1998 applies (the engagement of the claimant's rights under ECHR article 10 being disputed where the tort of trespass is concerned), I am satisfied that the claimant has taken all practicable steps to notify any named defendant who is not present or represented on this application. Where any defendant has not been notified, I am satisfied that there are compelling reasons for that, namely the impossibility of giving such notice in some cases, combined with the seriousness of the potential harm which the injunction seeks to prevent from occurring.
47. The incidents described in the evidence and the likelihood of further such incidents give rise to a serious question to be tried as to trespass and torts consisting of obstruction of the highway.
48. The previous pattern of behaviour, the online activity of groups such as Palestine Action and the continued political issues regarding conflict in the Middle East establish a strong possibility that, unless restrained by an injunction, the defendants will act in breach of the claimant's rights. That is in spite of what appears to be substantial action taken by the claimant to try to keep the sites secure.
49. The incident involving a car yesterday afternoon tends to confirm the immediacy of the threat of such action. Although it is not known whether the perpetrator is connected to any of the named defendants or any of the groups to which I have referred, there is evidence that he shares their motives, and the finding of red paint in his car tends to suggest an intention to act in some of the ways of which the claimant has complained.

That individual's acts would be covered by the terms of the proposed order against persons unknown.

50. For the reasons advanced by Manan Singh, it is reasonable to assume that loss caused by any such incident could not adequately be compensated by an award of damages.
51. On the information presently available, the interim relief sought is proportionate, striking a fair balance between the claimant's rights and the rights of the defendants under ECHR articles 10 and 11. The order would prevent deliberately disruptive obstruction of a specific part of the highway, namely Acorn Park, such as would cause further serious losses to the claimant (significant losses having already occurred) and could affect matters affecting the safety of service personnel, and could also cause loss and damage to other neighbouring businesses. The order would not prevent peaceful protest in and around the highway, such as a demonstration taking place on the pavement. The provisions about the highway are sought only in relation to the Shipley site, because of the geography of that site and the fact that there is only one access route.
52. In all the circumstances, the wider balance of convenience favours the grant of the injunction sought. It will not interfere with the right to peaceful protest, as I have said, but will restrain the causing of further serious losses to the claimant.
53. For the same reasons, the requirements of *Vastint* appear to be satisfied.
54. The likelihood of new protesters engaging in this type of action and of their not being readily identifiable makes out a compelling need for relief to extend to the unnamed defendants. That is underlined by the evidence about the acts of the lone male on 19 December. On the information presently available, the substantive *Wolverhampton/Valero* requirements have been satisfied. The draft order in its final version complies with the procedural requirements.
55. In my judgment, the proposed provisions for alternative service can be reasonably expected to bring the relevant documents to the attention of the defendants.

Conclusion

56. I will therefore make the order sought by the claimant, which contains the usual terms enabling any defendant to apply to vary it or set it aside.

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

Lower Ground, 46 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JE

Email: civil@epiqglobal.co.uk

This transcript has been approved by the Judge