

Nicholas James Wargent
Claimant
Fifth Statement
Exhibit NJW5
29 June 2026

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION**

Claim No. KB-2024-004175

B E T W E E N :

TELEDYNE UK LIMITED

Claimant

-and-

(1) JULIAN ALLEN GAO

**(2) – (7) OTHER NAMED DEFENDANTS AS LISTED AT SCHEDULE 1 TO THE
CLAIM FORM**

**(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

(12) – (20) OTHER NAMED DEFENDANTS AS LISTED AT SCHEDULE 1 TO THE CLAIM FORM

Defendants

**FIFTH WITNESS STATEMENT OF
NICHOLAS JAMES WARGENT**

I, **NICHOLAS JAMES WARGENT**, of 106 Waterhouse Lane, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 2QU, will state as follows –

1. I am a director of the Claimant, Teledyne UK Limited (**‘Teledyne UK’**). Teledyne UK is a wholly owned subsidiary of Teledyne Technologies Incorporated, a New York Stock Exchange listed company (together the **‘Teledyne Technologies Group’**). The Teledyne Technologies Group’s operations are primarily located in the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Western and Northern Europe.
2. I am also an in-house solicitor and General Counsel for the Europe, Middle East and Africa, and Asia-Pacific regions for the Teledyne Technologies Group, and I am duly authorised to make this witness statement on behalf of Teledyne UK.
3. I make this witness statement pursuant to paragraph 8 of the Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as Deputy Judge of the High Court) dated 25 July 2025 (**‘the Order’**) which requires Teledyne UK to by 4 July 2026 file and notify the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) of any evidence upon which it intends to rely at the review of the Order against Persons Unknown. That review is listed for **21 July 2026**.

4. To confirm, Teledyne UK seeks the continuation of the injunctive relief against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown), as granted by the Order, for a further year and until the next annual review. No variations to the terms of the relief are sought.
5. The facts and matters set out in this statement are within my own knowledge unless otherwise stated, and I believe them to be true. Where I refer to information supplied by others, the source of the information is identified; facts and matters derived from other sources are true to the best of my knowledge and belief. This witness statement has been made following conference and exchanges of emails with Teledyne UK's legal advisers.
6. There is now produced and shown to me a paginated bundle of true copy documents marked **NJW5**. All references to that bundle are in the format **NJW5/page number**.
7. In advance of the review hearing, I respectfully ask the court to consider the judgment of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a deputy Judge of the High Court) ([2025]) EWHC 2050 (KB) in these proceedings (the '**Judgment**'), which gives rise to the Order. A copy will be provided in the hearing bundle. That judgment sets out the key background to the proceedings, and I shall refrain from repeating the same in this statement.

Scope of this statement

8. This witness statement supplements the other witness statements that have been made in these proceedings and provides an update on matters arising since the grant of the Order. For the avoidance of doubt, Teledyne UK continues to rely on those witness statements and the content therein, and in the interests of proportionality I will not repeat all the same information in this statement. To be clear, my earlier witness statements are:
 - i. my first witness statement dated 13 December 2024 (my '**first witness statement**');
 - ii. my second witness statement dated 19 December 2024 (my '**second witness statement**');
 - iii. my third witness statement dated 15 January 2025 (my '**third witness statement**');and

iv. my fourth witness statement dated 23 May 2025 (my ‘**fourth witness statement**’).

9. In this statement, I shall address the following:

- i. compliance with the procedural requirements of the Order;
- ii. incidents of protest at Teledyne UK’s sites since the grant of the Order;
- iii. effectiveness of the injunctive relief granted;
- iv. continuing acts of direct-action protest affecting other organisations and Teledyne UK’s apprehension of further unlawful protest activity at its sites;
- v. an update on Palestine Action;
- vi. an update concerning the Named Defendants, contempt proceedings and criminal proceedings;
- vii. Conclusion.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE ORDER

10. The Order granted final injunctive relief for a period of five years against the remaining Named Defendants, namely those Named Defendants whose positions had not previously been resolved by settlement, and continued the injunctive relief against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown), also for a period of five years but subject to an annual review. Paragraph 3 of the Order provides for alternative service and notification of the Order and further documents in these proceedings. Paragraph 8 requires Teledyne UK to file and notify Persons Unknown of any evidence upon which it intends to rely at the review hearing by 4 July 2026; accordingly, this witness statement shall be served in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Order, and certificates of service will be produced in advance of the hearing.

11. Following the making of the Order, Teledyne UK took the steps required by paragraph 3 of the Order to serve the Order upon the persons to whom the Order applies.

12. In particular, as to paragraph 3(i) to 3(iv), which are to be treated conjunctively under the Order:

- i. on 25 July 2025 the Order was uploaded to the injunction website (<https://www.teledyne-injunction.co.uk/>) in accordance with paragraph 3(i) of the Order. I gave the instruction for the upload and viewed the website after the upload had been completed. The link to the injunction website also remains on Teledyne UK's main website, as required by paragraph 3(i). The injunction website continues to host copies of all orders and documents in these proceedings (save for documents that relate only to the contempt proceedings against D19 Mary Ensell and D20 Harry Wade, who were served either personally or via their legal representatives, as appropriate). During the course of preparing this statement I reviewed the injunction website and confirmed that it remains accessible and functioning. To the best of my knowledge, the injunction website has remained available throughout the period since the making of the Order subject to any temporary maintenance downtime or technical issues that may have occurred during this time;
- ii. Keystone Law (instructed by Teledyne UK) inform me that on 25 July 2025, the Order was sent to the email addresses specified in paragraph 3(ii) of the Order, together with details of the injunction website. I am informed that the email sent to the Palestine Action email address was returned as undeliverable, indicating that the email account was no longer active, which is consistent with the account having been closed following the proscription of Palestine Action;
- iii. Keystone Law also inform me that on 29 July 2025, copies of the Order were sent by first-class post to those Named Defendants whose addresses were known to Teledyne UK, in accordance with paragraph 3(iii) of the Order (this included D19 Mary Ensell and D20 Harry Wade, as paragraph 3(vi) of the Order did not apply to them, as their legal representatives were instructed in the contempt proceedings only); and

iv. the injunction signs required by paragraph 3(iv) of the Order remain in place at each of the six Teledyne UK sites protected by the injunction, namely the Shipley, Lincoln, Wirral, Chelmsford, Presteigne and Newbury Sites (having been erected following the earlier grants of injunctive relief). During the course of preparing this witness statement I have confirmed with colleagues responsible for those sites that the signs remain displayed at the sites, and have remained displayed at all times, in accordance with the Order.

13. The certificates of service exhibited at NJW5/1 – 8 record the steps taken to comply with the alternative service provisions contained in paragraph 3 of the Order.

14. Accordingly, the Order was served, including on the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown), in accordance with the alternative service provisions at paragraph 3 of the Order.

15. I am informed by Teledyne UK's legal advisers, Keystone Law, that the dedicated email address established by Keystone Law for communications relating to the injunction (as set out at paragraph 9 of the Order) remains active and continues to be monitored.

Notice of the review hearing

16. Paragraph 7 of the Order requires the review hearing to take place no later than 25 July 2026. Keystone Law, on behalf of Teledyne UK, sought the listing accordingly.

17. Notice of the hearing was then served in accordance with Paragraph 3 of the Order also, specifically (with certificates of service to be produced at the hearing):

- i. on 11 May 2026 the notice of hearing was uploaded to the injunction website, following my instruction, in accordance with paragraph 3(i) of the Order;
- ii. Keystone Law inform me that on 11 May 2026 the notice of hearing was sent to the email addresses specified in paragraph 3(ii) of the Order, together with details of the injunction website. I am informed that the email sent to the Palestine Action

email address was returned as undeliverable, indicating that the email account was no longer active, which is consistent with the account having been closed following the proscription of Palestine Action;

- iii. Keystone Law inform me that on 11 May 2026 the notice of hearing was sent by first-class post to those Named Defendants for whom an address is known (although this was not strictly necessary and was for their information only, as the review hearing does not relate to the Order as against the Named Defendants), per paragraph 3(iii) of the Order; and
- iv. as described above, the injunction signs required by paragraph 3(iv) above remain in situ.

INCIDENTS OF PROTEST AT TELEDYNE UK'S SITES SINCE THE GRANT OF THE ORDER

18. Since my fourth witness statement, there have continued to be incidents of protest at and proximate to Teledyne UK's sites. However, unlike the pattern of activity that led Teledyne UK to seek injunctive relief, those protests have been for the most part peaceful and lawful; protestors have occasionally tested the boundaries of the injunctive relief, but there have been no breaches (other than those of the predecessor order committed by D19 Mary Ensell and D20 Harry Wade on 28 January 2025) that would warrant contempt proceedings as a proportionate response. Accordingly, Teledyne UK makes no complaint about such activity. As I have emphasised throughout these proceedings, Teledyne UK does not seek to prevent or stifle peaceful protest and fully recognises the importance of the right of citizens to engage in lawful protest.

19. This eradication of acts of unlawful direct-action protest is in stark contrast with the position prior to the grant of injunctive relief, which was set out in detail in my earlier witness statements in these proceedings (and as is summarised in the Judgment). As with my previous witness statements, I exhibit at NJW5/9 – 14 a spreadsheet maintained by Teledyne UK which records incidents of protest at Teledyne UK's sites. That spreadsheet has been updated to 26 June 2026, and records the incidents known to Teledyne UK during the period since my fourth witness statement.

20. The updated spreadsheet demonstrates that persons continue to protest at Teledyne UK's sites. However, since my fourth witness statement, there have been no incidents of unlawful direct-action protest of the type that previously caused Teledyne UK concern and which formed the basis of these proceedings. In particular, there have been no site incursions, no occupations of buildings or roofs, no lock-ons, no significant obstruction of access to or from Teledyne UK's sites, and no incidents of criminal damage directed at those sites.
21. In my view, the continuation of peaceful protest activity alongside the absence of unlawful direct-action demonstrates that the injunctive relief granted by the Court has struck an appropriate balance. Individuals and groups remain able to express their views and to protest lawfully at and proximate to Teledyne UK's sites, whilst Teledyne UK is able to carry on its business without unlawful interference with its property, employees or operations. Indeed, the updated spreadsheet records that there continue to be, on average, approximately two peaceful protests each week at the Shipley Site by two separate protest groups. In my view, that further demonstrates that the injunction has not had a chilling effect upon lawful protest activity.
22. When appropriate and necessary to do so, staff at the relevant sites have served the injunction on those who are protesting – an example of this is recorded on the spreadsheet for 1 August 2025. Further, on 29 November 2025, the spreadsheet records that a protestor took a photograph of the injunction sign at the Presteigne Site, which clearly shows that the signs are being seen by those protesting, and that the alternative service measures are effective.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF GRANTED

23. In my fourth witness statement, I expressed the view that the injunctive relief had proved effective in reducing unlawful activity whilst preserving the ability of individuals and groups to protest peacefully. The events since that witness statement have reinforced that conclusion.
24. The reduction in unlawful activity should not, in my opinion, be taken as indicating that the underlying threat has disappeared. The updated protest spreadsheet demonstrates that

there remains a sustained level of protest activity directed at Teledyne UK's sites, particularly at the Shipley Site. Rather, I consider that the absence of unlawful direct-action protest is attributable to the existence and effectiveness of the injunction.

25. In particular, the evidence demonstrates that those who wish to protest continue to do so, but within mostly lawful boundaries. In my view, that shows that the balance struck by the Court has operated successfully in practice. The injunction has not prevented lawful protest, but it has protected Teledyne UK from the forms of unlawful conduct that gave rise to these proceedings.

26. I also consider that the alternative service arrangements approved by the Court have proved effective (as mentioned above). The continuation of regular protest activity, without any repetition of the unlawful conduct previously experienced by Teledyne UK, suggests that the terms and effect of the injunction are understood by those participating in such protests.

27. Overall, my view is that the injunction has proved effective and proportionate. It has enabled lawful protest to continue whilst allowing Teledyne UK to conduct its business without the unlawful interference that previously necessitated these proceedings.

28. It follows from the effectiveness of the injunctive relief that no further person has been identified who should be named as a defendant to these proceedings at this time.

CONTINUING ACTS OF DIRECT-ACTION PROTEST AND TELEDYNE UK'S APPREHENSION OF FURTHER UNLAWFUL PROTEST ACTIVITY

29. I am aware from industry colleagues and national news reporting that pro-Palestinian protests continue to affect organisations that have links (or perceived links) to Israel (and specifically the security and defence sector). In preparing this witness statement, I have reviewed publicly available material concerning acts of direct-action protest occurring after the Order. Given the sheer volume available, I have selected a proportionate amount to give the court an idea of the threat that continues to exist. In my view, that material demonstrates that the underlying risk of unlawful direct-action protest affecting organisations operating within, or associated with, the defence and security sectors has not disappeared. The continuous acts of protest at Teledyne UK's sites, and the continuation of unlawful direct-

action at other organisations' sites that are not protected by injunctive relief, cause Teledyne UK to apprehend that there is a real and imminent threat that unlawful direct-action would resume at its sites if the injunctive relief was discharged at this review hearing.

30. By way of example, the following all relate to pro-Palestine protest activity:

- i. On 15 July 2025, Sky News reported that three women had been arrested under the Terrorism Act after a van was driven into the fence of Leonardo UK's facility in Edinburgh. The article reports that Police Scotland's Counter Terrorism Unit was leading the investigation and that a group called "Shut Down Leonardo" had said that it was taking action to shut down Leonardo's weapons factory in Edinburgh. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/15 – 18 (<https://news.sky.com/story/three-women-arrested-under-terrorism-act-after-van-driven-into-edinburgh-factory-fence-owned-by-defence-company-13397143>). On 20 July 2025, Sky News reported that the same three women had been charged under the Terrorism Act following the incident at the Leonardo facility. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/19 – 21 (<https://news.sky.com/story/three-women-charged-under-terrorism-act-over-van-driven-into-fence-of-defence-factory-13399311>).
- ii. On 6 September 2025, The Guardian reported that Elbit Systems UK's facility at Aztec West, Bristol, appeared to have closed unexpectedly. The article reports that the site had been repeatedly targeted by Palestine Action and that the protests had included blockades using lock-ons, roof occupations, window-smashing and red paint. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/22 – 24 (<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/sep/06/israeli-arms-manufacturer-elbit-systems-closes-uk-facility-targeted-by-palestine-action>).
- iii. On 23 October 2025, Declassified UK published an article concerning injunctive relief obtained by Moog (a US arms manufacturer). The article reports that Moog had obtained an injunction against protestors in Britain following direct-action protest directed at its operations, and refers to allegations that activists crashed through factory gates and damaged the roof. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/25 – 31 (<https://www.declassifieduk.org/us-arms-firm-secures-ban-on-palestine-protests-in-britain/>). I note that Moog also operate an injunction website,

which can be found at <https://www.moog.co.uk/injunction.html>, and which also contains copies of the injunctions that have been granted in those proceedings (in September and October 2025).

- iv. On 7 November 2025, activists entered premises occupied by Keysight Technologies in Edinburgh. It was reported that windows, lighting and air conditioning units were damaged, red paint was sprayed both inside and outside the building, and the action formed part of a campaign targeting businesses alleged to be connected with the defence sector. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/32 – 33 (<https://www.thecanary.co.uk/news/2026/01/23/direct-action-targets-keysight-technologies-over-israeli-arms/>).
- v. On 13 November 2025, Wokingham Today reported that protesters had accessed the roof of Keysight Technologies in Wharfedale Road, Winnersh on 12 November 2025. The article reports that police estimated that approximately £5,000 of damage had been caused at the scene. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/ 34 – 36 (<https://wokingham.today/protestors-seen-on-roof-of-keysight-technologies-building-in-winnersh/>).
- vi. On 18 November 2025, Reuters reported that six pro-Palestinian activists were on trial accused of attacking a factory operated by Elbit Systems. The article reports that the defendants denied charges including aggravated burglary, violent disorder and criminal damage, and that the prosecution alleged that the factory had been attacked in order to cause as much damage as possible. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/37 – 38 (<https://www.reuters.com/world/uk/six-uk-pro-palestinian-activists-go-trial-over-attack-israels-elbit-factory-2025-11-18/>).
- vii. On 26 November 2025, Reuters published an article concerning the legal challenge to the proscription of Palestine Action. The article refers to the Government's case concerning Palestine Action and contains a photograph caption referring to protestors demonstrating on the roof of Guardtech Group in Brandon, Suffolk on 1 July 2025. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/39 – 40 (<https://www.reuters.com/business/aerospace-defense/uk-ban-pro-palestine-group-under-scrutiny-court-2025-11-26/>).

- viii. On 23 December 2025, The Guardian reported that Greta Thunberg had been arrested outside Aspen Insurance's offices in London during a protest concerning Palestine Action prisoners. The article also reports that, earlier, two other activists had defaced the building with red paint and glued themselves to it. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/41 – 43 (<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2025/dec/23/greta-thunberg-arrested-london-palestine-action-prisoners-placard>).

 - ix. On 8 April 2026, The Guardian reported that Allianz had issued civil proceedings against six individuals alleged to have participated in direct-action protests by Palestine Action at its UK offices. The article reports that Allianz sought damages of almost £300,000 in respect of protests at its UK offices in October 2024 and March 2025, and that the protests related to Allianz's alleged previous relationship with Elbit Systems UK. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/44 – 45 (<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2026/apr/08/allianz-insurance-company-sues-six-people-palestine-action-protests>).

 - x. On 24 April 2026, The Canary reported that members of People Against Genocide had occupied the roof of UAV Tactical Systems' factory in Leicester, a company said to be owned by Elbit Systems. The article reports that an activist abseiled into the factory through a hole made with power tools, and that damage was caused to the ceiling and air supply to a clean room. I exhibit a copy of the article at NJW5/46 – 47 (<https://www.thecanary.co/uk/news/2026/04/24/people-against-genocide-abseil-into-uav-tactical-systems-factory-in-leicester/>).
31. The above material demonstrates, in my view, that direct-action protest affecting organisations operating within, or associated with, the defence and security sectors has continued since the Order. The reported conduct includes alleged damage to defence premises, the use of vehicles to force entry or damage perimeter fencing, roof occupations, lock-ons, red paint attacks, criminal damage, and attempts to disrupt the operations of businesses said to be connected with defence supply chains.

32. I consider the Moog material to be particularly significant. Moog is another organisation operating within the defence sector which has considered it necessary to seek injunctive relief against Persons Unknown. In my view, that supports the conclusion that the risk faced by Teledyne UK is not historic, isolated or confined to events before the grant of the Order in these proceedings.
33. I also consider the material concerning Leonardo, Elbit Systems, Allianz, Aspen Insurance, Guardtech and Moog to be relevant because those incidents and proceedings concern either defence-sector organisations themselves, or organisations alleged to be associated with them. In my view, that is consistent with the pattern of targeting previously described in these proceedings.
34. The legal status of Palestine Action has also remained a live and developing issue during this period (as I shall explain further below). However, whether one focuses on Palestine Action itself, groups said to be associated with or inspired by it, or other similarly motivated persons, the material that I have reviewed suggests that the appetite for direct-action protest directed at defence-related organisations has not disappeared.
35. I also note that the wider political and military situation in the Middle East has, if anything, deteriorated since the grant of the Order in July 2025. It appears to me that the issues which have motivated direct-action protest against organisations operating within, or associated with, the defence and security sectors have not diminished. Viewed alongside the continuing incidents affecting comparable organisations described above, I consider that there is no basis for concluding that the risk of unlawful direct-action protest directed at Teledyne UK's sites has reduced since July 2025 and, if anything, the risk may have increased.
36. In my view, the continued occurrence of such incidents supports the conclusion that the reduction in unlawful activity at Teledyne UK's sites is not attributable to any disappearance of the underlying threat. Rather, I believe that the injunction has been effective in preventing the forms of unlawful direct-action protest that previously affected Teledyne UK, whilst allowing lawful protest to continue.

PALESTINE ACTION

37. Mr Manan Singh of Keystone Law made his seventh witness statement dated 21 July 2025 in advance of the final hearing on 25 July 2025. In that witness statement, Mr Singh updated the court as to significant recent events that had occurred, which included the UK Government's proscription of Palestine Action following an incident of direct-action protest that took place at RAF Brize Norton on 20 June 2025 (see in particular paragraphs 18 to 26 of that statement), and the subsequent judicial review proceedings and application for interim relief brought by way of challenge to the proscription by a co-founder of Palestine Action, Huda Ammori.
38. Since Mr Singh's seventh witness statement, further developments have occurred. On 13 February 2026 the Divisional Court found that the proscription was unlawful on two grounds of challenge: Convention rights (i.e. the proscription was disproportionate and did not strike the right balance) and that the decision to proscribe was against the Home Secretary's own policy (see *R(Ammori) v SSHD [2026] EWHC 292 (Admin)*). I note that Teledyne UK's injunction is referred to in the judgment, and that Ms Ammori's own submission was that seeking injunctive relief was a less intrusive measure than proscription.
39. The Government appealed, with the proscription remaining in place pending the outcome of that appeal. On 15 June 2026, the Court of Appeal (sitting with five judges) allowed the appeal and found that the decision to proscribe ought not to have been quashed (**[2026] EWCA Civ 721**). As such, Palestine Action remains a proscribed organisation under the Terrorism Act 2000 (as it was at the date of the final hearing in these proceedings on 25 July 2025).

UPDATE CONCERNING THE NAMED DEFENDANTS, CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

40. This witness statement is primarily concerned with the review of the Order against Persons Unknown. I nevertheless provide a brief update concerning the Named Defendants and the associated contempt and criminal proceedings.

41. The Court will be aware from the Order that final injunctive relief was granted against the remaining Named Defendants and that orders for costs were also made against them. I do not propose to repeat the procedural history of those proceedings, which is already before the Court.
42. As I explained in my previous witness statements, D19 Mary Ensell and D20 Harry Wade were arrested following the incident at the Shipley Site on 28 January 2025. I understand that the police ultimately took no further action in respect of any criminal prosecution arising from that incident.
43. However, Teledyne UK pursued contempt proceedings against Ms Ensell and Mx Wade arising out of the same events. Those proceedings have now concluded and sanctions on both Ms Ensell and Mx Wade were imposed by the Court through the contempt process.
44. In my fourth witness statement, I referred to the ongoing criminal investigation concerning D16 Lara Downes and D17 Gabrielle Middleton following the incident at the Wirral Site on 2 October 2024. I was subsequently informed that criminal charges were brought against Ms Downes and Ms Middleton. I understand from my colleagues at the Wirral Site that both of these defendants are due to stand trial for criminal damage and burglary later in 2026. I also explained in my fourth witness statement that D5 Ricky Southall, D6 Amareen Afzal and D7 Serena Fenton had all been found guilty of various offences relating to the incident that took place at the Shipley Site on 15 May 2024. I now understand from my colleagues at the Shipley Site that sentencing has taken place, all received suspended custodial sentences of varying lengths, significant unpaid work requirements, and various other ancillary sanctions. I further understand from my colleagues that D14 Autumn Taylor-Ward is due to stand trial for 2 weeks from 6 July 2026 for her role in the protest at the Wirral Site on 5 July 2024.
45. In his first witness statement dated 21 May 2025, Mr Scott Patterson explained what he observed at the Shipley Site on 2 April 2024 in relation to an incident in which D1 Julian Allen Gao, D2 Ruby Hamill, D3 Daniel Jones and D4 Najam Shah were involved. In that witness statement, Mr Patterson also explained that he gave evidence at the relevant trial of the criminal proceedings in September 2024, which produced a hung jury, with a re-trial set for February 2026. I now understand from Mr Patterson that these Defendants have

been found guilty of various offences and sentenced, with D1, D3 and D4 all receiving immediate custodial sentences of 20 months. D2 is yet to be sentenced, as she has absconded.

46. Save as set out above, I am not aware of any material developments concerning the Named Defendants which affect the issues to be determined at this review hearing.

47. In my view, the outcome of the contempt proceedings, together with the continuing criminal investigations and prosecutions arising from previous incidents at Teledyne UK's sites, reinforce the seriousness of the unlawful direct-action protest that gave rise to these proceedings. They do not, however, alter my view that there remains a real and continuing risk of similar conduct being directed at Teledyne UK's sites in the future by Persons Unknown.

48. For the reasons I have set out in this witness statement, I continue to consider that the injunction against Persons Unknown remains necessary and proportionate notwithstanding the disposal of the Claim against the Named Defendants.

CONCLUSION

49. In my view, there has been no material change of circumstances since the grant of the Order which would justify the discharge or variation of the injunction against Persons Unknown.

50. To the extent that circumstances have changed, I consider that those changes support the continuation of the injunction. In particular, whilst the legal position concerning Palestine Action has evolved, the material that I have reviewed demonstrates that organisations operating within, or associated with, the defence and security sectors continue to face the risk of unlawful direct-action protest. Comparable organisations continue to experience allegations of trespass, roof occupations, criminal damage and targeted disruption of their operations.

51. The injunction has proved to be effective. Since the grant of injunctive relief, Teledyne UK has not experienced the forms of unlawful direct-action protest that gave rise to these

proceedings. The evidence demonstrates that the injunction has operated as intended and has enabled Teledyne UK to conduct its business without unlawful interference.

52. At the same time, lawful protest has continued. As I have explained above, peaceful protests continue to take place at and proximate to Teledyne UK's sites, including regular demonstrations at the Shipley Site. Teledyne UK makes no complaint about such lawful activity and continues to recognise and respect the right of individuals and groups to engage in peaceful protest.

53. In my view, the evidence demonstrates that the injunction has struck the appropriate balance between protecting the rights of lawful protestors and protecting Teledyne UK's property, employees and business operations from unlawful interference.

54. Teledyne UK continues to apprehend that there is a real and continuing risk of unlawful direct-action protest being directed at Teledyne UK's sites in the absence of the protection afforded by the injunction. The reduction in unlawful activity at Teledyne UK's sites is not attributable to any disappearance of the underlying threat, but rather to the existence and effectiveness of the injunctive relief granted by the Court.

55. For those reasons, I respectfully consider that the injunction against Persons Unknown remains necessary and proportionate, and that it should continue in its present form.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts set out in this Witness Statement are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

DocuSigned by:

.....753F3005580B4D5.....
Nicholas James Wargent

Dated this 29 day of June 2026