

**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

**HEARING BUNDLE FOR
ANNUAL REVIEW HEARING ON 21 JULY 2026
(CONTINUATION APPLICATION BUNDLE)**

Tab.	Document	Date	Page
A	Injunction Order	Date	Pages
1	Sealed Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court)	25 July 2025	4 - 20
B	Continuation Application	Date	Pages
2	Sealed Application Notice	25 June 2026	21 - 28
3	Draft Order	25 June 2026	29 - 43
4	Fifth Witness Statement of Nicholas James Wargent	29 June 2026	44 - 60
5	Exhibit NJW5	29 June 2026	61 - 109

6	Judgment of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court)	01 August 2025	110 - 149
C	Certificates of Service of Richard Wright KC Injunction Order	Date	Pages
7	Named Defendants	05 August 2025	150 - 152
8	Persons Unknown	05 August 2025	153 - 155
9	Website	05 August 2025	156 - 157
D	Certificates of Service of Notice of Annual Review Hearing	Date	Pages
10	Named Defendants	14 May 2026	158 - 160
11	Persons Unknown	14 May 2026	161 - 163
12	Website	14 May 2026	164 - 165
E	Certificates of Service of Continuation Application (where separate to the above)	Date	Pages
13	Persons Unknown	30 June 2026	166 - 168
14	Website	30 June 2026	169 - 170
15	Signs and Notice of Hearing	30 June 2026	171 - 179

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE BELOW NAMED DEFENDANTS OR PERSONS UNKNOWN OR ANY OF YOU DISOBEY THIS ORDER OR INSTRUCT OR ENCOURAGE OTHERS TO BREACH THIS ORDER YOU MAY BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE YOUR ASSETS SEIZED.

ANY OTHER PERSON WHO KNOWS OF THIS ORDER AND DOES ANYTHING WHICH HELPS OR PERMITS THE DEFENDANTS BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.



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

Claim No. KB-2024-004175

KB-2024-004175

**Before Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court)
25 July 2025**

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 THIS ORDER AND ALSO 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 THIS ORDER AND ALSO AT SCHEDULE 1 TO THE CLAIM FORM

Defendants

INJUNCTION ORDER

UPON the Claimant’s claim brought by way of a Part 8 Claim Form dated 13 December 2024 (the ‘Claim’)

AND UPON the Claimant having been granted injunctive relief against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) and interim injunctive relief against the Named Defendants by way of orders dated 20 December 2024, 24 January 2025 and 21 March 2025

AND UPON the Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fifteenth and Eighteenth Defendants settling the proceedings by giving undertakings to the court

AND UPON the court reading the witness statements listed in Schedule 2 to this Order

AND UPON the court at this hearing (i) considering the final disposal of the Claim against the remaining Named Defendants and (ii) reviewing the Order as against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown)

AND UPON hearing Natalie Pratt of counsel and without any attendance by or on behalf of any Defendant

AND UPON the court being satisfied that each of the remaining Named Defendants and Persons Unknown have been given notice of this hearing

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

Definitions

1. For the purpose of this Order:

- i. The **‘Shipley Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, Airedale House, Acorn Park, Shipley BD17 7SW, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order;
- ii. The **‘Lincoln Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, 168 Sadler Road, Lincoln LN6 3RS, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 2 to this Order;
- iii. **‘Wirral Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, Unit A, 6 Tebay Road, Bromborough, Birkenhead, Wirral CH62 3PA, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 3 to this Order;
- iv. The **‘Chelmsford Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, 106 Waterhouse Lane, Chelmsford CM1 2QU, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 4 to this Order;
- v. The **‘Presteigne Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, Broadaxe Business Park, Presteigne LD8 2UH, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 5 to this Order;
- vi. The **‘Newbury Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, Reynolds Navigation House, Canal View Road, Newbury RG14 5UR, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 6 to this Order;
- vii. The road known as **‘Acorn Park’** means the road marked in purple on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order.

INJUNCTION

2. Until and including 25 July 2030, the **First to Seventh Defendants, Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown), Fourteenth Defendant, Sixteenth Defendant, Seventeenth Defendant, Nineteenth Defendant** and the **Twentieth Defendant** and each of them (whether by themselves or by instructing, encouraging, or allowing any other person) are forbidden from:

- i. Entering or remaining on the following sites and/or entering or remaining in or on buildings on the following sites:
 - a) the Shipley Site, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order (save for when exercising the right to pass and re-pass only along any public right of way);

- b) the Lincoln Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 2 to this Order;
 - c) the Wirral Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 3 to this Order;
 - d) the Chelmsford Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 4 to this Order;
 - e) the Presteigne Site, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 5 to this Order; and
 - f) the Newbury Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 6 to this Order.
- ii. Depositing any item or substance on the following sites, affixing themselves or any other item to any building, structure or fixture on the following sites, and/or defacing or damaging any building, structure or fixture on the following sites:
 - a) the Shipley Site, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order;
 - b) the Lincoln Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 2 to this Order;
 - c) the Wirral Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 3 to this Order;
 - d) the Chelmsford Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 4 to this Order;
 - e) the Presteigne Site, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 5 to this Order; and
 - f) the Newbury Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 6 to this Order.
- iii. Blocking, slowing down, obstructing or otherwise interfering with vehicular access to or from the highway at the Shipley Site (as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order);
- iv. Approaching, slowing down or obstructing any vehicle moving along or accessing the road known as Acorn Park, Shipley (as marked in purple on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order) for the purpose of:
 - a) disrupting vehicular access to or from the Shipley Site (as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order); and
 - b) protesting.
- v. Affixing themselves or any other item to, or leaving or depositing any item on, the road known as Acorn Park, Shipley (as marked in purple on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order) for the purpose of:
 - a) disrupting vehicular access to or from the Shipley Site (as marked in red in the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order); and

- b) protesting.
- vi. Affixing themselves or any other items to any vehicle on, entering or exiting the Shipley Site (as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order), where that affixation is done for the purpose of protesting.

Service and notification

3. Pursuant to CPR rules 6.15 and 6.27, the Claimant has permission to serve the First to Seventh Defendants, Fourteenth Defendant, Sixteenth Defendant, Seventeenth Defendant, Nineteenth Defendant and the Twentieth Defendant with, and notify the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) of, this Order and any further documents in the Claim by (with 3(i) – 3(iv) to be treated conjunctively):

- i. **Website:** placing a copy of the documents to be served on a website or webpage operated by the Claimant, a link to which shall be placed on the Claimant's main website; and
- ii. **Email:** sending a copy of the documents to be served to Palestine Action, Bradford Friends of Palestine and the Palestine Solidarity Campaign (including the relevant local branches) at the following email addresses

info@palestineaction.org ;	actions@palestineaction.org ;
media@palestinecampaign.org ;	branches@palestinecampaign.org ;
info@palestinecampaign.org ;	palestinesolidaritybradford@gmail.com ;
pscchelmsford@gmail.com ;	lincolnpalestine@gmail.com ;
liverpoolfopal@gmail.com ;	pscshrop@gmail.com ;
bfdfriendsofpalestine@yahoo.com ;	

and providing a link by which the webpage or website mentioned in paragraph 3(i) above can be accessed.

- iii. **Post:** where an address of a Named Defendant is known to the Claimant, by posting a copy of the documents to be served together with a covering letter by way of first-class post;
- iv. **Signs:** placing signs on the perimeter of the Shipley Site, Lincoln Site, Wirral Site, Chelmsford Site, Presteigne Site and Newbury Site, which advise that a High Court injunction is in force that restricts some protest activities, and which provide a weblink and QR code by which the website or webpage mentioned in paragraph 3(i) above can be accessed;
- v. **Where requested by a Defendant:** the documents to be served may be served by email where the Defendant has requested that they be served by email, by sending the email to the address provided by the Defendant; or
- vi. **Lawyers:** by serving any solicitor acting for a Defendant who has filed a notice of acting in these proceedings.

4. The deemed date of service of any documents referred to in paragraph 3 above shall be the day on which service of the document or documents is completed in accordance with paragraph 3 above.

Liberty to Apply

5. The Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) or any other person other than a Named Defendant and who is affected by this Order may apply to the court at any time to vary or discharge this Order or so much of it as affects that person, but they must first give the Claimant's solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of that application, that evidence must be served on the Claimant's solicitors 48 hours in advance of the hearing.
6. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name and address for service.

Review of the Order against Persons Unknown

7. The Order against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) shall be reviewed at a hearing no later than **25 July 2026** (or as near to that date as the court can reasonably accommodate), with a time estimate of ½ day, unless the Claimant indicates to the court that it does not seek an extension of the Order, upon which the Order will expire as against Persons Unknown only.
8. The Claimant must file and notify Persons Unknown of (in accordance with paragraph 3 above) any evidence upon which it intends to rely at the review hearing by 4pm on 4 July 2026. Any other person who would like to participate in the review hearing must also file and serve on the Claimant any evidence upon which they intend to rely at the review hearing by 4pm on 4 July 2026.

Communications with the Claimant and the Court

9. All communications with the Claimant about this Order should be sent by email to the Claimant's solicitors, Keystone Law, at info.teledyne@keystonelaw.co.uk.
10. All communications with the Court about this Order should be sent to KBJudgesListingOffice@justice.gov.uk or Room E03 Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London WC2A 2LL. The Telephone number is 020 3938957. The offices are open between 10am and 4pm Monday to Friday.

Costs

11. The First to Seventh Defendants, Fourteenth Defendant, Sixteenth Defendant, Seventeenth Defendant, Nineteenth Defendant and the Twentieth Defendant shall pay the Claimant's costs of the claim on the standard basis to be assessed if not agreed.
12. The First to Seventh Defendants, Fourteenth Defendant, Sixteenth Defendant, Seventeenth Defendant, Nineteenth Defendant and the Twentieth Defendant shall each make a payment of account of costs to the Claimant in the sum of £6,125 by 4pm on 8 August 2025.

13. No Order as to costs against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown).

Dated 25 July 2025

GUIDANCE NOTES

Effect of this Order – the Defendants

1. A Defendant who is an individual and who is ordered not to do something must not do it him or herself or in any other way nor must he/she do it through others acting on his/her behalf or on his/her instructions or with his/her encouragement.

Interpretation of this Order

2. In this Order, references to ‘the Defendant’ means any or all of them (unless expressly stated otherwise).
3. A requirement to serve on a ‘Defendant’ means on each of them. However, the Order is effective against any Defendant on whom it is served in accordance with this Order.
4. An Order requiring ‘the Defendant’ not to do anything applies to all Defendants.
5. This Order contains the following schedules and annexes
 - i. Schedule 1 – Named Defendants;
 - ii. Schedule 2 – witness statements;
 - iii. Annexe 1 – plans of the Shipley Site;
 - iv. Annexe 2 – plan of the Lincoln Site;
 - v. Annexe 3 – plan of the Wirral Site;
 - vi. Annexe 4 – plan of the Chelmsford Site;
 - vii. Annexe 5 – plans of the Presteigne Site;
 - viii. Annexe 6 – plan of the Newbury Site.

SCHEDULE 1 – NAMED DEFENDANTS

- (1) JULIAN ALLEN GAO
- (2) RUBY HAMILL
- (3) DANIEL JONES
- (4) NAJAM SHAH
- (5) RICKY SOUTHALL
- (6) AMAREEN AFZAL
- (7) SERENA FENTON
- (12) CHERYL LEANAGHAN
- (13) MAIS ROBINSON
- (14) AUTUMN TAYLOR-WARD
- (15) ANABELLA BARRINGER
- (16) LARA DOWNES
- (17) GABRIELLE MIDDLETON
- (18) LUKE CARTER
- (19) MARY ENSELL
- (20) HARRY WADE

SCHEDULE 2 – WITNESS STATEMENTS

The Court read the following witness statements on behalf of the Claimants:

- 1. The first witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 13 December 2024;
- 2. The first witness statement of Manan Singh dated 13 December 2024;
- 3. The second witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 19 December 2024;
- 4. The third witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 15 January 2025;
- 5. The third witness statement of Manan Singh dated 23 January 2025;
- 6. The fourth witness statement of Manan Singh dated 13 February 2025;
- 7. The fifth witness statement of Manan Singh dated 18 March 2025;
- 8. The first witness statement of Scott Douglas Patterson dated 21 May 2025;

9. The fourth witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 23 May 2025;
10. The sixth (labelled 'fifth') witness statement of Manan Singh dated 27 May 2025;
11. The seventh witness statement of Manan Singh dated 21 July 2025.

ANNEXE 1 – SHIPLEY SITE



Promap

LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445

Plotted Scale - 1:4000. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WYK387275

Acorn Park



Promap

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250, Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WYK387275

ANNEXE 2 – LINCOLN SITE



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024, OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: LL317736

ANNEXE 3 – WIRRAL SITE



Promap

LANDMAPPING SOLUTIONS

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: MS575234

ANNEXE 4 – CHELMSFORD SITE



Promap
LANDMAPS INTERNATIONAL

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:4000. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: EX688035

ANNEXE 5 – PRESTEIGNE SITE



Promap
Aerial imagery and mapping

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1000. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: CYM839162



Promap

LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:750. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WA552132

ANNEXE 6 – NEWBURY SITE



Promap

Landmark Information Systems

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:750. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: BK365055

N244

Application notice

For help in completing this form please read the notes for guidance form N244 Notes.


Find out how HM Courts and Tribunals Service uses personal information you give them

when you fill in a form:

[https://www.gov.uk/](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/hm-courts-and-tribunals-service/about/personal-information-charter)

[government/organisations/hm-courts-and-tribunals-service/about/personal-information-charter](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/hm-courts-and-tribunals-service/about/personal-information-charter)

Name of court HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE, KING'S BENCH DIVISION		Claim no. KB-2024-004175	
Fee account no. (if applicable) PBA0087115		Help with Fees - Ref. no. (if applicable) H W F - - - - -	
Warrant no. (if applicable)			
Claimant's name (including ref.) TELEDYNE UK LIMITED (TEL14/40)			
Defendant's name (including ref.) See Schedule 1			
Date		25 Jun 2026	



KB-2024-004175

Sub Event ID: 154

1. What is your name or, if you are a legal representative, the name of your firm?

Keystone Law

2. Are you a ☐ Claimant ☐ Defendant ☒ Legal Representative

☐ Other (please specify)

If you are a legal representative whom do you represent?

Claimant

3. What order are you asking the court to make and why?

The Claimant applies pursuant to paragraph 8 of the Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) dated 25 July 2025 for the injunction against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) to be continued in its present form for a further period of 12 months (until the next annual review). The application is supported by the Fifth Witness Statement of Nicholas James Wargent which will follow. A half-day review hearing has already been listed for 21 July 2026.

4. Have you attached a draft of the order you are applying for?

☒ Yes

☐ No

5. How do you want to have this application dealt with?

☒ at a hearing

☐ without a hearing

☐ at a remote hearing

6. How long do you think the hearing will last? Is this time estimate agreed by all parties?

Hours

Minutes

☐ Yes

☒ No

7. Give details of any fixed trial date or period

Half day hearing listed for 21 July 2026

8. What level of Judge does your hearing need?

Judge

9. Who should be served with this application?

Defendants

9a. Please give the service address, (other than details of the claimant or defendant) of any party named in question 9.

10. What information will you be relying on, in support of your application?

- ☐ the attached witness statement
- ☐ the statement of case
- ☒ the evidence set out in the box below

If necessary, please continue on a separate sheet.

The Fifth Witness Statement of Nicholas James Wargent is to follow.

11. Do you believe you, or a witness who will give evidence on your behalf, are vulnerable in any way which the court needs to consider?

☐ Yes. Please explain in what way you or the witness are vulnerable and what steps, support or adjustments you wish the court and the judge to consider.

☒ No

Statement of Truth

I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against a person 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.

☐ I **believe** that the facts stated in section 10 (and any continuation sheets) are true.

☒ **The applicant believes** that the facts stated in section 10 (and any continuation sheets) are true. **I am authorised** by the applicant to sign this statement.

Signature

M Singh

☐ Applicant

☐ Litigation friend (where applicant is a child or a Protected Party)

☒ Applicant's legal representative (as defined by CPR 2.3(1))

Date

Day

25

Month

06

Year

2026

Full name

MANAN SINGH

Name of applicant's legal representative's firm

KEYSTONE LAW

If signing on behalf of firm or company give position or office held

PARTNER

Applicant's address to which documents should be sent.

Building and street

48

Second line of address

CHANCERY LANE

Town or city

HOLBORN

County (optional)

Postcode

W	C	2	A	1	J	F
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

If applicable

Phone number

020 3319 3700

Fax phone number

DX number

193 Chancery Lane

Your Ref.

TEL14/40

Email

Manan.Singh@keystonelaw.co.uk
info.teledyne@keystonelaw.co.uk

SCHEDULE 1 – DEFENDANTS

1. JULIAN ALLEN GAO of 11 Ellesmere Place, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 5AE
2. RUBY HAMILL of 14A Emu Road, Wandsworth, London SW8 3PR
3. DANIEL JONES of 2 Rossett Road, Crosby, Sefton L23 3AW
4. NAJAM SHAH of 24 Cliffe Gardens, Shipley, Bradford BD18 3DB
5. RICKY SOUTHALL of 3 Clarendon Street, Wakefield, West Yorkshire WF1 3RQ
6. AMAREEN AFZAL of 11 North Hill Road, Flat F, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 2EN
7. SERENA FENTON of 19 Foxcroft Green, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 3NR
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. CHERYL LEANAGHAN of 33 Faulkner Square, Flat 2, Liverpool, Merseyside L8 7NZ
13. MAIS ROBINSON of The Trees, 83-89 Amhurst Park, Flat 24, Hackney, London N16 5DP
14. AUTUMN TAYLOR-WARD of 88 Allington Street, Liverpool, Merseyside L17 7AF
15. ANABELLA BARRINGER of 8 Furance Hill, Flat 4, Sheffield S3 7AF
16. LARA DOWNES of 49 Gipsy Hill, Flat 3, London SE19 1QH
17. GABRIELLE MIDDLETON of 21 Athelstan Road, Margate, Kent CT9 2BD
18. LUKE CARTER of 34 Broad Road, Lower Willingdon, East Sussex BN20 9QU
19. MARY ENSELL of 24 Aylton Road, Huyton, Merseyside L36 2LU
20. HARRY WADE of Beaumont, 178 Leverington Road, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire PE13 1RU

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE BELOW NAMED DEFENDANTS OR PERSONS UNKNOWN OR ANY OF YOU DISOBEY THIS ORDER OR INSTRUCT OR ENCOURAGE OTHERS TO BREACH THIS ORDER YOU MAY BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE YOUR ASSETS SEIZED.

ANY OTHER PERSON WHO KNOWS OF THIS ORDER AND DOES ANYTHING WHICH HELPS OR PERMITS THE DEFENDANTS BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

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

Claim No. KB-2024-004175

**Before [Judge]
21 July 2026**

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 THIS ORDER AND ALSO 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 THIS ORDER AND ALSO AT SCHEDULE 1 TO THE CLAIM FORM

Defendants

INJUNCTION ORDER

UPON the annual review of the injunction order granted against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) on 25 July 2025, as listed in accordance with paragraph 7 of that Order

AND UPON the Claimant’s Application dated 25 June 2026 seeking the continuation of the injunction against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown)

AND UPON the court considering the fifth witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 29 June 2026

AND UPON hearing Natalie Pratt of counsel for the Claimant and there being no attendance or representation for or on behalf of Persons Unknown

AND UPON the court being satisfied that notice of this hearing, the Claimant’s Application for the continuation of the injunction and the evidence in support of that Application has been notified to Persons Unknown in accordance with paragraphs 8 and 3 of the order dated 25 July 2025

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

Injunction Order of 25 July 2025

1. The injunction order granted against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) on 25 July 2025 shall continue until (and including) 25 July 2030, subject to paragraph 7 below.

Service and notification

2. Pursuant to CPR rules 6.15 and 6.27, and for the purposes of CPR rule 81.4, the Claimant shall notify the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) of this Order and any further documents in the Claim by taking all of the following steps (to be treated conjunctively):

- i. **Website:** placing a copy of the documents to be served on a website or webpage operated by the Claimant, a link to which shall be placed on the Claimant's main website; and
- ii. **Email:** sending a copy of the documents to be served to Palestine Action, Bradford Friends of Palestine and the Palestine Solidarity Campaign (including the relevant local branches) at the following email addresses

info@palestineaction.org;

media@palestinecampaign.org;

info@palestinecampaign.org;

pscchelmsford@gmail.com;

liverpoolfopal@gmail.com;

bfdfriendsofpalestine@yahoo.com;

actions@palestineaction.org;

branches@palestinecampaign.org;

palestinesolidaritybradford@gmail.com;

lincolnpalestine@gmail.com;

pscshrop@gmail.com;

and providing a link by which the webpage or website mentioned in paragraph 3(i) above can be accessed.

- iii. **Signs:** placing signs on the perimeter of the Shipley Site, Lincoln Site, Wirral Site, Chelmsford Site, Presteigne Site and Newbury Site, which advise that a High Court injunction is in force that restricts some protest activities, and which provide a weblink and QR code by which the website or webpage mentioned in paragraph 3(i) above can be accessed.
3. The deemed date of service of any documents referred to in paragraph 2 above shall be the day on which service of the document or documents is completed in accordance with paragraph 2 above.
 4. For the avoidance of doubt, service shall be effected in accordance with paragraph 2(iii) above on the date on which the signs are first erected, irrespective of whether they are later removed by a third-party.

Liberty to Apply

5. The Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) or any other person other than a Named Defendant and who is affected by this Order may apply to the court at any time to vary or discharge this Order or so much of it as affects that person, but they must first give the Claimant's solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of that application, that evidence must be served on the Claimant's solicitors 48 hours in advance of the hearing.
6. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name and address for service.

Review of the Order against Persons Unknown

7. The Order against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) shall be reviewed at a hearing no later than **26 July 2027** (or as near to that date as the court can reasonably accommodate), with a time estimate of ½ day, unless the Claimant indicates to the court that it does not seek an extension of the Order, upon which the Order will expire as against Persons Unknown only.
8. The Claimant must file and notify Persons Unknown of (in accordance with paragraph 2 above) any evidence upon which it intends to rely at the review hearing by 4pm on 5 July 2027. Any other person who would like to participate in the review hearing must also file and serve on the Claimant any evidence upon which they intend to rely at the review hearing by 4pm on 5 July 2027.

Communications with the Claimant and the Court

9. All communications with the Claimant about this Order should be sent by email to the Claimant's solicitors, Keystone Law, at info.teledyne@keystonelaw.co.uk.
10. All communications with the Court about this Order should be sent to KBJudgesListingOffice@justice.gov.uk or Room E03 Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London WC2A 2LL. The Telephone number is 0203 936 8957. The offices are open between 10am and 4pm Monday to Friday.

Costs

11. No Order as to costs.

Dated 21 July 2026

GUIDANCE NOTES

Effect of this Order – the Defendants

1. A Defendant who is an individual and who is ordered not to do something must not do it him or herself or in any other way nor must he/she do it through others acting on his/her behalf or on his/her instructions or with his/her encouragement.

Interpretation of this Order

2. In this Order, references to ‘the Defendant’ means any or all of them (unless expressly stated otherwise).
3. A requirement to serve on a ‘Defendant’ means on each of them. However, the Order is effective against any Defendant on whom it is served in accordance with this Order.
4. An Order requiring ‘the Defendant’ not to do anything applies to all Defendants.
5. This Order contains the following schedules and annexes
 - i. Schedule 1 – Named Defendants;
 - ii. Schedule 2 – witness statements;
 - iii. Annexe 1 – plans of the Shipley Site;
 - iv. Annexe 2 – plan of the Lincoln Site;
 - v. Annexe 3 – plan of the Wirral Site;
 - vi. Annexe 4 – plan of the Chelmsford Site;
 - vii. Annexe 5 – plans of the Presteigne Site;
 - viii. Annexe 6 – plan of the Newbury Site.

SCHEDULE 1 – NAMED DEFENDANTS

- (1) JULIAN ALLEN GAO
- (2) RUBY HAMILL
- (3) DANIEL JONES
- (4) NAJAM SHAH
- (5) RICKY SOUTHALL
- (6) AMAREEN AFZAL
- (7) SERENA FENTON
- (12) CHERYL LEANAGHAN
- (13) MAIS ROBINSON
- (14) AUTUMN TAYLOR-WARD
- (15) ANABELLA BARRINGER
- (16) LARA DOWNES
- (17) GABRIELLE MIDDLETON
- (18) LUKE CARTER
- (19) MARY ENSELL
- (20) HARRY WADE

SCHEDULE 2 – WITNESS STATEMENTS

The Court read the following witness statements on behalf of the Claimants:

1. The first witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 13 December 2024;
2. The first witness statement of Manan Singh dated 13 December 2024;
3. The second witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 19 December 2024;
4. The third witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 15 January 2025;
5. The third witness statement of Manan Singh dated 23 January 2025;
6. The fourth witness statement of Manan Singh dated 13 February 2025;
7. The fifth witness statement of Manan Singh dated 18 March 2025;
8. The first witness statement of Scott Douglas Patterson dated 21 May 2025;
9. The fourth witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 23 May 2025;
10. The sixth (labelled 'fifth') witness statement of Manan Singh dated 27 May 2025;
11. The seventh witness statement of Manan Singh dated 21 July 2025;
12. The fifth witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 29 June 2026.

ANNEXE 1 – SHIPLEY SITE



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:4000. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WYK387275



Promap

LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250, Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WYK387275

ANNEXE 2 – LINCOLN SITE



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024, OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250. Paper Size – A4

Title Number: LL317736

ANNEXE 3 – WIRRAL SITE



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: MS575234

ANNEXE 4 – CHELMSFORD SITE



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:4000. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: EX688035

ANNEXE 5 – PRESTEIGNE SITE



Promap © Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
LANDMARK INFORMATION Plotted Scale - 1:1000; Paper Size - A4

Title Number: CYM839162



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:750. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WA552132

ANNEXE 6 – NEWBURY SITE



Promap
LANDMAP INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024, OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:750. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: BK365055

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:

753F3D05580B4D5.....
 Nicholas James Wargent

Dated this 29 day of June 2026

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

EXHIBIT NJW5

This is Exhibit NJW5 referred to in the Fifth Witness Statement of Nicholas James Wargent.

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
29/07/2025

The date of service is 29/07/2025

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Sealed Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) dated 25 July 2025

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

See Schedule 1 Attached

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☒ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with (.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) (please specify)

☐ by other means permitted by the court (please specify)

In accordance with para 3 of the Order of Richard Wright KC dated 25/07/2025.

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) (you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)

☐ by other electronic means (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) (please specify)

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

See Schedule 1 Attached

Being the ☐ claimant's ☒ defendant's

☐ solicitor's ☐ litigation friend

☒ usual residence

☒ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☐ other (please specify)

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name Manan Singh

Signed M Singh

(Claimant) (Defendant) ('s solicitor) ('s litigation friend)

Position or office held Partner

(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Date 05/08/2025

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Schedule 1

- D1** JULIAN ALLEN GAO of 11 Ellesmere Place, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 5AE
- D2** RUBY HAMILL of 14A Emu Road, Wandsworth, London SW8 3PR
- D3** DANIEL JONES of 2 Rossett Road, Crosby, Sefton L23 3AW
- D4** NAJAM SHAH of 24 Cliffe Gardens, Shipley, Bradford BD18 3DB
- D5** RICKY SOUTHALL of 3 Clarendon Street, Wakefield, West Yorkshire WF1 3RQ
- D6** AMAREEN AFZAL of 11 North Hill Road, Flat F, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 2EN
- D7** SERENA FENTON of 19 Foxcroft Green, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 3NR
- D14** AUTUMN TAYLOR-WARD of 88 Allington Street, Liverpool, Merseyside L17 7AF
- D16** LARA DOWNES of 49 Gipsy Hill, Flat 3, London SE19 1QH
- D17** GABRIELLE MIDDLETON of 21 Athelstan Road, Margate, Kent CT9 2BD
- D19** MARY ENSELL of 24 Aylton Road, Huyton, Merseyside L36 2LU
- D20** HARRY WADE of Beaumont 178 Leverington Road, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire PE13 1RU

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
2 5 / 0 7 / 2 0 2 5

The date of service is 2 5 / 0 7 / 2 0 2 5

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Sealed Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) dated 25 July 2025

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendant 8 - Defendant 11

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with (.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) (please specify)

☒ by other means permitted by the court (please specify)

On Claimant injunction website in accordance with para 3 of the Order of Richard Wright KC dated 25/07/2025.

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) (you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)

☐ by other electronic means (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) (please specify)

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

https://www.teledyne-injunction.co.uk/

Being the

☐ claimant's

☐ defendant's

☐ solicitor's

☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☐ other (please specify)

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name

Manan Singh

Signed

M Singh

(Claimant) (~~Defendant~~) (~~'s solicitor~~) (~~'s litigation friend~~)

Position or office held

Partner

(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Date

0 5 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 5

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
2 5 / 0 7 / 2 0 2 5

The date of service is 2 5 / 0 7 / 2 0 2 5

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Sealed Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) dated 25 July 2025

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendant 8 - Defendant 11

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with (.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) (please specify)

☒ by other means permitted by the court (please specify)

Email times at Schedule 1 in accordance with para 3 of the Order of Richard Wright KC dated 25/07/2025.

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) (you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)

☒ by other electronic means (Sch 1.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) (please specify)

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

See Schedule 1 Attached

Being the ☐ claimant's ☒ defendant's

☐ solicitor's ☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☒ other (please specify)

Known Emails for Service

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name
Manan Singh

Signed

(Claimant) (~~Defendant~~) (~~'s solicitor~~) (~~'s litigation friend~~)

Date
0 5 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 5

Position or office held
Partner
(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Schedule 1

1. media@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:17:26
2. info@palestineaction.org - Email sent at:17:28
3. info@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:17:28
4. pscchelmsford@gmail.com - Email sent at: 17:28
5. pscshrop@gmail.com - Email sent at:17:28
6. lincolnpalestine@gmail.com - Email sent at:17:30
7. liverpoolfopal@gmail.com - Email sent at:17:28
8. palestinesolidaritybradford@gmail.com - Email sent at:17:28
9. branches@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:17:29
10. actions@palestineaction.org - Email sent at:17:29
11. bdfdfriendsofpalestine@yahoo.com - Email sent at:17:29

Teledyne UK - attacks and demonstrations 2022 - 2024								
Date	Location	Duration	Group	Approx numbers	Police attendance	Tactics seen	Remarks	Subsequent Action
09-Dec-22	Labtech Prestigne	5-6 hours	Palestine Action	4	Yes. Large police response, somewhat slow.	Accessed reception. Sledgehammers used to break glass and destroy IT equipment. Ladders used to scale roof. Damage to roof and production area.	Police at heights team and Fire Service removed and arrested protesters from roof.	4 protesters held in prison on remand pending trial. Trial held 9-12 May 2023. Susan Bagshaw, Morwenna Grey, Tristan Dixon changed plea to guilty. Sentenced to 23 months imprisonment. Ruth Hogg found guilty. Sentenced to 27 months imprisonment.
28-Sep-23	TeZv Chelmsford	Minutes	Palestine Action	1	No.	Red paint splashed across front wall.	Photographer present.	Police did not respond - led to subsequent calls with the Essex Chief of Police. Photo of TDY employee on national press website: taken down on request.
23-Nov-23	TDS Shipley	1-2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	10	Yes immediate 4 Officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
07-Dec-23	TDS Shipley	1-2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	30	Yes immediate +6 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
19-Dec-23	TDS Shipley	1-2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	120	Yes immediate approx 10 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
26-Dec-23	TDS Shipley	Minutes	Unknown	2	Yes immediate approx 10 officers		Arson attack. No injuries. Minor damage to goods inward area.	Suspect arrested September 2024. Thought to be a local, not part of a group. The CPS decided not to charge: evidence not strong enough.
04-Jan-24	TDS Shipley	1-2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	120	Yes immediate approx 10 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
18-Jan-24	TDS Shipley	1-2 hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	45	Yes immediate approx 10 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
25-Jan-24	TDS Shipley	1-2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	40	Yes immediate approx 10 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
08-Feb-24	TDS Shipley	1-2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	15	Yes immediate approx 10 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
14-Feb-24	TDS Shipley	1-2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	60	Yes immediate approx 10 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
16-Feb-24	CML Bromborough	1-2 hrs	Palestine Action Liverpool	10	Yes approx 30 mins after start of protest - 1 vehicle 2 Officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access trying to hand out leaflets	Not believed to be linked to Palestine Action Group. peaceful banners and posters and handing out leaflets	
29-Feb-24	TDS Shipley	1-2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	20	Yes immediate approx 10 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee access. Photographs of site and hostile reconnaissance	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) but verbally aggressive/handling out leaflets	
06-Mar-24	CML Bromborough	1-2hrs	Palestine Action Liverpool	20	Yes immediate 1 vehicle 6 Officers	Blocking entrances trying to hand out leaflets. Possible that as all police/security resource arrives they disperse, thus costing Police and site extra cost. This tactic has been seen at Elbit where once the Police and security resource has left, the protesters return.	Peaceful, blocking entrance gates, displaying banners handing out leaflets	
06-Mar-24	Labtech Prestigne	1-2 hrs	Radnor Palestine Links	25	No. Police state minimum of 50mins to arrive if called 999	Blocking vehicle gate and handing in a letter	Peaceful. Handing over a letter demanding to speak to management. Subsequent piece in press. Two individuals with known links to PAG and previous protests/damage etc	
15-Mar-24	CML Bromborough	1-2hrs	Palestine Action Liverpool	20	Yes immediate approx 8 officers	Blocking entrances handing out leaflets	Peaceful, blocking entrance gates, displaying banners handing out leaflets	

18-Mar-24	CML Bromborough	1.5 hrs	Palestine Action Liverpool	20	40 minute response. 1 police officer	Blocking entrances but allowing employee entry	As previous. Banners leaflets standing at entrance points	
20-Mar-24	TDS Shipley		Bradford Friends of Palestine	60	5 Police, 2 vehicles in attendance prior to protest	Stood in front of vehicle gates but allowed access	Peaceful displaying banners (pro Palestine/Anti Teledyne) 1 protester taking a lot of footage of the site buildings and perimeter. Assessed to be hostile recon. Speaker units and microphone in use (unknown what was said) 2 protesters praying at gate during protests (not seen before). Unite union flags in attendance.	
23-Mar-24	CML Bromborough	45mins	Palestine Action Liverpool	60	1 police vehicle 2 officers	Blocking entrances but allowing employee entry	As previous. Banners leaflets standing at entrance points. No employees required access/exit	
27-Mar-24	Labtech Prestigne	2hrs	Radnor Palestine Links	18	no police	Stood in front of vehicle gates, handed letter to site	Banners, leaflets etc	
02-Apr-24	TDS Shipley	approx 18hrs	Palestine Action Liverpool	4 on roof + 20 outside	All emergency services in numbers	On roof, smashing roof tiles, brickwork, windows etc	Eventually arrested and removed. Significant damage to building. Costs estimated at c£700k	Daniel Jones & Najam/Sayed Shah released from custody after 1 week. Ruby Hamill released from custody 2 May. Julian (aka Laila) Gao remained in custody until June. Trial 5-13 Sept 2024. Hung jury. Retrial set for 9 February 2026.
04-Apr-24	Labtech Prestigne	10 mins	Local councillor and ex mayor	1	No police	Handed letter to site	Nothing further	
09-Apr-24	TDS Shipley	2hrs	Bradford friends of Palestine	20-25	6 Officers	Blocking entrances but allowing ingress egress	Banners, leaflets and speakers	
10-Apr-24	CML Bromborough	1hr	Palestine Action Liverpool	approx 8	No police	Stood in front of entrances but allowed access	Banners, leaflets, chanting	
17-Apr-24	CML Bromborough	1hr	Palestine Action Liverpool	10	No Police	Stood in front of gates allowing access	Banners, leaflets, chanting	
21-Apr-24	E2V Tech Lincoln	30mins	Unknown	3	No police	Damage caused to perimeter fence/gate	No entry onto site, damage repaired following day	
23-Apr-24	E2V Tech Lincoln	10mins	Unknown	1	No Police	1 individual seen early hours inspecting repaired fence and gate	Police informed, images captured	
24-Apr-24	TDS Shipley	2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	30	8 officers	Slow march on approach road, standing in front of gates	Banners, chanting, hands covered in red paint	
11-May-24	Cumbernauld	15mins	Unknown	4	No response requested	4 individuals smashing windows and spraying paint. Did not enter building	Red paint, sledgehammers. Not assessed to be PA	
12-May-24	Cumbernauld	20 mins	Unknown	1	Reported to Police	1 person taking photos of damaged windows	Reported to Police, they are investigating. Teledyne security investigation finds that the individual was an employee but had failed to notify the Control room of their visit out of hours. Employee educated and Police informed	
13-May-24	Cumbernauld	5-10 mins	Unknown	2	Reported to Police and response initiated	2 individuals walking along two aspects of the building	Police responded. No feedback from them due to investigation.	
15-May-24	TDS Shipley	7 hrs	Palestine Action group	4 (3 female, 1 Male)	Large Emergency Services response	4 individuals gained access to reception roof and smashed roof and windows. Access to site was via a ladder against the fence. CCTV alarms activated and response called.	Police at Heights team and Fire Service removed and arrested protesters from roof. Supporting demonstrators were held by Police at entrance to the industrial estate to prevent support to roof top protesters	Ricky Southall, Amareen Afzal, Serena Fenton released on police bail Francesca Nadin in custody (has also attacked Barclays bank)
07-Jun-24	CML Bromborough	10mins	Unknown	1 male	Nil	1 individual cut through fence and walked through site	Police informed, images captured	
21-Jun-24	CML Bromborough	1.5hrs	Palestine Action Liverpool	15	Large police presence	Stood in front of gates allowing access	Banners, leaflets, chanting	
21-Jun-24	CML Bromborough	10 mins	Unknown	1 male	Nil	Appears to have cut through fence and walked off site	Police informed, images captured	
06-Jul-24	CML Bromborough	4 hrs	Palestine Action Liverpool	3 females	Large Police presence	3 individuals attempted to scale ladder to roof. After failing this, they rammed the vehicle gates with a van and proceeded to spray paint over the building whilst klive streaming	Police arrested 3 protestors. All 3 released on bail. We await court dates	
07-Aug-14	TDS Shipley	2 hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	Approx 20	Large Police presence	standing in front of gates, chanting and singing	Banners, speakers etc	
18-Sep-24	TDS Shipley	2 hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	Approx 30	Large Police presence	Standing in front of gates, chanting and singing	Banners, speakers etc. One individual carried a mask of Scott Patterson	Mask-wearer arrested, charged with a public order offence and bailed. Plea hearing 18 October 2024.

23-Sep-24	TDS Shipley	various over a 15hr period	female 1 known to be Bradford friends of palestine attendee/female 2 and male unknown	2 female/1 male	reported to Police	0157hrs - female 1 carrying out hostile recon in the area including taking photographs. 1442hrs - The male was seen walking around the site appearing to be filming on his phone before leaving the area. Not reported to Police. 1658hrs - female 2 arrives in vehicle and drives around in the area including around the builders yard next to site appearing to film site. On arrest she was in possession of 4 burner phones. She was eventually bailed.	police believe female 2 may have passed phone onto PA prior to arrest. Male was possibly a you tube auditor female 1 incident reported to police Crime ref No. 13240522712/WYP-20240924-0741	28 Dec - update from Police on female 2 - Police and CPS deciding what to do
02-Oct-24	CML Bromborough	5hrs	Palestine Action Liverpool	2 males 2 females (1 male, driving the van, left immediately on electric scooter).	Large Police response	Climbed onto roof via ladder sealed in van, smashed roof and damaged production floor and clean room	Police arrested 3 individuals. We await court dates.	3 protestors released on police bail.
30-Oct-24	TDS Shipley		Bradford friends of Palestine	approx 35	immediate Police response	standing in front of gates, chanting and singing	originally planned for 12pm arrived at 0630hrs. banners, speakers etc	
20-Nov-24	TDS Shipley	2hrs	Bradford friends of Palestine	approx 12	police on scene	Standing in front of gates, chanting, singing and dancing	Police on scene preventing photography	
28-Nov-24	TDS Shipley	3 hrs	Bradford friends of Palestine	approx 20	Police on scene prior	initially in front of gates, Police eventually moved them across the road to allow employee access	Police on scene throughout, prevented photography	
08-Dec-24	e2v Chelmsford	N/A	Chelmsford Palestine Solidarity Campaign	N/K	Nil	Social media posted for a protest outside 1130-1330hrs 8 Dec 24. A further post was made postponing the event until 22 Dec 24	no protest took place, due to adverse weather	
16-Dec-24	TDS Shipley	3hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	approx 17	Large Police presence	Not directly impacting site to start. At top of road on public highway. However at around 1450hrs, 1 protester pulled their car in front of gates and attempted to lock on. Police reacted quickly and unlocked and arrested the protester.	Police arrested 1 x protester, offence not known at this time but was found in possession of 2 x zombie knives and a sledgehammer	
28-Jan-25	TDS Shipley	8hrs	Palestine Action	2 possibly 4 individuals	large Police Presence including protest removal team	At 0457hrs this morning a white transit van attempted to ram the vehicle gates at Shipley. the vehicle got stuck on the vehicle bollards and failed to breach the perimeter. It is believed that the driver left after being picked up by another vehicle. The van is currently stuck on the bollards with two individuals locked on. No One hurt. Police on scene waiting for protest removal team. another protest at the top of the road which Police have cordoned and are escorting staff onto site.	2 protesters locked on from the outside with arms locked through hole in the van into concrete. A liquid (possibly cooking oil) was leaking from the van. Police Protest removal teams eventually unlocked them.	Police arrested the 2 at 1233hrs. Vehicle forensics and removal ongoing.
05-Feb-25	TDS Shipley	1hr	Bradford friends of Palestine	approx 20	approx 10 officers	12pm, roadside protest at top of industrial park, followed by a 10 minute chant opposite side of road to vehicle gates before moving back to top of the park	Flags, banners and chanting	no arrests
17-Feb-25	TDS Shipley	U/K	U/K	U/K	police called after the event	time unknown. Person(s) threw red paint against rear wall of building, believed to be from outside site.	no damage apart from paint stains	no arrests
19-Feb-25	TDS Shipley	2hrs	Bradford friends of Palestine	approx 12				
12-Mar-25	TDS Shipley	1hr	Bradford friends of palestine		police on scene, prior, during and after protest	approx 0800, protesters at top of estate and then on road opposite main gates before dispersing.	no damage just chanting and placard holding	no arrests
03-Apr-25	TDS Shipley	2hrs	Bradford Friends of Palestine	approx 12	Police on scene prior, during and after the demonstration	1200 - roadside demonstration at top of the estate, approx 1310, demonstrators arrived at gates and held on opposite side of road. Demonstrators returned to top of park at approx 1325hrs	no damage, chanting and singing	no arrests of protesters. However one van driver was arrested for hitting a protester with his van (nudging into him) and then assaulting the demonstrator. This was away from site and the driver was not part of Teledyne.

12-Apr-25	TDS Shipley	2hrs (at site) around 5 hrs in total inc March from town centre	Bradford Friends of Palestine with it is believed Leeds PSC/Bradford PSC/Dewsbury PSC/Youtube auditors	approx 300	Police on scene throughout and post event	protest arrived at site approx 1445. there were a number of speeches, chanting and banner waving but remained peaceful throughout	no damage	No arrests although Police were pressed to take action against two youtube auditors taking photography of site under NSA. We were told that the photography was not prejudicial to NS although it was pointed out that PA use auditor footage for hostile recon
18-Apr-25	TDS Shipley	1hr 20 mins	Pray for peace	approx 11	Police on scene throughout	arrived at 1440hrs and stood adjacent to the vehicle gate. Incident passed peacefully and they left site at 1558hrs	no damage	peaceful and no Police intervention required.
17-Jun-25	e2v Chelmsford	2hrs	various groups	approx 12	Police on scene	arrived from 0645hrs, stretched along opposite pathway and conducted peaceful, silent protest, dispersed around 090hrs	no damage or abuse	peaceful and no Police intervention required.
02-Jul-25	Shipley	25mins	Bradford friends of Palestine	approx 30	Police on scene in numbers	Demonstrators arrived approx 1315hrs and left approx 20 minutes later	no damage or abuse	Peaceful with no Police intervention, youtube auditors at site but didn't take any footage of site. One photographer (possibly press) warned by police to not take photos
03-Jul-25	Shipley	approx 1 hr	unknown		4 Police in attendance	4 females arrived and quietly demonstrated	no damage or abuse	peaceful and the demonstrators left at 0833hrs. They claim they will come every week until 'we are shut down'
08-Jul-25	Shipley	approx 1 hr	unknown		4 Police in attendance	4 females arrived and quietly demonstrated	no damage or abuse	peaceful and the demonstrators left after about an hour approx 0730-0830hrs. Same individuals as 3 Jul 25
16-Jul-25	Shipley		Bradford friends of palestine	approx 25	Police in attendance	Demonstration started at top of Acorn park at around 1600hrs with banners/placards for passing vehicles. They walked down to site at 1710 and stayed around 10 minutes before returning to top of the estate and dispersing	no damage. Chanting and singing	peaceful and no Police intervention required.
23-Aug-25	Chelmsford	3 hrs	PSC	approx 12	Police in attendance	Chelmsford PSC carried out silent protest	no damage, just banners and no interaction	No Police intervention, silent protest only
24-Jul-25	Shipley	1hr 10mins	unknown		5 police watching from CCTV	usual ladies plus a local female. This time stood in front of vehicle gate access control point preventing vehicle access for approx 40 minutes	no damage and minimal disruption to site	no Police intervention even though called
01-Aug-25	Shipley	1hr	Unknown		5 police watching via CCTV	usual ladies plus a local female. This time stood in front of vehicle gate access control point preventing vehicle access for 1 hour	no damage, minimal disruption	injunction issued by site staff for blocking the entrance access point. Protesters refused to give names
04-Aug-25	Shipley	1hr	Same ladies as previous unknown		3 Police watching on CCTV	usual ladies plus a local female. This time stood in front of vehicle gate access control point preventing vehicle access for 1 hour	no damage minimal disruption	no police intervention even though called
15-Aug-25	Shipley	1hr	Same ladies as previous unknown		5 Police watching on CCTV	usual ladies arrived stayed for approximately an hour before leaving	no damage minimal disruption	no police intervention
20-Aug-25	Shipley	30 mins	Bradford friends of palestine	approx 30	Police in attendance	Demonstration walked down at approx 1305hrs at site chanted and made speeches before returning to top of the estate and dispersing	no damage. Chanting, speeches and singing	peaceful and no Police intervention required.
22-Aug-25	Shipley	1hr	usual ladies and BFoP		9 Police observing	9 ladies tried to intimidate staff and walking in a circle in front of the gate	no damage chanting semi blocking and intimidation of staff	Police attended only after the event
27-Aug-25	Shipley	1hr 20mins	usual ladies and BFoP		7 Police in attendance	stood in front of gate but not preventing access	no damage	Police attended but took no action
10-Sep-25	Shipley	1hr 20mins	BFoP	approx 8	Police in attendance	protesters on path opposite main vehicle gate. Attempts to hang a banner on the fence by 1 lady prevented by the Police	no damage	police attended, intervened twice but took no further action
11-Sep-25	Shipley	1hr	usual ladies and BFoP		4 police arrived 20 mins after protesters arrived	protesters on path opposite main vehicle gate.	No damage	Police spoke to ladies but no further action
18-Sep-25	Shipley	1hr 5 mins	usual ladies		4 Police on site 15 mins later	sat adjacent to main vehicle gate	no damage	Police left at 0750 and protesters left at 0835

25-Sep-25	Shipley	1hr 15 mins	usual ladies and BFoP		5	No police attendance until after the protest	hung banners on fenceline opposite site and sat in deckchairs to side of site	no damage	didn't appear to be any interaction with site staff. At 0840hrs, banners removed and ladies left area. Police arrived at 0914hrs and immediately left the area.
02-Oct-25	Shipley	1hr 20 mins	usual ladies and BFoP		6	Police in attendance	banners affixed to fence on neighbouring company, chalk messages on road	no damage	Police spoke to protesters, but peaceful
09-Oct-25	Shipley	1hr 10 mins	usual ladies and BFoP		5	Police in attendance	banners attached to neighbouring company's fence	no damage	Police spoke with protesters. staff member from neighbouring company who gave verbal abuse to Teledyne staff members was also spoken to by Police.
16-Oct-25	Shipley	1hr 30 mins	BFoP		8	Police attended briefly	banners on neighbours fence	no damage	Banners loudspeakers chanting. Possible filming of site staff by a protester. Reported to Police and CRN gained
17-Oct-25	Shipley	1hr 6 mins	believed to be usual ladies and BFoP		5	Police on site briefly	banners on neighbours fence	no damage	flags, banners and chanting
21-Oct-25	Shipley	1hr 20 mins	Usual 4 ladies plus BFoP		6	Police called but did not attend	Banners on neighbours fence	no damage	flags and banners
05-Nov-25	Shipley	1hr 28 mins	BFoP		8	Police in attendance prior to protest	banners on neighbours fence, flags, placards and chanting	no damage	flag, banners and placards
					4	police briefly attended	flags and banners	no damage	flags banners
10-Nov-25	Shipley	1 hr 45 mins	3 ladies not BFoP		4	Police briefly attended	flags and banners	no damage	banners and no interaction with site staff
17-Nov-25	Shipley	1hr 3 mins	1 male 2 females believed to be the usual group		3	Police briefly attended	banners on neighbours fence	no damage	numbers unknown due to protest being at the top of Acorn park with no interference with site at all. No CCTV but video on socials
19-Nov-25	Shipley	approx 1 hr	BFoP	appeared to be 4 from social media footage		U/K	protesters stood at top of acorn park on main road	no damage	believed that Angie Zeigler attended, photos taken of injunction notice
29-Nov-25	Labtech Prestigne	20 mins	unknown		5	police on scene and spoke to protesters	at main gate Unit 1, Palestine flags being waved	no damage	banners showing e2v name associating them with supply of arms to Israel.
29-Nov-25	Chelmsford	n/k	n/k	social media shows approx 12		Unknown if Police attended	protest happened along Parkway, a main road route through Chelmsford but close vicinity to e2v	no damage	
03-Dec-25	Shipley	3 mins at site, longer at top of acorn park	BFoP		14	Police in attendance	Protest started at top of Acorn park before they walked down to site across the gate and back up to top of park	no damage, usual banners and chanting	usual banners and chanting
05-Dec-25	Shipley	1hr 8 mins	3 known females 1 male		4	No police attendance	all 4 stood in their usual place at side of vehicle gate, no interference with staff	no damage just stood there	NTR
11-Dec-25	Shipley	1 hr 9 mins	2 regular females		2	Police briefly attended	both stood to side of gate with Palestine flag.	no damage or interaction with staff	NTR
16-Dec-25	Shipley	1hr 6 mins	regular females		6	no police attendance	stood to side of main gate with banners	no damage or interaction with staff	NTR
17-Dec-25	Shipley	1hr 15mins	BFoP		11	Police in attendance	Stood on path opposite site banging pots and pans	no damage or interaction with staff	one male arrested under stop and search (unrelated to protest) and released.
07-Jan-26	Shipley	58 mins	BFoP		14	Police in attendance	stood on path across from site with banners	no damage or interaction with staff	peaceful but 1 male seen appearing to film site for approx a minute
14-Jan-26	Shipley	49 mins	regular females		5	Police in attendance	stood on corner of vehicle gate not obstructing access	no damage or interaction with staff	peaceful, police in attendance throughout
20-Jan-26	Shipley	1hr	regular females		5	No Police attendance	stood/sat at corner of ped gate not obstructing access	no damage or interaction with staff	peaceful
21-Jan-26	Shipley	52 mins	BFoP		17	Police in attendance at all times	stood opposite from site, banners and placards, banging pots and pans	no damage or interaction with staff	Peaceful with police in attendance prior to and after event
30-Jan-26	Shipley	1 hr 7 mins	regular females		7	no police attendance	stood adjacent to pedestrian gate, flags and banners	no damage or interaction with staff	peaceful
04-Feb-26	Shipley	unknown	BFoP	approx 8		Police in attendance	Protesters stayed at top of industrial park	Nothing to report	holding banners to passing traffic.
06-Feb-26	Shipley	48 mins	1 male believed to be from regular ladies protest		1	Police in attendance and spoke to male	male walked up and down across main gate (not hindering traffic) waving Palestinian flag	no damage or interaction with staff	Palestine flag.
12-Feb-26	Shipley	57 mins	Regular ladies		4	No Police attendance	ladies sat to side of vehicle gate, flags and banners. No interaction with staff	no damage	flags and banners

17-Feb-26	Shipley	1hr 7 mins	regular ladies plus 2 males	7	Police attendance	banners stating I oppose genocide I support Palestine action	no damage	Protesters blocked pedestrian entrance, took photos of site and had illegal banner. Police confirmed no action taken on banner and photos were not deemed hostile.
24-Feb-26	Shipley	1hr 8 mins	regular ladies plus 2 males	6	Breif Police attendance	carrying signs	no damage, partial blocking of pedestrian access but did not cause any issues	Police arrived, turned around and drove away
04-Mar-26	Shipley	1hr 19 mins	BFoP	15 male and female	Police in attendance throughout	pots and pans, flags, banners	no damage, stood on path opposite to site	2 police vehicles in attendance, no interaction required
05-Mar-26	Shipley	1hr 15 mins	regular ladies and 1 male	5 females 1 male	Police in attendance	signs and flags	No damage or interaction with staff	1 police vehicle nointeraction with demonstrators
10-Mar-26	Shipley	1hr 6mins	regular ladies and 1 male	3 female 1 male	Police attended post event	flags and chalk writing on the path	No damage or interaction with staff	Police attended after event and spoke to site staff
17-Mar-26	Shipley	approx 1 hr 20 mins	BFoP	9 male and female	Police attended throughout	flags, banners signs	no damage or interaction with staff	protesters staged at top of Acorn park staying on the main road.
18-Mar-26	Shipley	36 mins	regular ladies	4	No police	banners	no damage or interaction with staff	protesters sat on opposite path to site.
24-Mar-26	Shipley	1 hr 7 mins	regular ladies	3 female 1 male	no police	signs and flags	no damage or interaction with staff	stood on opposite path to main gate
31-Mar-26	Shipley	1hr 12 mins	Regular ladies plus males	7	Police attended at end of protest	banners and chalk messages on road	no damage or interaction with staff	stood outside site and opposite, alternating between
01-Apr-26	Shipley	1hr 19 mins	BFoP	7	Police on scene throughout	Banners and chalk messages on road	no damage or interaction with staff	1 x protester attempted to approach the main gate but were spoken to by Police and they returned to their original position on the opposite side of the road
08-Apr-26	Shipley	1hr 1min	regular ladies	4	Police on scene for 1 minute	banners and chalk messages on path	no damage or interaction with staff	both sides of the road but no interference with site ingress/egress.
16-Apr-26	Shipley	1hr 27 mins	regular ladies plus Teledyne diversity?	3 female 1 male	Police on scene for approx 25 mins	Banners on opposite fenceline	no damage or interaction with staff	both sides of road but no interference with ingress/egress
24-Apr-26	Shipley	1hr 13 mins	believed to be BFoP	4 female 1 male	Police on scene for 15 mins	banners on opposite fence and plastic skeleton draped in black cloth laid in road	no damage or interaction with staff	only addition to usual banners was the plastic skeeton.
29-Apr-26	Shipley	1hr 12 mins	regular ladies plus BFoP	5 female 1 male	Police on scene for 11 minutes	banners and flags	no damage or rinteraction with staff	both sides of road but no interference with ingress/egress
06-May-26	Shipley	U/K	believed to be BFoP following social media posts	U/K	Police in area	banners and flags	no interaction with staff	protest was held at top of the industrial path so little detail is known
14-May-26	Shipley	1hr 3 mins	Regular ladies plus male	5	No police presence	banners and flags	no interaction with staff	both sides of the road but no interference with site ingress/egress.
20-May-26	Shipley	1hr 1min	BFoP	7	Police on scene	banners, flags, pots and pans	no interaction with staff	opposite side of road from main gate
21-May-26	Shipley	1hr 16 mins	regular ladies	4 females	Police on scene	banners and flags	no interaction with staff	opposite side of road from main gate
26-May-26	Shipley	approx 15 mins	individual	1 male	reported to Police	male walked around site and took images of site including camera placement	no interaction with site security	male was reported to Ploice who caught up with the individual and on examining hisphone the male had numerous photos of site over numerous day. Police believed to have arrested him.
27-May-26	Shipley	1 hr 2 mins	regular ladies	4 females	Police in attendance	banners and flags	no interaction with staff	opposite side of road from main entrance
03-Jun-26	Shipley	1hr 12 mins	regular ladies	6 females 2 males	Police in attendance	banners and flags	no interaction with staff	opposite side of road from main entrance
09-Jun-26	Shipley	1hr 9 mins	regular ladies	4 females	No Police	banners and flags	no interaction with staff	either side of main vehicle gate not obstructing entry
16-Jun-26	Shipley	1hr 26 mins	regular ladies	7 male and female	No Police	banners and flags	no interaction with staff	either side of main vehicle gate not obstructing entry
16-Jun-26	Shipley	1hr 18 mins	BFoP	8 male and female	Police arrived after start of protest	Banners, flags, chalk writing on path, music chanting, pots and pans banging	no interaction with staff or Police	opposite side of road from main gate
22-Jun-26	Shipley	1hr 13 mins	regular ladies	4 females 1 male	No Police	banners and flags	no interaction with staff	opposite side of the road frommain gate

Three women arrested under Terrorism Act after van driven into Edinburgh factory fence owned by defence company

A pro-Palestine action group, which aims to close defence company Leonardo's Edinburgh plant, said it is "taking action to shut down Leonardo's weapons factory".

🕒 Tuesday 15 July 2025 20:27, UK



Aftermath of a van crashing into a fence outside Leonardo's Edinburgh factory. Pic: Shut Down Leonardo / X



 Why you can trust Sky News >

Three women have been arrested under the Terrorism Act after a van was driven into an Edinburgh-based defence company's fence.

Police Scotland said the three women - aged 31, 34 and 42 - were arrested after a disturbance in the Crewe Road North area of **Edinburgh** on Tuesday.

The force said a van was driven into an external fence of a business premises, and that its Counter Terrorism Unit was leading the investigation.

It added: "Enquiries are ongoing. We are treating this as targeted, and we do not believe there is any wider threat to the public."

Direct action campaign group Shut Down Leonardo - which said it aims to target aerospace, defence and security company Leonardo's headquarters in Edinburgh - posted a photo of the van.

It shows police on the roof of the vehicle, which has a Palestine flag hanging off the back.

Shut Down Leonardo claims the factory makes components for Israel's F-35 fighter jets.

MORE ON EDINBURGH



[Man charged with five counts of attempted murder linked to terrorism](#)



[Edinburgh: Man charged over series of 'anti-Muslim' attacks](#)



[Life sentence for teenager who stabbed man to death in Edinburgh while on bail for slashing another victim](#)

Related Topics:

[Edinburgh](#)
[Protest](#)
[Scotland](#)
[Terrorism](#)

In a separate post, the group said "we're taking action to shut down Leonardo's weapons factory in Edinburgh" and shared a video of an "action taker" explaining why the site has been targeted.

Read more:

[Palestine Action has been proscribed - what does that mean?](#)

[John Torode sacked from MasterChef](#)

[Doctor among four people killed in Southend Airport plane crash](#)



Get Sky News on WhatsApp

Follow our channel and never miss an update.

[Tap here to follow](#)

A Leonardo spokesperson told the PA news agency: "Leonardo UK is subject to UK government export controls and does not supply

equipment direct to Israel.

"The right to peaceful protest is an important principle in our society, however, aggressive and violent activity should have no place in protest.

"The intimidation of our people, who work hard to support the security and defence of the UK, is not acceptable.

"Our main customer is the UK Armed Forces. We are proud to manufacture technology that supports our service personnel and helps keep them safe. Their dedication underpins the freedom on which our society is based."

Palestine Action - now **proscribed as a terrorist group** - had also targeted Leonardo's Edinburgh site, cutting off the electricity supply to the factory in March.

Related Topics

- Edinburgh
- Protest
- Scotland
- Terrorism

About Sky News

About Us

Sky News Profiles

Sky News Distribution

Sky News Library Sales

Site Map

Sky News Services

Sky News RSS


Sky News For Your Phone

Sky News Radio

Three women charged under Terrorism Act after van driven into fence of defence factory

The three suspects - aged 31, 34 and 42 - are due to appear at Edinburgh Sheriff Court on Monday, after the incident at the Leonardo facility in Crewe Road North last Tuesday.

🕒 Sunday 20 July 2025 15:35, UK



The aftermath of a van crashing into a fence outside Leonardo's Edinburgh factory. Pic: Shut Down Leonardo/X



 Why you can trust Sky News >

Three women have been charged under the Terrorism Act after a van was driven into an external fence of a defence business in Edinburgh.

The incident happened at the Leonardo facility in Crewe Road North last Tuesday.

The three women - aged 31, 34 and 42 - who were earlier arrested under the Terrorism Act have been charged and are due to appear at Edinburgh Sheriff Court on Monday.

Police Scotland's Counter Terrorism Unit is leading the investigation and enquiries are ongoing.

Officers are appealing for information to trace the movements of a blue Ford Transit van in the Gorgie Road area last Monday and prior to the incident last Tuesday.

They are also keen to trace the movements of a white Honda CR-Z on those days. It was recovered from a car park in Gorgie Road following the incident.

Direct action campaign group Shut Down Leonardo - which said it aims to target aerospace, defence and security company Leonardo's headquarters in Edinburgh - posted a photo of a van.

It showed police on the roof of a vehicle, which has a Palestine flag hanging off the back.



Get Sky News on WhatsApp

Follow our channel and never miss an update.

[Tap here to follow](#)

Shut Down Leonardo claims the factory makes components for Israel's F-35 fighter jets.

A Leonardo spokesperson told the PA news agency: "Leonardo UK is subject to UK government export controls and does not supply equipment direct to Israel.

"The right to peaceful protest is an important principle in our society, however, aggressive and violent activity should have no place in protest.

"The intimidation of our people, who work hard to support the security and defence of the UK, is not acceptable."

Related Topics

[Police](#)

[Scotland](#)

[About Sky News](#)

[Sky News Services](#)

[About Us](#)

[Sky News RSS](#)



Arms trade

🕒 This article is more than **9 months old**

Israeli arms manufacturer closes UK facility targeted by Palestine Action

Exclusive: Elbit Systems UK site in Bristol was subject of protest days before direct action group was proscribed

Haroon Siddique and Jamie Grierson

Sat 6 Sep 2025 05.00 BST

 Prefer the Guardian on Google

An Israeli arms manufacturer's facility in Bristol which was repeatedly targeted by [Palestine Action](#) appears to have closed unexpectedly.

The Elbit Systems UK site in the Aztec West business park was the subject of dozens of protests by Palestine Action, including on 1 July, days before the direct action group [was banned under the Terrorism Act](#).

Elbit has held the lease since 2019 and it was not due to expire until 2029. The protests included blockades using lock-ons, occupying the roof, smashing windows and dousing the site in red paint.

Elbit Systems UK is a subsidiary of Elbit Systems, which is Israel's largest arms producer. Elbit Systems, which had revenues of \$6.8bn (£5bn) last year, describes itself as the "backbone" of the **Israel** Defense Force's (IDF's) drone fleet, which has been used extensively in the assault on Gaza.

Its portfolio also includes systems for military aircraft and helicopters, armed remote control boats, land vehicles and for command and control.

Elbit Systems UK did not respond to the Guardian's request for comment about the status of the site. But the property, located within a commercial and industrial park on the outskirts of Bristol where the M5 and M4 meet, was deserted when the Guardian visited this week.

There were no staff present aside from a security guard stationed in a vehicle parked outside the premises.

The site was previously owned by Somerset Council, which was also targeted by Palestine Action before selling the property last year. The Guardian attempted to contact the current landlords. Fences and barriers had been put up around the site after it was targeted by protesters.

The Aztec West facility is a different Elbit facility from that in Filton, Bristol, which was also targeted by Palestine Action and in relation to which 24 people are awaiting trial on charges including criminal damage, violent disorder and aggravated burglary. One individual has also been charged with grievous bodily harm with intent.

Before it was proscribed, Palestine Action ran a campaign targeting the company's UK sites and connected firms, which escalated significantly after Israel's assault on Gaza in response to the 7 October 2023 attacks by Hamas. Elbit System UK's latest accounts show that it made an operating loss of £4.7m last year, compared with a profit of £3.8m in 2023.

📧 Free newsletter | Every weekday

Sign up to First Edition

Our morning email breaks down the key stories of the day, telling you what's happening and why it matters

👁️ [Preview latest](#)

Enter your email



[Sign up](#)

Andrew Feinstein, an expert and author on the global arms trade and former member of the South African national assembly, described the closure as “extremely significant”, adding: “We need to remind ourselves that Elbit (Systems) is one of the two most important Israeli arms firms, along with IAI, that is it is obviously a key component of Israel’s military industrial complex.”

Last year, [Elbit Systems UK sold its West Midlands-based subsidiary Elite KL](#) (now Calatherm). After Elite KL’s operating profit fell by 75% in 2022, it said that it was primarily a result of increased security costs, its Tamworth site having been targeted by Palestine Action. The new owners said they would not have any association with Elbit and cancel its defence contracts.

In 2022, [Elbit sold Ferranti P&C](#), part of its Oldham-based business, after 18 months of protests by Palestine Action as well as Oldham Peace.

Last month, Private Eye revealed that Elbit Systems UK was part of a consortium close to winning a £2bn contract that would make it a “strategic partner” of the Ministry of Defence. [The FT reported](#) that the former Labour cabinet minister, Peter Hain, had written to the defence secretary, Jon Healey, urging him not to hand the contract to the company, given “the devastation unfolding in Gaza”.

Palestine Action has been [granted permission for a judicial review](#) in November of the decision to proscribe. However, at a court of appeal hearing on 25 September, the home secretary [will try to overturn the permission decision](#).

DECLASSIFIED UK

INVESTIGATIONS :

US ARMS FIRM SECURES BAN ON PALESTINE PROTESTS IN BRITAIN

Court documents reveal aerospace firm Moog has obtained an injunction against protesters in Britain and even consulted the police about Declassified.

JOHN MCEVOY

23 OCTOBER 2025



A Moog system with missile launcher on display at an airshow.

Listen to this article

8 min

DECLASSIFIED UK**INVESTIGATIONS :**

Court documents show Moog, which makes military aircraft parts and has **links** to Israel's arms trade, applied for an injunction in September to prevent protests at its UK sites.

The application, which was granted by the High Court, sought to stop "persons unknown" who "for the purpose of protest enter occupy or remain on" the firm's facilities across Britain.

Moog returned to court earlier this month and obtained a wider injunction to cover interference with "access to or egress from that land and premises".

This means protesters are barred from blocking traffic around entrances and exits and face risk of arrest on public land adjacent to the company's sites.

Moog requested the injunction after its factory in Wolverhampton was targeted by a direct-action group named "Palestinian Martyrs for Justice".

In August, four members of that group crashed through the factory's gates and smashed its rooftop, allegedly causing over £1m in damage.

The activists accused Moog of supplying Israel's largest arms firm Elbit Systems with aircraft parts "used to train Israeli pilots to fly F-16 and F-35 fighter jets".

Declassified and *The Ditch* had previously **exposed** how Moog sent at least ten shipments of trainer aircraft parts from Wolverhampton to an Elbit Systems site in Israel between December 2024 and July 2025.

Listen to this article

8 min

DECLASSIFIED UK**INVESTIGATIONS :**

Amnesty International said it was “seriously concerned by the development of so-called ‘persons unknown injunctions’ by the British courts, and their impact on peaceful protest rights”.

Its UK law and human rights director Tom Southerden told *Declassified*: “Such injunctions are routinely issued for companies, landowners and public authorities without any opposition, anyone putting the counter arguments or anyone testing the evidence that the applicants seek to rely on.

“They bring with them hugely inflated punishments for acts of protest, as breaching them constitutes contempt of court.

“Potentially even worse are the financial risks faced by anyone caught up in them, who face the prospect of having to pay the legal costs of major multinational corporations, leading to people losing their homes and being made bankrupt.

“These injunctions are created solely to intimidate people into not protesting and urgently need to be curtailed”.

RELATED**ISRAELI FIGHTER PILOTS TRAINING WITH UK EQUIPMENT**[READ MORE](#)

Listen to this article

8 min

INVESTIGATIONS :

injunction because *Declassified* has published investigations into Moog's links to the Israeli arms industry.

“Prior to its proscription, there was a clear pattern of UK-based companies being targeted by protests from Palestine Action and other pro-Palestinian organisations, particularly after being named in *Declassified*”, the witness statement says.

It goes on to note how protests took place across several BAE Systems sites in December 2023, weeks after *Declassified* had published an article “alleging that BAE manufactured key parts for the F-35 fighter jets being used to support strikes on Gaza”.

Moog curiously omits how it is common knowledge that BAE Systems produces key parts for F-35s because it is **stated** on its own website.

Moog also attempts to construct a timeline between a *Declassified* report on 8 May 2025 and Elbit-owned Instro Precision being targeted by Palestine Action later that month.

“Following publication of the article, there was a... Palestine Action attack aimed at Instro Precision on 29 May 2025. In this instance, Palestine Action targeted the registered London address of Discovery Park”, the witness statement reads.

But this was far from the first time that activists had protested Instro Precision, with trade unions **demonstrating** at the factory in October 2023 and Palestine Action targeting the company in June 2024.

Moog did not approach *Declassified* for comment before

Listen to this article

8 min

DECLASSIFIED UK**INVESTIGATIONS :**

that *Declassified's* approaches were shared with Staffordshire police before our article had even been published.

“On 4 July 2025, a police officer from South Staffordshire... visited the site, reviewed the email sent from Mr McEvoy at Declassified, discussed safety at the Wolverhampton Site in the event of a protest”, the document notes.

‘Specific allegations’

In its witness statement, Moog does not attempt to refute *Declassified's* reporting, saying it would not be company policy “to respond to any of the specific allegations made... in the Article”.

The firm nonetheless says it does not “accept the characterisation of Moog’s business activities in the Article and, in particular, the link it attempts to make with the situation in Gaza”.

It is unclear on what specific basis Moog is trying to distance itself from “the situation in Gaza”.

But cargo documents show, since December 2024, the company has exported M-346 Lavi components to an Elbit Systems factory in Israel as well as to the country’s ministry of defence.

The M-346 Lavi is a high-performance aircraft designed to train Israeli pilots to fly advanced fighter jets including the F-16 and **F-35**.

Trade minister Chris Bryant attempted to justify the export of

Listen to this article

8 min

DECLASSIFIED UK**INVESTIGATIONS :**

A US air force report also recently **estimated** that it could take just four to six months to train Ukrainian fighter pilots to fly F-16 fighter jets. These same aircraft have been **used** by Israeli forces in Gaza, including in an attack on British doctors in January 2024.

RELATED

UK AEROSPACE FIRM SUPPLYING ISRAEL'S DEFENCE MINISTRY

[READ MORE](#)**Damage**

Moog's witness statement also details the financial impact of the direct-action campaign at its Wolverhampton factory.

The company says 95% of the solar panels on the roof were "destroyed at an estimated approximate value of £700,000".

The entire system was therefore "inoperable, meaning that Moog will be liable for the loss of energy generation and will need to procure electricity off the grid".

In addition, all of the windows at roof-level were smashed, and some of the skylights were destroyed

[Listen to this article](#)

8 min

DECLASSIFIED UK**INVESTIGATIONS:**

The direct-action campaign also had knock-on effects for Moog's contractual arrangements.

The company said it had "issues with meeting supply contracts on time, including the supply of components for ultimate use by the MoD".

It added that "there is potential reputational damage for Moog if customers conclude that Moog's ability to supply components on time... could be compromised by its susceptibility to disruption caused by unlawful protest activity".

Ultimately, Moog estimated that the total financial loss caused by the incident to be "between circa £1,250,000 to £2,000,000".

The firm reported a gross profit of almost **\$1bn** last year.

TAGGED: **Israel** **US**

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Listen to this article
8 min



Direct action targets Keysight Technologies over Israeli arms



by The Canary — 23 January 2026 in News, UK Reading Time: 2 mins read

216 2 AA 1

Home > UK > News

Share on Facebook

Share on Twitter



Share on Bluesky



Share via WhatsApp



Share via Telegram



Share on Threads

From 5.30am on 21 January, three action takers from [People Against Genocide](#) visited the Keysight Technologies site at 610 Wharfedale Road, Reading. They targeted the company's logistics fleet and mobile collaboration unit. Each of them climbed on top of a separate logistics van belonging to the electronics firm, to prevent their use in transporting parts for Israeli weapons. They also sprayed the vans with black paint.

American-owned Keysight produces electronic components for weapons which have been used against the civilian population in Gaza. It exports its products directly to the Israeli military, as well as supplying them to UAV Tactical Systems. UAV is a subsidiary of [Elbit Systems](#), Israel's biggest weapons firm. Elbit manufactures over 85% of the Israeli military's killer drone fleet and land-based equipment. Keysight also has business links to the French weapons giant [Thales](#).

People Against Genocide targets Keysight Technologies

Because of its involvement in the Gaza Genocide, pro-Palestine activists have repeatedly targeted Keysight facilities. Most recently there was [an action against Keysight's Berkshire Headquarters](#), by People Against Genocide, in November 2025. This followed another action, a week earlier, [targeting Keysight's Edinburgh offices](#). The Autonomous Activist Group claimed responsibility for that action.

A spokesperson for People Against Genocide said:

Keysight are one of many companies in Britain, often foreign-owned, making rich profits from assisting in the ongoing slaughter of the Palestinian people. We will continue to target them until they stop supplying the Israeli war machine.

Keir Starmer is doing everything he can to crush protest, particularly when it challenges his Israeli pay-masters, and the private companies who are assisting in exterminating the Palestinian people. People Against Genocide are using direct action to impede the Israeli war-machine on British soil. Come and join us, get trained up to take direct action with Direct Action Training.

Featured image via the Canary

Tags: [israel](#) [militarism](#) [palestine](#) [protest](#)

Share 162

Tweet 101

 Share

 Send

 Share

 Share

Previous Post

Netanyahu skips Davos 'peace board' signing as Switzerland say he'll be arrested

Next Post

Watch: disabled woman in Australia PROSECUTED for 'butt-dialing' Jewish nutritionist

Comments 1



Azzouzi 5 months ago

Well done

 Reply

Leave a Reply

Your email address will not be published. Required fields are marked *

Comment *

Name *

Email *

Website

POST COMMENT

Sign up for our daily newsletter

WOKINGHAM
.TODAY

HOME

MY AREA

CRIME

SPORT

READING FC

COMMUNITY



LIFESTYLE

WHAT'S ON

BUSINESS

ADVERTISE

CONTACT

Home > Featured

UPDATE: Two arrested after protestors seen on roof of Winnersh building

by [Staff Writer](#) — November 13, 2025 in [Featured](#), [News](#), [Winnersh](#)



Reading Today has received reports of a protest which has garnered a significant police presence in Winnersh this morning (Wednesday,

November 12.)

 Share on Facebook

Share on Twitter



Two people have been arrested following a protest which garnered a significant police presence in Winnersh this morning (Wednesday, November 12.)

It comes after protestors were seen standing on the roof of the Keysight Technologies building in Wharfedale Road, Winnersh, brandishing flags.

A number of police officers attended the scene, with multiple police cars in the area.

Two women have been arrested-one aged 38 and of no fixed abode, and another aged 20 and from Nottingham- on suspicion of aggravated trespass and criminal damage to property.

Police estimate that around £5,000 of damage has been caused at the scene.

Among the signs at the site of the protest are those in support of hunger strikes in support of Palestinian people, as well as Palestinian flags.

Related posts

Robbery investigation launched after incident in Winnersh underpass

“It is unacceptable to cause such suffering”: Police comment after Winnersh woman given sentence for shooting cats with air weapon



Thames Valley Police said in a statement: “Officers from Thames Valley Police are currently dealing with an ongoing incident at Keysight Technologies on Wharfedale Road, Wokingham.

“A group of trespassers has accessed the roof of the building and caused damage.

“Our officers are on scene and working with partners to engage with those involved and resolve the situation safely.

“Please be aware there may be some disruption in the local area while this is ongoing- we ask members of the public to avoid the area for now.”

In a later statement, a Thames Valley Police spokesperson said: “Following an incident this morning (12/11) at Keysight Technologies in Wharfedale Road, Wokingham, two people have been arrested.

“A 38-year-old woman of no fixed abode and another woman, aged 20, from Nottingham, have been arrested on suspicion of aggravated trespass and criminal damage to property – value over £5,000.

“They are currently in police custody.”

Detective Inspector Stuart Streeter said: “I would like to thank the public for their patience and understanding while we dealt with this incident, which has now been safely resolved.

“We have made two arrests, and an investigation into the incident is ongoing.”

Tags: winnersh crime winnersh protest

Previous Post

Daisy’s Dream to highlight childhood bereavement on Children in Need this weekend

Next Post

Unsung heroes celebrated at Wokingham Community Awards 2025

Learn more about

LSEG



Subscribe



Six UK pro-Palestinian activists go on trial over attack on Israel's Elbit factory

By Michael Holden

November 18, 2025 3:46 PM GMT · Updated November 18, 2025



Summary Companies

Defendants deny aggravated burglary, violent disorder and criminal damage

Palestine Action group banned by government in year after attack

Judge warns jurors not to bring in views over Gaza and banning of group

LONDON, Nov 18 (Reuters) - Six British pro-Palestinian activists went on trial on Tuesday accused of attacking a factory operated by Israeli defence firm Elbit to cause as much damage as possible, with one also charged with striking a police officer with a sledgehammer.

Prosecutors said the six defendants were part of a group from the now banned organisation Palestine Action, which carried out the meticulously planned assault on the Elbit Systems UK facility in Bristol, southwest England, in August last year.

Get a look at the day ahead in European and global markets with the Morning Bid Europe newsletter. Sign up [here](#).

Some of the group used fireworks and smoke grenades to keep security guards at bay, while others caused "extensive damage" inside the factory by smashing equipment with crowbars and hammers and spraying red paint, prosecutor Deanna Heer said.

PROSECUTOR SAID GROUP THREATENED VIOLENCE

She said they intended to "cause serious damage to property and to use or threaten unlawful violence against anyone who stood in their way, if necessary with the use of weapons".

Charlotte Head, 29, Samuel Corner, 23, Leona Kamio, 30, Fatema Zainab Rajwani, 21, Zoe Rogers, 22, and Jordan Devlin, 31, deny charges of aggravated burglary, violent disorder and criminal damage.

Corner also denies causing grievous bodily harm with intent for allegedly hitting a female police sergeant with a sledgehammer in the back as she was trying to arrest Rogers. Heer said the attack caused a lumbar spine fracture.

Heer told jurors at London's Woolwich Crown Court that "a step-by-step plan of action" had been devised, involving two teams: a "black team" and a "red team", wearing jumpsuits.

The black team's job was to threaten the security guards to allow the red team, of which the defendants were members, to break in and "cause as much damage as possible", she said.

Heer said a white former prison van was driven through a fence into the yard outside the factory, with members of the red team getting out and "destroying as much property as they could".

Members of the group had used GoPro cameras to film the incident, Heer added, and footage posted online featured two members laughing and saying: "You've been Pal-Action-ed."

JURORS TOLD VIEWS ON GROUP, GAZA IRRELEVANT

Britain proscribed Palestine Action as a terrorist organisation in July, almost a year after the Elbit incident took place, making it a crime to be a member.

The judge, Jeremy Johnson, told the jury there was controversy about that decision, and whether it was lawful, but said that was irrelevant to the case.

He said many people also had strong views about the [war in Gaza](#), but told jurors they must "judge the case on the evidence, not on the basis of what you or anyone else thinks about Palestine Action or the war in Gaza".

Earlier on Tuesday, Elbit [reported](#) sharply higher third-quarter profit, fuelled by sales to Israel's military and by higher global defence spending.

Reporting by Michael Holden and Sam Tobin; Editing by Paul Sandle and Alison Williams

Our Standards: [The Thomson Reuters Trust Principles.](#) [↗](#)

Suggested Topics:

United Kingdom

Purchase Licensing Rights

UK ban on pro-Palestine group branded 'authoritarian' as appeal begins

By Sam Tobin

November 26, 2025 1:37 PM GMT · Updated November 26, 2025



[1/3] Protesters from "Palestine Action" demonstrate on the roof of Guardtech Group in Brandon, Suffolk, Britain, July 1, 2025. REUTERS/Chris Radburn [Purchase Licensing Rights](#) 



Summary Companies

Palestine Action's proscription being challenged by co-founder
UK says group responsible for 'escalating campaign' of damage
Civil liberties groups intervening, argue move disproportionate

LONDON, Nov 26 (Reuters) - The British government's ban on pro-Palestinian campaign group Palestine Action as a terrorist organisation amounted to an authoritarian restriction on protest, lawyers representing a co-founder seeking to overturn the ban argued on Wednesday.

Palestine Action was proscribed in July, putting it on a par with Islamic State or al Qaeda and making it a crime to be a member, which carries a maximum sentence of 14 years in prison. Since then, more than 2,000 people have been [arrested for holding signs](#) in support of the group.

The Reuters Inside Track newsletter is your essential guide during the World Cup. Sign up [here](#).

The group had increasingly targeted Israel-linked defence companies in Britain with "direct action", often blocking entrances, or spraying red paint, particularly focusing on Israel's largest defence firm [Elbit Systems](#). [\(ESLT.TA\)](#) 

Britain's Home Office (interior ministry) argues the group's escalating actions, culminating in a June break-in at the RAF Brize Norton air base when activists damaged two planes, amount to terrorism.

But lawyers representing Huda Ammori, who co-founded Palestine Action in 2020, say the move flies in the face of Britain's long history of direct action protests and is "so extreme as to render the UK an international outlier".

It was the first time a "direct action, civil disobedience organisation that does not advocate for violence" had been proscribed as terrorist, Ammori's lawyer Raza Husain told London's High Court.

He compared the response to the group to that of other civil disobedience campaigns, such as Rosa Parks, the late U.S. civil rights figure who refused to give up her seat on a segregated bus in 1955, and the suffragette movement which campaigned for women's right to vote in the early 20th century.

GROUP'S ACTIONS ESCALATED AMID WAR IN GAZA

Lawyers representing the Home Office said in court filings that the right to freedom of expression does not protect "speech and activity in support of a proscribed organisation that commits serious property damage".

Palestine Action has frequently targeted defence companies. It stepped up its actions during the Gaza war, with six members arrested on suspicion of plotting to disrupt the London Stock Exchange in January 2024.

Six people went on trial last week for aggravated burglary, criminal damage and violent disorder over a raid on Elbit, with one charged with causing grievous bodily harm by hitting a police officer with a sledgehammer. They deny the charges.

Ammori's lawyers say the ban has led to pro-Palestinian protesters being questioned by police at demonstrations without expressing support for Palestine Action.

The British government argues proscription only prevents support for Palestine Action and has not prevented people from protesting "in favour of the Palestinian people or against Israel's actions in Gaza".

The case is due to conclude next week, with a ruling at a later date.

Reporting by Sam Tobin Editing by Peter Graff

Our Standards: [The Thomson Reuters Trust Principles.](#) [↗](#)

Suggested Topics:

Aerospace & Defense

Human Rights

Purchase Licensing Rights

Read Next

World

EXCLUSIVE

US defence firm Anduril in talks for Nissan plant to build drones in Japan

3 hours ago

World at Work

Airbus faces French union backlash over four-day return to office push

39 mins ago

Aerospace & Defense

Trump meets munitions makers amid push to replenish weapons stockpiles

8 hours ago

Business

EasyJet knocks back \$6.5 billion Castlake bid but deal hopes rise

10 mins ago



UK news

🕒 This article is more than **5 months** old

Greta Thunberg arrested in London over 'Palestine Action prisoners' placard

Two other people held on suspicion of criminal damage after protest at insurance company's offices

Ben Quinn

Tue 23 Dec 2025 13:15 GMT

 Prefer the Guardian on Google

Greta Thunberg has been arrested in London after taking part in a protest holding a sign expressing support for Palestine Action-affiliated hunger strikers.

The Swedish activist, 22, arrived after a protest had begun outside the offices of an insurance company in London. She sat down with a sign saying "I support the Palestine Action prisoners. I oppose genocide."

Two other activists are said to have earlier used repurposed fire extinguishers to cover the front of the building used by Aspen Insurance with red paint before locking themselves to it.

The campaign group Prisoners for Palestine said Aspen, a global speciality insurer and reinsurer, was targeted because it provided services to Elbit Systems UK, a subsidiary of an Israeli weapons maker.

Prisoners for Palestine said the action was also carried out in solidarity with prisoners who have been on hunger strike while awaiting trial for alleged offences relating to Palestine Action before [the group was banned](#).

Eight prisoners had been on hunger strike. The two to begin the protest are now on their 52nd day and at a critical stage for their health. Three of the eight have stopped because of severe risk.

A City of London police spokesperson said hammers and red paint were used to damage a building on Fenchurch Street at 7am on Tuesday.

“A man and a woman have been arrested on suspicion of criminal damage. They glued themselves nearby and specialist officers are working to release them and bring them into police custody,” the spokesperson said.

“A little while later, a 22-year-old woman also attended the scene. She has been arrested for displaying an item - in this case a placard - in support of a proscribed organisation - in this case Palestine Action - contrary to section 13 of the Terrorism Act 2000.”

Police later said the woman had been released on bail to a date in March.

While thousands of people have been arrested over the past year at protests for holding placards saying “I support Palestine Action”, campaigners questioned why the wording of Thunberg’s sign had led to her being arrested under counter-terrorism legislation.

Families and supporters of hunger strikers have pleaded with David Lammy, the justice secretary, to meet them in an attempt to end the impasse. On Monday, as the protest [reached a dangerous stage](#), lawyers for the hunger strikers sent a legal letter claiming that by refusing a meeting, Lammy had failed to comply with the Ministry of Justice’s policy on the handling of hunger strikes.

The demands of the hunger strikers include the granting of immediate bail, ending the ban on Palestine Action and stopping restrictions on their communications.

Thunberg said in a statement: “It is up to the state to intervene and put an end to this by meeting these reasonable demands that pave the way for the freedom of all those who choose to use their rights trying to stop a genocide, something the British state has failed to do themselves.”

Aspen was targeted after it emerged that two insurance firms that were repeatedly targeted by Palestine Action before the group was banned had stopped insuring UK subsidiaries of Israel's largest arms manufacturer, Elbit Systems.

Allianz and Aviva ended insurance contracts with Elbit Systems UK and UAV Engines respectively. They have all been approached for comment.

On Saturday, after Ireland's Gaelic Athletic Association came under pressure to end its sponsorship by Allianz, the insurance company **told RTÉ** that it "has no relationship with Elbit Systems and does not engage in any investment or underwriting activity connected to the Middle East".

... we have a small favour to ask. Tens of millions have placed their trust in the Guardian's fearless journalism since we started publishing more than 200 years ago, turning to us in moments of crisis, uncertainty, solidarity and hope. More than 1.5 million supporters, from 180 countries, now power us financially - keeping us open to all, and fiercely independent. **Will you make a difference and support us too?**

Unlike many others, the Guardian has no shareholders and no billionaire owner. Just the determination and passion to deliver high-impact global reporting, always free from commercial or political influence. Reporting like this is vital for democracy, for fairness and to demand better from the powerful.

And we provide all this for free, for everyone to read. We do this because we believe in information equality. Greater numbers of people can keep track of the global events shaping our world, understand their impact on people and communities, and become inspired to take meaningful action. Millions can benefit from open access to quality, truthful news, regardless of their ability to pay for it.

Whether you give a little or a lot, your funding will power our reporting for the years to come.

If you can, please support us on a monthly basis. It takes less than a minute to set up, and you can rest assured that you're making a big impact every single month in support of open, independent journalism. Thank you.

☐ Support £4/monthly

☒ **Support £12/monthly**

Recommended

Unlock **All-access digital** benefits:

- ✓ Far fewer asks for support
- ✓ Ad-free reading
- ✓ Unlimited access to the Guardian app



UK news

• This article is more than 2 months old

Allianz sues six people alleged to have been part of Palestine Action protests

Insurance company seeking almost £300,000 for protests at UK offices, during which red paint was daubed on buildings

Haroon Siddique *Legal affairs correspondent*

Wed 8 Apr 2026 16.28 BST

 Prefer the Guardian on Google

One of the world's largest insurance companies is suing six people alleged to have taken part in Palestine Action protests against the company.

Allianz is seeking damages of almost £300,000 for protests at its UK offices in October 2024 and March 2025, in what is believed to be the first civil case brought against people accused of involvement in direct action with the protest group.

Palestine Action repeatedly targeted the German insurance company over its provision of insurance to the UK subsidiary of Israel's largest arms manufacturer, Elbit Systems. During the two protests that form the basis of the civil case, red paint was daubed over Allianz's UK headquarters in Guildford, Surrey and its City of London office.

Palestine Action claimed to have occupied the Guildford office during the 2024 protest, while activists scaled the building with a flag reading "Drop Elbit" in last year's action. Allianz ended its contract with Elbit Systems UK last year.

The six defendants, who have all been charged with criminal offences and pleaded not guilty, are applying to the civil court to stay the case brought by Allianz until after their criminal trials, which they say the insurer has refused to do.



Onlookers gathering near the London office after the red paint protest in 2024. Photograph: Hannah McKay/Reuters

An Allianz spokesperson said it did not comment on legal proceedings and respected the right to lawful protest, but added it would not tolerate alleged “intimidation of our staff, threats or any behaviour that endangers the safety and security of our people, business or property”. They added: “We reserve the right to take lawful action, including civil proceedings against individuals, to recover for damage caused to our buildings and business.”

Seren John-Wood, a 30-year-old community worker who is charged with criminal damage alongside two other defendants in relation to the City of London protest, said: “This is an unprecedented and unusual extra step that is being conducted parallel to criminal proceedings.

“The burden of proof is significantly lower in civil courts. We believe that in a criminal court we will be found not guilty. In a civil court, they will have an extremely unfair advantage; we are unable to afford legal representation whereas, according to their own annual report, they made a record operating profit of €17.4bn (£15.1bn) last year. There is no legal aid available for civil courts.”

Anna Letts, 44, a teacher charged in relation to the same protest, said: “We are people who work and volunteer with refugees and asylum seekers, in homelessness services, with children and young people and, like most working people in the UK, live paycheck to paycheck. Being forced to pay hundreds of thousands of pounds means decades of money being deducted from salaries that barely cover our rent as it is.”

George Elliott, a 29-year-old writer and performer charged with criminal damage, aggravated trespass and going equipped to lock-on alongside two other defendants in relation to the Guildford protest, said: “Allianz brought on its own reputational damage and embarrassment, as well as any other alleged harm to its business and/or employees, by opting to insure Elbit Systems.”

A [decision to ban Palestine Action](#) under the Terrorism Act was overturned in February by the high court, which [ruled that it was unlawful](#). It remains in place pending the home secretary’s appeal, which will be heard on 28 and 29 April.

Article count [on](#)

You’ve read **5** articles in the last year

... we have a small favour to ask. Tens of millions have placed their trust in the Guardian’s fearless journalism since we started publishing more than 200 years ago, turning to us in moments of crisis, uncertainty, solidarity and hope. More than 1.5 million supporters, from 180 countries, now power us financially - keeping us open to all, and fiercely independent. [Will you make a difference and support us too?](#)

Unlike many others, the Guardian has no shareholders and no billionaire owner. Just the determination and passion to deliver high-impact global reporting, always free from commercial or political influence. Reporting like this is vital for democracy, for fairness and to demand better from the powerful.



People Against Genocide abseil into UAV Tactical Systems factory in Leicester



by The Canary — 24 April 2026 in Global, News, UK Reading Time: 2 mins read

247 8 AA 0

Home > Global

Share on Facebook

Share on Twitter



Share on Bluesky



Share via WhatsApp



Share via Telegram



Share on Threads

From approximately 3am on Friday 24 April, People Against Genocide began occupying the roof of the Leicester factory of UAV Tactical Systems. Elbit Systems, Israel's biggest weapons maker, owns the company. UAV Tactical Systems produces drones for the Israeli military's killer drone fleet, of which Elbit supplies over 85%.

Then at approximately 10am, an action taker from the group occupying the roof abseiled into the clean room with power tools. Whilst abseiling into the weapons factory, the action taker proceeded to damage the clean room.

The clean room is used to make essential components for Israeli military drones and, once damaged, will be out of use for several months.

The action involved four people from direct action group People Against Genocide. They succeeded in evading security patrols at the plant, and used 10m extension ladders to ascend over razor-wire fencing to the roof. The team next began to use high-grade power tools to cut their way through the roof, tearing away sections of the roof.

UAV Tactical Systems was originally a joint venture between Elbit and French arms giant Thales. Since 2019, the Israeli weapons firm has owned the company entirely.

In addition to other military drones, UAV Tactical Systems is responsible for developing the Viper and Hermes 450 drone which has been central to the ongoing genocide in Gaza, and linked to the World Central Kitchen in April 2024.

The UAV Tactical Systems plant has been the scene of numerous protests and actions over the years.



Contractor for Bibby Stockholm asylum barge overcharged government by £118m



'Shocking' increase in explicit racism at work in recent years - TUC



Labour's US gambit fails as Trump threatens tariff on UK digital tax



Unite officers strike next week against union boss Graham



FIFA faces backlash as Trump's immigration agenda threatens World Cup

NEXT POST

Israel continues to slaughter people across West Asia, with weapons manufactured in the UK. We cannot stand idly by while Elbit continues to manufacture death and destruction here in Leicester.

Petitions, protests and lobbying decision makers who are actively involved in the Gaza genocide, has unsurprisingly, failed to create necessary change. Therefore, rather than appeal to politicians or the government, we're bypassing the complicit decision makers and are taking direct action to shut Elbit down and disrupt the murderous Israeli war machine ourselves.

Elbit Systems markets its drones as "battle-tested" on Palestinians, and uses them to commit genocide in Palestine and to slaughter people across the region. For the people murdered by Elbit's weaponry and for those whose lives are threatened everyday by Israeli military drones, today, we have shut Elbit down.

Featured image supplied

Tags: [israel](#) [militarism](#) [protest](#)

Share 189

Tweet 118

 Share

 Send

 Share

 Share

Previous Post

Three Palestinians murdered in just over 24 hours by illegal Israeli settlers in occupied West Bank

Next Post

Contractor for Bibby Stockholm asylum barge overcharged government by £118m

Leave a Reply

Your email address will not be published. Required fields are marked *

Comment *

**Contractor for Bibby Stockholm asylum barge overcharged government by £118m**

**'Shocking' increase in explicit racism at work in recent years – TUC**

**Labour's US gambit fails as Trump threatens tariff on UK digital tax**

**Unite officers strike next week against union boss Graham**

**FIFA faces backlash as Trump's immigration agenda threatens World Cup**

NEXT POST

Name *

Email *

Website



Neutral Citation Number: [2025] EWHC 2050 (KB)

Case No: KB-2024-004175

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 01 August 2025

Before :

Richard Wright KC Sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court

Between :

TELEDYNE UK LIMITED

Claimant

- and -

(1) JULIAN ALLEN GAO

Defendants

**(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**

**Natalie Pratt (instructed by Keystone Law) for the Claimant
The Defendants did not attend and were not represented**

Hearing date: 25th July 2025

Approved Judgment

This judgment was handed down by the Judge remotely by circulation to the parties' representatives by email and release to The National Archives. The date and time for hand down is deemed to be 10:30am on 01 August 2025.

Richard Wright KC :

Introduction

1. This case was listed before me on Friday 25th July 2025 for final hearing of a claim for injunctive relief in respect of twelve remaining Named Defendants and for a review of an existing interim order against four categories Persons Unknown Defendants.
2. At the conclusion of the hearing, I granted a final injunction against the Named Defendants, and having conducted a review, a five year continuation of the injunction against the four categories of Persons Unknown Defendants subject to further annual review as set out in the terms set out in my Order attached to this Judgement at Annexe A.
3. These are my reasons for making that Order.

The Claim

4. By this Claim the Claimant seeks injunctive relief to:
 - i) restrain acts of trespass at six of its sites (Shipleigh, Lincoln, Wirral, Chelmsford, Presteigne and Newbury). Three of these sites (Shipleigh, Lincoln and Chelmsford) hold Facility Security Clearance (formerly known as ‘List X’ status) by reason of the Claimant holding contracts with the UK Ministry of Defence, which requires the Claimant to safeguard assets classified ‘SECRET’ or above on its premises;
 - ii) restrain interferences with its common law right to access the highway from the Shipleigh Site only;
 - iii) restrain acts of public nuisance (obstruction of the highway) in relation to the adopted highway serving the Shipleigh Site only (that road being known as ‘Acorn Park’).

Factual Background

5. The Claimant holds the freehold title to sites in Shipleigh, Lincoln and Chelmsford and the leasehold title to sites in the Wirral, Presteigne and Newbury, from which it conducts its business.
6. Across those sites the Claimant produces specialised components and subsystems for medical, science, aerospace, defence and industrial applications. The products it manufactures are for commercial use in a wide range of industrial markets, including defence and aerospace. The manufactured components and subsystems are incorporated by the Claimant’s customers into their own products. 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.
7. By reason of its business, the Claimant has become a target for direct-action protest, especially by activists protesting at the conflict in the Middle East. In particular, the

group known as ‘Palestine Action’ has frequently targeted the Claimant’s sites. On 4th July 2025 the website of the organisation was removed following the groups proscription. Prior to that, and as recently as 25th June 2025, the six sites of the Claimant in respect of which this injunction is sought, were published on the website as ‘targets’ for direct action.

8. Each of the Named Defendants has been arrested at one of the Claimant’s sites throughout either 2024 or 2025 in connection with alleged acts of unlawful protest, carried out under the banner of Palestine Action. Specifically:
 - i) D1 (Julian Allen Gao), D2 (Ruby Hamill), D3 (Daniel Jones) and D4 (Najam Shah) were all arrested at the Shipley Site on 2 April 2024;
 - ii) D5 (Rickly Southall), D6 (Amareen Afzal) and D7 (Serena Fenton) were all arrested at the Shipley Site on 15 May 2024;
 - iii) D14 (Autumn Taylor-Ward) was arrested at the Wirral Site on 5 July 2024;
 - iv) D16 (Lara Downes) and D17 (Gabrielle Middleton) were arrested at the Wirral Site on 2 October 2024; and
 - v) D19 (Mary Ensell) and D20 (Harry Wade) were arrested at the Shipley Site on 28 January 2025.
9. The Claimant’s sites have been the subject of protests on many occasions, many of which the Claimant acknowledges to have been peaceful and lawful. No instance of peaceful protest has been relied upon in support of the Claim. The Claimant relies upon evidence derived from a number of witness statements and supporting exhibits of protests that were not peaceful or lawful and occurred on thirteen different dates at the following locations namely:
 - i. 9 December 2022, Presteigne Site
 - ii. 28 September 2023, Chelmsford Site
 - iii. 26 December 2023, Shipley Site
 - iv. 2 April 2024, Shipley Site
 - v. 15 May 2024, Shipley Site
 - vi. 5 July 2024, Wirral Site
 - vii. 2 October 2024, Wirral Site
 - viii. 30 October 2024, Shipley Site
 - ix. 20 November 2024, Shipley Site
 - x. 28 November 2024, Shipley Site
 - xi. 19 December 2024, Shipley Site
 - xii. 28 January 2025, Shipley Site
 - xiii. 18 February 2025, Shipley Site
10. Many of those incidents resulted in significant financial loss being caused to the Claimant as is further evidenced in the witness statements relied upon in support of the application. In particular the losses included:

- i) Presteigne Site (9 December 2022) – £1.2million property damage, US\$1m sales unable to be completed and shipped, £266,000 loss by reason of disruption to business;
 - ii) Shipley Site (26 December 2023) – £35,000 property damage;
 - iii) Shipley Site (2 April 2024) – £571,000 property damage, £300,000 loss of revenue;
 - iv) Shipley Site (15 May 2024) – £68,000 property damage, £60,000 loss of revenue;
 - v) Wirral Site (5 July 2024) – £1000 property damage, £6400 loss of revenue;
 - vi) Wirral Site (2 October 2024) – £148,000 property damage (temporary repairs only), a further £335,00 is expected to be spent on permanent repairs, £14,000 loss of revenue;
 - vii) Shipley Site (28 January 2025) – £3402.16 property damage.
11. The Claimant company and its sites have not been the only targets for protests by unidentified members of the Palestine Action organisation. Since the commencement of this Claim, and in direct consequence of their role in bringing it on behalf of the Claimant, Keystone Law and Manan Singh (the partner at that firm with conduct of the litigation) have been targeted in a number of incidents. In particular:
- i) 10 March 2025, Keystone Law (Chancery Lane) – four unidentified persons attended Keystone Law’s offices at 2:19am and smashed the front window. A re-purposed fire extinguisher was used to spray red paint on the outside of the building, and the hose also inserted in the hole in the smashed window to spray paint inside the reception area. The pavement was stencilled with “DROP TELEDYNE”. The action was publicised on the Palestine Action Instagram account;
 - ii) 10/11 May 2025, Black Sheep Coffee (Southampton Buildings – off Chancery Lane) – multiple posters were affixed to the outside of the coffee shop, in which Mr Singh was named and pictured, and his affiliation with Keystone Law given, and was accused of being complicit in war crimes and genocide. The poster carried the Palestine Action group logo;
 - iii) 15 May 2025, King’s College London – a student contacted Mr Singh by email to advise that they had come across the same poster when leaving the library the day before.

Procedural History

12. This claim first came before Bourne J on 20th December 2024. On that date, having considered evidence in witness statements prepared by Nicholas Wargent (a Director of the Claimant company) and Manan Singh (the solicitor with conduct of the litigation on behalf of the Claimant) he issued an interim injunction against the first seven Named Defendants and four categories of Persons Unknown. The Order of Bourne J fixed a further hearing for consideration of the continuation of his interim Order for 24th

January 2025. The decision of Bourne J, in which he sets out in detail the evidence that he considered (which evidence I have also considered on the application for a final Order), is reported at **[2024] EWHC 3538 (KB)**.

13. On 24th January Tipples J heard an application for the continuation of the Order of Bourne J by which time a further seven named Defendants had been added to the Claim. Tipples J, having considered a number of further witness statements prepared by Mr Wargent and Mr Singh, extended the order of Bourne J until a final hearing which she fixed for 25th July 2025. Tipples J refused the application of the Claimant to make an order against the four categories of Persons Unknown for a period of five years (subject to annual review) on the basis that there had been recent developments in the Middle East, including a tentative ceasefire, and that a five-year order may in the event not be necessary. She adjourned that issue for determination at the final hearing on 25th July. The form of Order made by Tipples J was identical to that of Bourne J save for the addition of the further Named Defendants.
14. On 21st March 2025 a further application was made by the Claimant to Murray J for an Order in respect of two further Named Defendants (D19 and D20). The prohibitions set out in the Order of Murray J were in identical terms to those against Named Defendants in the Orders of Bourne J and Tipples J.
15. Murray J listed his Order for final hearing alongside that of Tipples J on 25th July 2025.
16. Although some Named Defendants have since settled the claim by signing consent orders and undertakings, twelve named defendants remained live defendants to the claim as of the date of the hearing before me, namely:
 - i) D1 – Julian Allen Gao;
 - ii) D2 – Ruby Hamill;
 - iii) D3 – Daniel Jones;
 - iv) D4 – Najam Shah;
 - v) D5 – Ricky Southall;
 - vi) D6 – Amareen Afzal;
 - vii) D7 – Serena Fenton;
 - viii) D14 – Autumn Taylor-Ward;
 - ix) D16 – Lara Downes;
 - x) D17 – Gabrielle Middleton;
 - xi) D19 – Mary Ensell;
 - xii) D20 – Harry Wade.

17. Two of the remaining twelve Named Defendants (D5 Ricky Southall and D14 Autumn Taylor-Ward) had also signed a consent order settling the claim but did not sign the relevant undertaking that accompanied that order. Despite repeated attempts by the Claimant's solicitors to contact those defendants and to chase their missing signatures, no signed undertaking has been provided by either of them, and they remained live defendants at the hearing on 25th July.
18. The Named Defendants have not engaged with these proceedings at any stage. They have not acknowledged the claim, sought to defend it, made any representations nor attend any previous hearing. No Named Defendant attended the hearing before me on 25th July and no representations were made to the Court, in writing or otherwise, by or on behalf of any defendant (as to which see the postscript to this judgement below).

This Application

19. At the hearing listed before me the Claimant sought final injunctive relief against the remaining twelve Named Defendants and a continuation of the Order against the four categories of Persons Unknown. The Claimant invited me to make a single coterminous Order that would expire on 25th July 2030, with an annual review in respect of Persons Unknown. In support of that application the Claimant relied upon the evidence that had previously been considered by Bourne J, Tipples J and Murray J, together with further witness statements from Scott Patterson (21st May 2025) Nicholas Wargent (23rd May 2025) and Manan Singh (27th May 2025).
20. At the outset of the hearing Natalie Pratt, on behalf of the Claimant, sought permission to rely upon a seventh witness statement prepared in these proceedings by Manan Singh, her instructing solicitor. That statement is dated 21st July 2025 and was accompanied by a large volume of documentary exhibits. On the basis that I was undoubtedly going to be assisted in determining this application by receiving and considering the most up to date evidence about events that were continuing to evolve I granted permission at the outset of the hearing for the Claimant to rely upon that statement.

Procedural Requirement – Notice of the Hearing

21. Each of the Named Defendants was served with the Order of Tipples J or Murray J as applicable to their cases. Those Orders listed this hearing on their face and the other service provisions of each of those orders have been complied with. The applicable certificates of service were produced in the procedural bundle prepared by the Claimant for the hearing.
22. The Claimant drew my attention to the fact that four bundles had been sent to the last known address of the fourth Named Defendant (Najam Shah) but had been returned unopened with an indication that he was no longer at that address. I am nonetheless satisfied that he has been properly served in accordance with the terms of the earlier Orders.
23. The Persons Unknown Defendants have been served with notice of this hearing in accordance with the service provisions of the earlier Orders of Murray J and Tipples J and the Certificates of Service were also before me in the Claimant's procedural bundle. I am entirely satisfied that by discharging the comprehensive notification requirements

in the Orders of Tipples J and Murray J the Claimant has taken all reasonable steps to draw its application to the attention of Persons Unknown in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court in **Wolverhampton City Council & Ors v London Gypsies and Travellers & Ors** [2024] AC 983.

The Law

Causes of Action

24. The Claim is advanced under three heads namely trespass, interference with the Claimant's common law right to access the highway and public nuisance (by obstruction of the highway).

Trespass

25. Trespass to land is the interference with possession or the right to possession and includes instances in which a person intrudes upon the land of another without legal justification. The key and well-established features of trespass are:
- i. it is a strict liability tort, such that the defendant need not know that they are committing a trespass to be liable for the same; and
 - ii. the tort is actionable per se, such that the claimant does not have to prove damage to establish liability for the tort.
26. A person does not commit a trespass where they enter onto the land of another pursuant to a licence, whether express or implied. However, where a person enters onto land pursuant to a licence, and proceeds to act in a way that exceeds the scope of that licence or remains on the land after the expiration of the licence, a trespass is committed (See **Hillen v ICI (Alkali) Ltd** [1936] AC 65 at Paragraph 69 per Lord Atkin).

Interference with the Common Law right to access the highway

27. In **Marshall v Blackpool Corp** [1935] AC 16 at 22 Lord Atkin explained the right to access the public highway:

“The owner of land adjoining a highway has a right of access to the highway from any part of his premises. This is so...whether he is entitled to the whole or some interest in the ground subjacent to the highway or not. The rights of the public to pass along the highway are subject to this right of access; just as the right of access is subject to the rights of the public and must be exercised subject to the general obligations as to nuisance and the like imposed upon a person using the highway.”

28. Having considered that passage from **Marshall** Jonathan Hilliard KC (Sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) held in **Arla Foods Limited & Anr v Persons Unknown & Ors** [2024] EWHC 1952 (Ch) at paragraphs 89 to 93:

“An interference with the right is actionable without proof of loss, and if an interference does cause a loss, then damages can be obtained. Taking the last part of the extract from Marshall above, in my judgment the key question here is the qualification of the right of access by the rights of the public. In Ineos Upstream Ltd v Persons Unknown [2017] EWHC 2945 (Ch), Morgan J considered at [107] the interaction of the

adjoining landowner's right of access to the highway with the protestors' right to a reasonable use of the highway. He assumed in favour of the protestors that if they were carrying on a reasonable use of the highway which impacted on the rights of the claimants in that case to access the highway, that would not be an infringement of the right of access to the highway.

While Morgan J did not have to decide the point, because the claimants in that case put their case on the basis of public nuisance rather than the landowner's right to access the highway, in my judgment that is correct and I should take the same approach here. The rights of the public include the right to reasonable use of the highway. Therefore, applying the principles set out in Marshall, a reasonable use of the highway by members of the public will not constitute unlawful interference with the adjoining landowner's right to access the highway.

It was submitted by the Claimants that the decision of Julian Knowles J in High Speed Two (HS2) Limited v Four Categories of Persons Unknown & Monaghan & Others [2022] EWHC 2360 (KB) at [196] suggests that no balancing act is to be applied between the right to access the highway and the Article 10 and 11 rights of the defendants, because in a claim under this cause of action much, if not all, of the relevant protest is taking place on private land. I do not take Julian Knowles J to be going so far in [196]. Rather he simply put forward the fact that in the case before him much if not all of the protests had taken place on private land as being the first of three reasons why there was no unlawful interference with Articles 10 and 11 on the facts before him. Further, here, the Claimants rely on the obstruction of the highway, such as by protestors mounting and affixing themselves to vehicles on it, as future acts that would breach their right to access the highway, and that acts are not taking place on private land.

However, as set out below, I consider that the apprehended actions would amount to a violation of the Claimants' right to access the highway whether or not such a balancing act is to be applied. Therefore, I do not consider it necessary to consider further the question of whether such a balancing act needs to be applied."

Public Nuisance (by obstruction of the highway)

29. It is long established that in certain circumstances a public nuisance can be occasioned by obstruction of the highway. In *Thurrock Council & Anr v Persons Unknown* [2024] EWHC 2576 (KB) Julian Knowles J, having conducted a comprehensive review of earlier authorities summarised the law in this regard as it relates to protestor cases at Paragraph 64 of his judgement:

"(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 must be wilful.”

Article 10 and Article 11 rights: proportionality

30. An application for injunctive relief that interferes with the qualified Article 10 and 11 right of a Defendant will give rise to additional considerations. Any interference with the Article 10 and 11 rights of a Defendant must be a proportionate means to a legitimate aim, and necessary in a democratic society.
31. In ***DPP v Ziegler & Ors [2022] AC 408*** the Supreme Court set out the test to be applied by a Court when considering the proportionality of any injunctive relief sought. In summary, determination of the issues that arise under Articles 10 and 11 require the Court to ask itself five questions:
 - i) Is what the defendant did in exercise of one of the rights in articles 10 or 11?
 - ii) If so, is there an interference by a public authority with that right?
 - iii) If there is an interference, is it ‘prescribed by law’?
 - iv) If so, is the interference in pursuit of a legitimate aim as set out in paragraph (2) of article 10 or 11, for example the protection of rights of others?
 - v) If so, is the interference ‘necessary in a democratic society’ to achieve that legitimate aim?
32. The fifth and final question will necessarily require a fact specific inquiry in which the Court performs an evaluation of the circumstances of the case before it in order to assess whether any interference is proportionate. That inquiry will itself require the Court to engage with four further questions:
 - i) Is the aim sufficiently important to justify interference with a fundamental right?
 - ii) Is there a rational connection between the means chosen and the aim in view?
 - iii) Are there less restrictive means available to achieve that aim?
 - iv) Is there a fair balance between the rights of the individual and the general interests of the community, including the rights of others?
33. In *Zeigler* (at paragraph 72) the Supreme Court adopted a non-exhaustive list of factors relevant to any proportionality assessment as had been set out by Lord Neuberger in ***City of London Corporation v Samede [2012] PTSR 1624*** (See Paragraphs 39 to 41) which in summary are:

- i) the extent to which the continuation of the protest would breach domestic law;
- ii) the importance of the precise location to the protestors;
- iii) the duration of the protest;
- iv) the degree to which the protestors occupy the land;
- v) 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;
- vi) 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’; and
- vii) whether the protestors ‘believed in the views that they were expressing’.

Article 10 and 11 rights: Trespass

34. When considering Article 10 and 11 rights in the particular context of a claim for trespass Lord Burnett (LCJ) observed in **DPP v Cuciurean [2022] 3 WLR 446 (DC)** at Paragraph 46 that:

“Articles 10 and 11 are subject to limitations or restrictions which are prescribed by law and necessary in a democratic society. Those limitations and restrictions include the law of trespass, the object of which is to protect property rights in accordance with A1P1. On the other hand, property rights might have to yield to articles 10 and 11 if, for example, a law governing the exercise of those rights and use of land were to destroy the essence of the freedom to protest. That would be an extreme situation.”

35. As Sheldon J observed in **The Office Group Properties & Anr v Persons Unknown [2025] EWHC 1438 (KB)** at Paragraph 29 of the Judgement (before disposing of the case on different grounds):

“it will be an unusual case where Article 10 and 11 rights of those who trespass on private land will outweigh the A1P1 rights of the landowner”

36. It is in any event not suggested on the facts of this case that a prohibition on trespass would have the effect of preventing the effective exercise of the Article 10 and 11 rights of any defendant.

Persons Unknown

General Principles

37. The decision of the Supreme Court in **Wolverhampton City Council and others v London Gypsies and Travellers and others [2023] UKSC 47** makes plain that any claim and application for injunctive relief against newcomer Persons Unknown is to be treated differently to those against named defendants. In particular a Claimant must show a ‘compelling need’ for the order sought (at Paragraph 218):

“any [claimant] applying for an injunction against persons unknown, including newcomers ... must satisfy the court by full and detailed evidence that there is a compelling justification for the order sought ... There must be a strong probability that a tort ... is to be committed and that this will cause real harm. Further the threat must be real and imminent.”

38. Following **Wolverhampton**, Ritchie J summarised the requirements for an injunction against persons unknown in **Valero Energy Ltd v Persons Unknown [2024] EWHC 134 (KB)**. In particular a number of substantive and procedural requirements must be satisfied before relief could be granted.
39. The substantive requirements are:
- i) there must be a cause of action;
 - ii) there must be full and frank disclosure by the claimant;
 - iii) there must be sufficient evidence to prove the claim (although this requirement appears to be crafted with the summary judgment application in mind);
 - iv) there must be no realistic defence;
 - v) there must be a compelling justification for the remedy sought, and the court must take into account any balancing exercised that may be required if article 10 and 11 rights are engaged;
 - vi) damages must not be an adequate remedy.
40. The procedural requirements are:
- i) Persons Unknown must be clearly and plainly identified by reference to the tortious conduct to be prohibited, and clearly defined geographical boundaries (if possible);
 - ii) 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;
 - iii) the prohibitions must match the torts claimed;
 - iv) the prohibitions must be defined by clear geographic boundaries (if possible);
 - v) the injunction should be temporally limited to that which is reasonably necessary to protect the claimant’s rights;
 - vi) the proceedings and any order made must be served by alternative means (referred to as ‘notification’ and not service in **Wolverhampton**). The court should have regard to the Human Rights Act 1998, s12(2);
 - vii) there must be a right to set aside or vary any order made;

viii) provision should be made for the review of the injunction in the future.

41. On the basis that in this case the Claimant is seeking an element of precautionary relief the Court would usually be required to have regard to the multi-factorial test stated by Marcus Smith J in **Vastint Leeds BV v Persons Unknown [2019] 4 WLR 2**. That test requires these two questions to be answered in the affirmative before injunctive relief could be granted:

i) First, is there a strong possibility that, unless restrained by an injunction, the defendant will act in breach of the claimant's rights?; and

ii) Second, if the defendant did act in contravention of the claimant's rights, would the resulting harm be so grave and irreparable that, notwithstanding the grant of an immediate interlocutory injunction (at the time of the actual infringement of the claimant's rights) to restrain further occurrence of the acts complained of, a remedy of damages would be inadequate.

42. Those questions are to be addressed by reference to the following factors:

i) in relation to the first question: if the infringement is purely anticipatory, what steps has the claimant taken to ensure that the infringement does not occur; the attitude of the defendants; where infringements have already been committed, it may be that the defendant's intentions are less significant than the natural and probable consequences of his or her act; the time frame between the application for relief and the threatened infringement may be relevant (the courts often use the language of imminence, meaning that the remedy sought must not be premature);

ii) in relation to question two: how easily can the harm of the infringement be undone by ex post rather than ex ante intervention; the gravity of the anticipated harm.

43. In **Rochdale MBC v Persons Unknown [2025] EWHC 1314 (KB)** Garnham J considered the **Vastint** test and how it sat alongside the **Wolverhampton** framework and concluded at Paragraph 78:

"In my judgment, the test articulated by Marcus Smith J in Vastint Leeds BV v Persons Unknown [2019] 4 WLR 2 and approved by Sir Geoffrey Vos MR in Barking and Dagenham v Persons Unknown [2022] EWCA Civ 13 has been subsumed into the Wolverhampton framework. The Vastint test, however, provides a useful double check."

Approach to 'review'

44. At Paragraph 225 of the Judgment in **Wolverhampton** the Supreme Court observed that the temporal limitation and periodic review of newcomer injunctions provides:

"all parties an opportunity to make full and complete disclosure to the court, supported by appropriate evidence, as to how effective the order has been; whether any reasons or grounds for its discharge have emerged; whether there is any proper justification for its continuance; and whether and on what basis a further order ought to be made."

45. A series of recent decisions have considered how the Court should approach the review exercise. In **High Speed Two (HS2) Ltd v Persons Unknown [2024] EWHC 1277**

(KB) (**'HS2'**), Ritchie J considered the correct approach and concluded that (at Paragraph 32):

“Drawing these authorities together, on a review of an interim injunction against PUs and named Defendants, this Court is not starting de novo. The Judges who have previously made the interim injunctions have made findings justifying the interim injunctions. It is not the task of the Court on review to query or undermine those. However, it is vital to understand why they were made, to read and assimilate the findings, to understand the sub-strata of the quia timet, the reasons for the fear of unlawful direct action. Then it is necessary to determine, on the evidence, whether anything material has changed. If nothing material has changed, if the risk still exists as before and the claimant remains rightly and justifiably fearful of unlawful attacks, the extension may be granted so long as procedural and legal rigour has been observed and fulfilled.

On the other hand, if material matters have changed, the Court is required to analyse the changes, based on the evidence before it, and in the full light of the past decisions, to determine anew, whether the scope, details and need for the full interim injunction should be altered. To do so, the original thresholds for granting the interim injunction still apply.”

46. The same approach was taken by Morris J in **Transport for London v Persons Unknown & Ors** [2025] EWHC 55 (KB) and by Hill J when conducting the annual review in **Valero Energy Ltd v Persons Unknown** [2025] EWHC 207 (KB).

47. In **Basingstoke & Deane BC v Persons Unknown** [2025] EWHC 738 the Court took a different approach and conducted a further full Wolverhampton assessment. However, in **Rochdale** Garnham J considered that **Basingstoke** could be regarded as an outlier for good reason on the facts and held that:

“In my judgment the correct approach is dictated by the Supreme Court’s judgment in Wolverhampton and in particular [225]. This is not a “tick box” exercise, but the matters on which evidence should be adduced and argument focussed are (i) how effective the order has been; (ii) whether any reasons or grounds for its discharge have emerged; (iii) whether there is any proper justification for its continuance; and (iv) whether and on what basis a further order ought to be made. The parties should give full disclosure, supported by appropriate evidence, directed towards those questions.”

48. In this case Miss Pratt submits that there has been no change of circumstance that would necessitate a full Wolverhampton assessment and that I should follow the approach taken in **Rochdale** and other cases, effectively treating **Basingstoke** as an outlier.

49. I accept the Claimant’s submission as to the correct approach to review in this case. This is not a de novo hearing of the application for a Persons Unknown Order, and the Court has previously, and on two occasions, performed a full Wolverhampton assessment alongside a Ziegler proportionality assessment. The process of annual review provides an additional check and balance on an Order that has already been the subject of anxious scrutiny against stringent criteria. The purpose of the review is to ensure that there has been no change of circumstance as would mean that the continuation of the order was unnecessary or that it should otherwise be discharged or varied.

Form of any Order

50. Miss Pratt referred the Court, in discharging the Claimant's obligation for full and frank disclosure, to the decision of Nicklin J in ***MBR Acres Limited & Ors v Curtin & Persons Unknown*** [2025] EWHC 331 (KB) (a decision handed down after the Order made by Tipples J in this case).
51. That decision, is notable for two reasons:
- i) Nicklin J granted a true *contra mundum* order on the basis of the decision of the Supreme Court in *Wolverhampton* and found that *Persons Unknown* did not need to be, and ought not to be, defined in any way; and;
 - ii) Nicklin J included within the *contra mundum* order a requirement that the court's permission must be obtained before a contempt application could be made.
52. Having drawn my attention to that decision Miss Pratt nonetheless urged me not to vary the form of any order I am willing to make in this case so as to make it a truly *contra mundum* order. She submitted that such an approach would be inconsistent with the approach taken in a number of other cases decided post ***Wolverhampton***, and that although Fordham J followed the same approach as Nicklin J at the first hearing of a without notice application in ***The Chancellor, Master and Scholars of the University of Cambridge v Persons Unknown*** [2025] EWHC 454 (KB), that approach was not followed by the Soole J on the return date who preferred and adopted the 'conventional' approach (See [2025] EWHC 724 (KB)).
53. Miss Pratt further submits that I should not impose a permission condition in this case. Accepting that such conditions have featured in some other recent injunctions (See for example ***Trinity College Cambridge v Persons Unknown*** and ***St John's College Cambridge v Persons Unknown*** [2025] EWHC 1577 (Ch)), she submits that:
- (i) The Claimant making a contempt application does so at their own risk including as to costs;
 - (ii) There is no reason to suspect that the Claimant in this case would seek to bring vexatious or ill-founded contempt applications before the Court; and
 - (iii) The introduction of a permission requirement is therefore an unnecessary step at this stage.

Evidence

54. In addition to the evidence that had previously been considered by Bourne J, Tipples J and Murray J, (which I received in extensive bundles that I have read and considered carefully) I have also scrutinised the further statements and associated exhibits relied upon by the Claimant from Scott Patterson (21st May 2025) Nicholas Wargent (23rd May 2025) and Manan Singh (27th May 2025).
55. The evidence establishes that since the grant of the initial relief by Bourne J on 20th December 2024 there have been just two instances of unlawful protest at the Shipley site. One of those incidents, on the 28th January 2025, caused major disruption and led

to the addition of two further named defendants to the Claim (Defendants 19 and 20). That position, when compared and contrasted to the position in 2024 and earlier, demonstrates a marked decrease in unlawful protest and a marked decrease in the harm caused by such protests (financial or otherwise). I am satisfied that this decrease in unlawful activity is evidence of the relief having its intended effect, rather than evidence that the risk of further unlawful protest has dissipated.

56. The proscription of Palestine Action and the removal of the group's website does not in my judgement diminish the risk of further unlawful protest. It might rather be said that whilst the risk remains the same, the ability to monitor and respond to that risk has been reduced as following proscription a number of alternative groups have been rapidly formed that all pursue the same aims with similar tactics being deployed.
57. The evidence clearly establishes that unlawful protests of the type suffered by the Claimant continue at other sites and against other bodies and companies that are not themselves protected by injunctive relief. The targeting of the offices of Keystone Law and the solicitor with conduct of this litigation on behalf of the Claimants demonstrates that when enjoined from unlawful protest at the Claimant's sites the focus has shifted to attacking those associated with the Claimant and concerned in obtaining injunctive relief. Were that relief to be withdrawn I have no doubt that the focus would return to Teledyne who would be subject to further unlawful action.
58. The removal of the Palestine Action website, which listed Teledyne and its sites, described them as 'targets', advocated unlawful attacks upon them, and educated those visiting the webpages how to conduct those attacks and how to seek to avoid detection having committed them, does not materially reduce the risk to the Claimant given the emergence of other groups and Teledyne having been publicly named as a target for a prolonged period of time in material that was available to download and easily accessible.
59. The tentative ceasefire that had recently been announced prior to the hearing before Tipples J has not resulted in any lasting end to hostilities. Support for the pro-Palestinian cause remains significant with protests continuing (both lawful and unlawful) on a regular basis.
60. I am satisfied on all of the evidence that the risk of further unlawful action targeting the Claimant's sites remains high and that the relief granted to date has been effective in reducing that risk to the levels that have pertained following the initial grant in December 2024.

Decision

Final Injunction

The Causes of Action

61. I am satisfied on the evidence having regard both to past events and to the very real threat of a repeat of similar unlawful protest in the future, that the conduct of the named Defendants and the identified categories of Persons Unknown would prima facie constitute the torts of trespass, interference with the common law right of the Claimant

to access the highway at its Shipley site and public nuisance by obstruction of the highway.

Requirements for the Grant of a Final Injunction

62. I am further satisfied on the evidence that there remains a real and imminent risk of further unlawful protest at the Claimant's sites and that any such unlawful protests would represent an infringement of the Claimant's rights. No defendant has sought at any stage to engage with the Claimant's application and no arguable defence to the claim has been identified. The fact that since the interim relief was granted the number of incidents has diminished is evidence that the injunctive relief is well targeted and effective.
63. The tactic of pursuing and targeting the lawyers acting for the Claimant represents a shift in emphasis as a direct result of the Court issuing relief. The proscription of Palestine Action has not reduced the risk in my judgement; it has rather made it harder to monitor and respond to that risk. A number of other groups have emerged to fill the vacuum created by proscription and the aims of those groups remain the same. There is no reason to suppose that the Claimant does not remain a 'target' of those groups, and the individuals associated with them.
64. The majority of the named defendants have been charged with a variety of criminal offences arising from their previous targeting of the Claimant. They have been tried or are awaiting trial. All have pleaded not guilty in their criminal proceedings but none of them deny the underlying conduct. As I have already observed all have failed to engage with this Claim in any way.
65. The loss that would be occasioned to the Claimant by further acts of unlawful protest would not in my view be adequately compensated by damages. Significant harm has already been caused to the Claimant's sites. That harm (both caused and risked) is not only financial. There is a significant direct risk of physical harm to the Claimant's staff, the defendants and the wider public by protests that targets secure sites on which are stored highly volatile chemicals and other compounds. There is also an ongoing indirect risk to military personnel occasioned by equipment shortages if disruptive protests on the scale of those to date continue. The financial costs have been significant, both direct and in terms of the further security measures that have had to be taken to secure the Claimant's six sites. The Claimant's should not have to make good the significant destruction caused by the Defendant's actions by conducting repairs.

Articles 10 and 11 of the ECHR

66. Asking myself the five ***Ziegler*** questions the first four can plainly be answered in the affirmative. I have therefore gone on to consider the fifth 'proportionality' question and in doing so the four sub-questions:
 - i) Is the aim sufficiently important to justify interference with a fundamental right?
 - ii) Is there a rational connection between the means chosen and the aim in view?
 - iii) Are there less restrictive means available to achieve that aim?

iv) Is there a fair balance between the rights of the individual and the general interests of the community, including the rights of others?

67. I am satisfied that the aim of the injunctive relief sought is sufficient to justify interference with the Defendant's rights. There is a history of seriously disruptive unlawful conduct designed to obstruct the highway and future disruption would cause significant loss to the Claimant. There is plainly a rational connection between the final injunctive relief sought and the aim of preserving the right of the Claimant to free and unfettered access to the Public Highway. The decrease in unlawful protests since the interim relief was granted demonstrates that the injunction has achieved its intended effect.
68. As I have already observed I do not consider damages to be an adequate remedy and there are no less restrictive means available. I do not consider that recent changes to the law to create new criminal offences aimed at protesters have had the effect of deterring those who seek to unlawfully protest at the Claimant's sites in the manner prohibited by the terms of this injunction.
69. I am also satisfied (as were Bourne J and Tipples J when granting interim Orders), that the making of this final Order will not interfere with or restrict the right to peaceful and lawful protest at any of the Claimant's sites. As the evidence before me demonstrated, peaceful and lawful protests have taken place, and the Order sought would not fetter the right to hold them. Rather, the Order is targeted at the restriction of unlawful protest that would cause further serious losses to the Claimant in addition to those that have already been occasioned.
70. In all of the circumstances I am satisfied that the **Ziegler** requirements are all satisfied and that it is just and convenient to grant the final Order sought against the Named Defendants.

Review of the Injunction against Persons Unknown

71. As I have stated at Paragraph 49 (above) I accept the submissions of the Claimant that in reviewing the Order against Persons Unknown I am not required to make fresh **Wolverhampton** and **Ziegler** assessments; the Court has previously been satisfied of those requirements and the **Valero** procedural requirements before granting interim relief.
72. On review I am satisfied that there are no grounds for the discharge or variation of the relief against Persons Unknown as granted previously (subject to one minor amendment to one of the terms of the final Order that gives proper effect to a right of way running through the Claimant's land). The factual analysis and reasoning that justifies the making of the final Order against the Named Defendants applies equally to the need for an Order against defined categories of Persons Unknown. Even if I had been satisfied that I was required to make a fresh assessment I would have been satisfied that an Order against Persons Unknown was justified on the evidence that I have read and considered and the conclusions I have reached upon it.

Form of Order

73. I am not invited by the Claimant to make a true *contra mundum* Order of the type made by Nicklin J in **MBR Acres**. To the contrary the Claimant positively submits that the Court should not make such an order in this case, arguing that to do so would be to impose an Order of far wider scope than that currently in force with no justification for doing so.
74. At Paragraph 221 in **Wolverhampton** the Supreme Court held that:
- “The actual or intended respondents to the application must be defined as precisely as possible. In so far as it is possible actually to identify persons to whom the order is directed (and who will be enjoined by its terms) by name or in some other way, as Lord Sumption explained in Cameron, the local authority ought to do so. The fact that a precautionary injunction is also sought against newcomers or other persons unknown is not of itself a justification for failing properly to identify these persons when it is possible to do so, and serving them with the proceedings and order, if necessary, by seeking an order for substituted service. It is only permissible to seek or maintain an order directed to newcomers or other persons unknown where it is impossible to name or identify them in some other and more precise way. Even where the persons sought to be subjected to the injunction are newcomers, the possibility of identifying them as a class by reference to conduct prior to what would be a breach (and, if necessary, by reference to intention) should be explored and adopted if possible.”*
75. In **MBR Acres**, Nicklin J concluded that in order to give effect to this aspect of the Judgement it was necessary to make a true *contra mundum* Order. There will no doubt be cases similar to **MBR Acres** in which it will be possible, and indeed desirable, to frame the Order in a similar manner and thereby to achieve the precision in definition required to be compliant with the procedural requirements imposed by the Supreme Court in **Wolverhampton**.
76. However, each case will undoubtedly turn on its own facts and different factual scenarios may require different approaches to the drafting of **Wolverhampton** compliant Orders. In this case I am satisfied that the terms of the previous order defined the intended respondents as precisely as it is possible to do and identifies any newcomers ‘as a class by reference to conduct prior to what would be a breach’. I do not therefore consider it necessary or appropriate to impose a true *contra mundum* order that would mark a significant, and unnecessary, widening of the scope of the order that has hitherto been in place.
77. I note that in the reviews that were conducted in both **London City Airport Ltd & Ors v Persons Unknown (24 June 2025, unrep.) [2025] 6 WLUK 499** and **Esso Petroleum Co Ltd v Persons Unknown [2025] EWHC 1768 (KB)** Bourne J and Sweeting J respectively declined to follow the approach of Nicklin J in **MBR Acres** and did not impose *contra mundum* Orders, each preferring not to interfere with the ‘conventional’ form of Order as had previously been imposed in each case.
78. I am furthermore unpersuaded, notwithstanding the approach taken by Nicklin J on the facts of **MBR Acres**, that there is any blanket requirement to impose a condition that requires the Claimant to seek permission before bringing contempt proceedings. As Sweeting J held in **Esso Petroleum**:

“I observe that the suggestion of a blanket requirement for all newcomer injunctions in protest cases appears to have been made per incuriam given other relevant authorities, such as AG v Times Newspapers Ltd [1974] AC 273, Sectorguard plc v Dienne plc [2009] EWHC 2693 (Ch), and PJSC Vseukrainskyi Aktsionernyi Bank v. Maksimov & Ors [2014] EWHC 4370 (Comm). These cases suggest that the courts already possess adequate mechanisms to address disproportionate committal applications.”

79. There being in my view no blanket requirement to impose a restriction on contempt proceedings, I do not consider it appropriate to impose such a requirement on the facts of this case.
80. There is only one aspect of the previous Orders that requires modification and that is to give effect to a public right of way that passes over the Claimant’s Shipley site. I have given effect to that right of way by making a minor adjustment to Paragraph 2(i)(a) of the Order which ensures that no person would breach the terms of the Order by exercising their right to pass and re-pass only along the public right of way.

Length of the Order

81. Although Tipples J declined to make a five-year order against Persons Unknown (subject to annual review) she did so on the basis that events in the Middle East at the time of the hearing before her may have resulted in an order of that length being unnecessary. The issue of the length of Order was ultimately adjourned to be determined at the final hearing. I take the view that any optimism the Court may have held as regards the need for a longer order appears to have been misplaced in the light of subsequent events. I take the view that a five-year Order is appropriate and remind myself that in any event an application may be made to set aside this Order, and it will also be subject to annual review. If in twelve months the Court concluded that in fact a five-year Order was no longer required, it would be open to the Court to then vary or discharge the Order I have made. Important safeguards against an unduly long order are built into the annual review process.
82. Having concluded that the Order should be made for a five-year period I have issued a single Order that applies for the same duration of time in the case of the Named Defendants and Persons Unknown and consolidates the earlier orders made by Tipples J and Murray J into a single Order.

Conclusion

83. For the reasons that I have now given, I issued a single Order on 25th July 2025 in respect of both the Named Defendants and the Persons Unknown Defendants for a period of five years, namely until 25th July 2030.
84. As regards the Persons Unknown Defendants the Order will be subject to annual review, the first such review taking place no later than 25th July 2026.
85. The twelve named Defendants referred to in Paragraph 11 of my Order (D1 – 7, D14, D16, D17, D19 and D20) will pay the Claimant’s costs on the standard basis to be assessed. Each of them must make a payment on account of costs in the sum of £6125 by 4pm on 8th August 2025.

Postscript: Costs Order D19 and D20

86. By an email to the Court office timed at 5.19 pm on Friday 25th July Robert Lizar Solicitors invited me to vary the order for Costs that I had made in respect of Mary Ensell and Harry Wade, the 19th and 20th Named Defendants. The email explained that Robert Lizar Solicitors do not act for those defendants in the hearing that was listed before me but do act for them in contempt proceedings that had been listed before Stacey J on 28th July 2025. The email made the following request:

“We write in respect of the Order made today renewing the Injunction and ordering costs of £6,125 against each of the named defendants in the Injunction Proceedings of £6,125, to be paid by 4pm on 8 August 2025.

The reason for this email is that our clients had understood that a settlement had been reached in the Contempt Application, which ensured that no costs would be sought against them in the Injunction Proceedings, as well as the Contempt Application.

It was the Defendant’s understanding that the settlement agreement would be a full and final agreement relating to all financial claims and costs between the parties. The terms of the agreement are described in the Claimant’s skeleton argument as: “The Claimant will undertake not to pursue the Defendants for any financial loss at this time or in the future”.

On this basis our clients did not attend today’s hearing, as they did not contest the injunction renewal and understood that costs would not be sought against them.

Following the hearing, this matter was raised with the Claimant in an attempt to reach an agreement. There is a dispute between the parties regarding the scope of the settlement agreement reached. The Claimant (copied into this email) does not accept that the settlement reached in the committal application applies to the injunction proceedings (and disputes that the skeleton argument quoted reflects the terms of the agreement). Unfortunately, it does not appear that agreement will be reached between the parties.

The Court clearly made the costs orders today without being informed about or addressed on any of these matters. As stated, had our clients been aware that the Claimants would seek costs they would have attended the hearing. In order to allow for a fair disposal of the costs in the claim we therefore respectfully request that our clients be allowed to make brief submissions on costs in writing to the Court as to why the costs order against them should be set aside, to which the Claimant can of course respond.

We submit that the most proportionate method to address the issue is to vary the order made today to allow for submissions to be made in writing by the Defendants. We understand that the Claimant’s position is that a formal application to vary the costs order should be made by our clients. In our submission this will incur unnecessary expense and delay which is not required and is not proportionate to the issues. We should inform the court that both our clients are each of extremely limited means, they are unable to afford legal representation. Legal aid is not available in relation to the main injunction proceedings and only covers the committal applications. This is a

discrete issue that could be resolved proportionately and fairly through short written submissions by both parties.

Should the Court accede to our request, then we would ask for a period of 7 days to serve our client's submissions, allowing the Claimant a further appropriate period (of no less than 7 days) to respond."

87. I do not accept the premise of the email that the non-attendance of the Defendants at the hearing before me was because they did not anticipate an application for costs to be made against them; as I observed in the body of my Judgement they have not engaged with this Claim in any way or at any stage. The opportunity to address the issue of costs was at the hearing before me on 25th July of which they were fully aware. The Defendants did not take that opportunity and I do not consider it appropriate to now informally set aside or otherwise vary my Order. It is a matter for the Defendant's whether they now seek to make a formal application to vary with the attendant cost implications of doing so.

ANNEXE A

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE BELOW NAMED DEFENDANTS OR PERSONS UNKNOWN OR ANY OF YOU DISOBEY THIS ORDER OR INSTRUCT OR ENCOURAGE OTHERS TO BREACH THIS ORDER YOU MAY BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE YOUR ASSETS SEIZED.

ANY OTHER PERSON WHO KNOWS OF THIS ORDER AND DOES ANYTHING WHICH HELPS OR PERMITS THE DEFENDANTS BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

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

Claim No. KB-2024-004175

**Before Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court)
25 July 2025**

B E T W E E N :

TELEDYNE UK LIMITED

Claimant

-and-

(3) JULIAN ALLEN GAO

(4) – (7) OTHER NAMED DEFENDANTS AS LISTED AT SCHEDULE 1 TO THIS ORDER AND ALSO AT SCHEDULE 1 TO THE CLAIM FORM

(12) 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).**

**(13) 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**

**(14) 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)**

**(15) 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 THIS ORDER AND ALSO AT SCHEDULE 1 TO THE CLAIM FORM**

Defendants

INJUNCTION ORDER

UPON the Claimant’s claim brought by way of a Part 8 Claim Form dated 13 December 2024 (the ‘Claim’)

AND UPON the Claimant having been granted injunctive relief against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) and interim injunctive relief against the Named Defendants by way of orders dated 20 December 2024, 24 January 2025 and 21 March 2025

AND UPON the Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fifteenth and Eighteenth Defendants settling the proceedings by giving undertakings to the court

AND UPON the court reading the witness statements listed in Schedule 2 to this Order

AND UPON the court at this hearing (i) considering the final disposal of the Claim against the remaining Named Defendants and (ii) reviewing the Order as against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown)

AND UPON hearing Natalie Pratt of counsel and without any attendance by or on behalf of any Defendant

AND UPON the court being satisfied that each of the remaining Named Defendants and Persons Unknown have been given notice of this hearing

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

Definitions

1. For the purpose of this Order:

- i. The **‘Shipley Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, Airedale House, Acorn Park, Shipley BD17 7SW, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order;
- ii. The **‘Lincoln Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, 168 Sadler Road, Lincoln LN6 3RS, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 2 to this Order;
- iii. **‘Wirral Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, Unit A, 6 Tebay Road, Bromborough, Birkenhead, Wirral CH62 3PA, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 3 to this Order;
- iv. The **‘Chelmsford Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, 106 Waterhouse Lane, Chelmsford CM1 2QU, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 4 to this Order;
- v. The **‘Presteigne Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, Broadaxe Business Park, Presteigne LD8 2UH, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 5 to this Order;
- vi. The **‘Newbury Site’** shall mean Teledyne UK Limited, Reynolds Navigation House, Canal View Road, Newbury RG14 5UR, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 6 to this Order;
- vii. The road known as **‘Acorn Park’** means the road marked in purple on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order.

INJUNCTION

2. Until and including 25 July 2030, the **First to Seventh Defendants, Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown), Fourteenth Defendant, Sixteenth Defendant, Seventeenth Defendant, Nineteenth Defendant** and the **Twentieth Defendant** and each of them (whether by themselves or by instructing, encouraging, or allowing any other person) are forbidden from:

- i. Entering or remaining on the following sites and/or entering or remaining in or on buildings on the following sites:

- a) the Shipley Site, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order (save for when exercising the right to pass and re-pass only along any public right of way);
 - b) the Lincoln Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 2 to this Order;
 - c) the Wirral Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 3 to this Order;
 - d) the Chelmsford Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 4 to this Order;
 - e) the Presteigne Site, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 5 to this Order; and
 - f) the Newbury Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 6 to this Order.
- ii. Depositing any item or substance on the following sites, affixing themselves or any other item to any building, structure or fixture on the following sites, and/or defacing or damaging any building, structure or fixture on the following sites:
 - a) the Shipley Site, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order;
 - b) the Lincoln Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 2 to this Order;
 - c) the Wirral Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 3 to this Order;
 - d) the Chelmsford Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 4 to this Order;
 - e) the Presteigne Site, as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 5 to this Order; and
 - f) the Newbury Site, as marked in red on the plan at Annexe 6 to this Order.
- iii. Blocking, slowing down, obstructing or otherwise interfering with vehicular access to or from the highway at the Shipley Site (as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order);
- iv. Approaching, slowing down or obstructing any vehicle moving along or accessing the road known as Acorn Park, Shipley (as marked in purple on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order) for the purpose of:
 - a) disrupting vehicular access to or from the Shipley Site (as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order); and
 - b) protesting.

- v. Affixing themselves or any other item to, or leaving or depositing any item on, the road known as Acorn Park, Shipley (as marked in purple on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order) for the purpose of:
 - a) disrupting vehicular access to or from the Shipley Site (as marked in red in the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order); and
 - b) protesting.
- vi. Affixing themselves or any other items to any vehicle on, entering or exiting the Shipley Site (as marked in red on the plans at Annexe 1 to this Order), where that affixation is done for the purpose of protesting.

Service and notification

3. Pursuant to CPR rules 6.15 and 6.27, the Claimant has permission to serve the First to Seventh Defendants, Fourteenth Defendant, Sixteenth Defendant, Seventeenth Defendant, Nineteenth Defendant and the Twentieth Defendant with, and notify the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) of, this Order and any further documents in the Claim by (with 3(i) – 3(iv) to be treated conjunctively):

- i. **Website:** placing a copy of the documents to be served on a website or webpage operated by the Claimant, a link to which shall be placed on the Claimant's main website; and
- ii. **Email:** sending a copy of the documents to be served to Palestine Action, Bradford Friends of Palestine and the Palestine Solidarity Campaign (including the relevant local branches) at the following email addresses

info@palestineaction.org;
media@palestinecampaign.org;
info@palestinecampaign.org;
pscchelmsford@gmail.com;
liverpoolfopal@gmail.com;
bfdfriendsofpalestine@yahoo.com;

actions@palestineaction.org;
branches@palestinecampaign.org;
palestinesolidaritybradford@gmail.com;
lincolnpalestine@gmail.com;
pscshrop@gmail.com;

and providing a link by which the webpage or website mentioned in paragraph 3(i) above can be accessed.

- iii. **Post:** where an address of a Named Defendant is known to the Claimant, by posting a copy of the documents to be served together with a covering letter by way of first-class post;
- iv. **Signs:** placing signs on the perimeter of the Shipley Site, Lincoln Site, Wirral Site, Chelmsford Site, Presteigne Site and Newbury Site, which advise that a High Court injunction is in force that restricts some protest activities, and which provide a weblink and QR code by which the website or webpage mentioned in paragraph 3(i) above can be accessed;

- v. **Where requested by a Defendant:** the documents to be served may be served by email where the Defendant has requested that they be served by email, by sending the email to the address provided by the Defendant; or
 - vi. **Lawyers:** by serving any solicitor acting for a Defendant who has filed a notice of acting in these proceedings.
4. The deemed date of service of any documents referred to in paragraph 3 above shall be the day on which service of the document or documents is completed in accordance with paragraph 3 above.

Liberty to Apply

5. The Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) or any other person other than a Named Defendant and who is affected by this Order may apply to the court at any time to vary or discharge this Order or so much of it as affects that person, but they must first give the Claimant's solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of that application, that evidence must be served on the Claimant's solicitors 48 hours in advance of the hearing.
6. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name and address for service.

Review of the Order against Persons Unknown

7. The Order against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown) shall be reviewed at a hearing no later than **25 July 2026** (or as near to that date as the court can reasonably accommodate), with a time estimate of ½ day, unless the Claimant indicates to the court that it does not seek an extension of the Order, upon which the Order will expire as against Persons Unknown only.
8. The Claimant must file and notify Persons Unknown of (in accordance with paragraph 3 above) any evidence upon which it intends to rely at the review hearing by 4pm on 4 July 2026. Any other person who would like to participate in the review hearing must also file and serve on the Claimant any evidence upon which they intend to rely at the review hearing by 4pm on 4 July 2026.

Communications with the Claimant and the Court

9. All communications with the Claimant about this Order should be sent by email to the Claimant's solicitors, Keystone Law, at info.teledyne@keystonelaw.co.uk.
10. All communications with the Court about this Order should be sent to KBJudgesListingOffice@justice.gov.uk or Room E03 Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London WC2A 2LL. The Telephone number is 020 3938957. The offices are open between 10am and 4pm Monday to Friday.

Costs

11. The First to Seventh Defendants, Fourteenth Defendant, Sixteenth Defendant, Seventeenth Defendant, Nineteenth Defendant and the Twentieth Defendant shall pay the Claimant's costs of the claim on the standard basis to be assessed if not agreed.
12. The First to Seventh Defendants, Fourteenth Defendant, Sixteenth Defendant, Seventeenth Defendant, Nineteenth Defendant and the Twentieth Defendant shall each make a payment of account of costs to the Claimant in the sum of £6,125 by 4pm on 8 August 2025.
13. No Order as to costs against the Eighth to Eleventh Defendants (Persons Unknown).

Dated 25 July 2025

GUIDANCE NOTES

Effect of this Order – the Defendants

1. A Defendant who is an individual and who is ordered not to do something must not do it him or herself or in any other way nor must he/she do it through others acting on his/her behalf or on his/her instructions or with his/her encouragement.

Interpretation of this Order

2. In this Order, references to 'the Defendant' means any or all of them (unless expressly stated otherwise).
3. A requirement to serve on a 'Defendant' means on each of them. However, the Order is effective against any Defendant on whom it is served in accordance with this Order.
4. An Order requiring 'the Defendant' not to do anything applies to all Defendants.
5. This Order contains the following schedules and annexes
 - i. Schedule 1 – Named Defendants;
 - ii. Schedule 2 – witness statements;
 - iii. Annexe 1 – plans of the Shipley Site;
 - iv. Annexe 2 – plan of the Lincoln Site;
 - v. Annexe 3 – plan of the Wirral Site;
 - vi. Annexe 4 – plan of the Chelmsford Site;
 - vii. Annexe 5 – plans of the Presteigne Site;
 - viii. Annexe 6 – plan of the Newbury Site.

SCHEDULE 1 – NAMED DEFENDANTS

- (1) JULIAN ALLEN GAO
- (2) RUBY HAMILL
- (3) DANIEL JONES
- (4) NAJAM SHAH
- (5) RICKY SOUTHALL
- (6) AMAREEN AFZAL
- (7) SERENA FENTON
- (16) CHERYL LEANAGHAN
- (17) MAIS ROBINSON
- (18) AUTUMN TAYLOR-WARD
- (19) ANABELLA BARRINGER
- (20) LARA DOWNES
- (21) GABRIELLE MIDDLETON
- (22) LUKE CARTER
- (23) MARY ENSELL
- (24) HARRY WADE

SCHEDULE 2 – WITNESS STATEMENTS


The Court read the following witness statements on behalf of the Claimants:

- 1. The first witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 13 December 2024;
- 2. The first witness statement of Manan Singh dated 13 December 2024;
- 3. The second witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 19 December 2024;
- 4. The third witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 15 January 2025;
- 5. The third witness statement of Manan Singh dated 23 January 2025;
- 6. The fourth witness statement of Manan Singh dated 13 February 2025;
- 7. The fifth witness statement of Manan Singh dated 18 March 2025;
- 8. The first witness statement of Scott Douglas Patterson dated 21 May 2025;

9. The fourth witness statement of Nicholas James Wargent dated 23 May 2025;
10. The sixth (labelled 'fifth') witness statement of Manan Singh dated 27 May 2025;
11. The seventh witness statement of Manan Singh dated 21 July 2025.

ANNEXE 1 – SHIPLEY SITE





Promap

LANDRAVE INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WYK387275

ANNEXE 2 – LINCOLN SITE



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024, OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: LL317736

ANNEXE 3 – WIRRAL SITE



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: MS575234

ANNEXE 4 – CHELMSFORD SITE



Promap

LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:4000. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: EX688035

ANNEXE 5 – PRESTEIGNE SITE



Promap © Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
LANDMARK INFORMATION Plotted Scale - 1:1000, Paper Size - A4

Title Number: CYM839162



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:750. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WA552132

ANNEXE 6 – NEWBURY SITE



Promap
LANDMAP INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024, OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:750, Paper Size - A4

Title Number: BK365055

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve? 29/07/2025

The date of service is 29/07/2025

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Sealed Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) dated 25 July 2025

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

See Schedule 1 Attached

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☒ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with
(.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

☐ by other means permitted by the court
(please specify)

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)*

☐ by other electronic means (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

See Schedule 1 Attached

Being the

☐ claimant's
☐ solicitor's

☒ defendant's
☐ litigation friend

☒ usual residence

☒ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☐ other *(please specify)*

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name

Manan Singh

Signed

M Singh

(Claimant) (Defendant) ('s solicitor) ('s litigation friend)

Position or office held

Partner

(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Date

05/08/2025

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Schedule 1

- D1** JULIAN ALLEN GAO of 11 Ellesmere Place, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 5AE
- D2** RUBY HAMILL of 14A Emu Road, Wandsworth, London SW8 3PR
- D3** DANIEL JONES of 2 Rossett Road, Crosby, Sefton L23 3AW
- D4** NAJAM SHAH of 24 Cliffe Gardens, Shipley, Bradford BD18 3DB
- D5** RICKY SOUTHALL of 3 Clarendon Street, Wakefield, West Yorkshire WF1 3RQ
- D6** AMAREEN AFZAL of 11 North Hill Road, Flat F, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 2EN
- D7** SERENA FENTON of 19 Foxcroft Green, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 3NR
- D14** AUTUMN TAYLOR-WARD of 88 Allington Street, Liverpool, Merseyside L17 7AF
- D16** LARA DOWNES of 49 Gipsy Hill, Flat 3, London SE19 1QH
- D17** GABRIELLE MIDDLETON of 21 Athelstan Road, Margate, Kent CT9 2BD
- D19** MARY ENSELL of 24 Aylton Road, Huyton, Merseyside L36 2LU
- D20** HARRY WADE of Beaumont 178 Leverington Road, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire PE13 1RU

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
2 5 / 0 7 / 2 0 2 5

The date of service is
2 5 / 0 7 / 2 0 2 5

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Sealed Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) dated 25 July 2025

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendant 8 - Defendant 11

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with
(.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

☒ by other means permitted by the court
(please specify)

Email times at Schedule 1 in accordance with para 3 of the Order of Richard Wright KC dated 25/07/2025.

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)*

☒ by other electronic means (Sch 1.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

See Schedule 1 Attached

Being the

☐ claimant's

☒ defendant's

☐ solicitor's

☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☒ other *(please specify)*

Known Emails for Service

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name

Manan Singh

Signed

M Singh

(Claimant) (~~Defendant~~) (~~'s solicitor~~) (~~'s litigation friend~~)

Position or office held

Partner

(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Date

0 5 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 5

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Schedule 1

1. media@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:17:26
2. info@palestineaction.org - Email sent at:17:28
3. info@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:17:28
4. pscchelmsford@gmail.com - Email sent at: 17:28
5. pscshrop@gmail.com - Email sent at:17:28
6. lincolnpalestine@gmail.com - Email sent at:17:30
7. liverpoolfopal@gmail.com - Email sent at:17:28
8. palestinesolidaritybradford@gmail.com - Email sent at:17:28
9. branches@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:17:29
10. actions@palestineaction.org - Email sent at:17:29
11. bdfdfriendsofpalestine@yahoo.com - Email sent at:17:29

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
2 5 / 0 7 / 2 0 2 5

The date of service is 2 5 / 0 7 / 2 0 2 5

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Sealed Order of Richard Wright KC (sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court) dated 25 July 2025

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendant 8 - Defendant 11

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with (.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) (please specify)

☒ by other means permitted by the court (please specify)

On Claimant injunction website in accordance with para 3 of the Order of Richard Wright KC dated 25/07/2025.

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) (you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)

☐ by other electronic means (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) (please specify)

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

https://www.teledyne-injunction.co.uk/

Being the

☐ claimant's

☐ defendant's

☐ solicitor's

☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☐ other (please specify)

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name

Manan Singh

Signed

M Singh

(Claimant) (Defendant) ('s solicitor) ('s litigation friend)

Position or office held

Partner

(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Date

0 5 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 5

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
1 1 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

The date of service is
1 1 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Notice of Hearing for the Annual Review Listed on 21 July 2026

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

See Schedule 1 Attached

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☒ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with
(.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

☐ by other means permitted by the court
(please specify)

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)*

☐ by other electronic means (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

See Schedule 1 Attached

Being the

☐ claimant's

☒ defendant's

☐ solicitor's

☐ litigation friend

☒ usual residence

☒ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☐ other *(please specify)*

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name
Manan Singh

Signed

(Claimant) (~~Defendant~~) (~~'s solicitor~~) (~~'s litigation friend~~)

Date
1 4 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

Position or office held
Partner
(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Schedule 1

- D1** JULIAN ALLEN GAO of 11 Ellesmere Place, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey KT12 5AE
- D2** RUBY HAMILL of 14A Emu Road, Wandsworth, London SW8 3PR
- D3** DANIEL JONES of 2 Rossett Road, Crosby, Sefton L23 3AW
- D4** NAJAM SHAH of 24 Cliffe Gardens, Shipley, Bradford BD18 3DB
- D5** RICKY SOUTHALL of 3 Clarendon Street, Wakefield, West Yorkshire WF1 3RQ
- D6** AMAREEN AFZAL of 11 North Hill Road, Flat F, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 2EN
- D7** SERENA FENTON of 19 Foxcroft Green, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 3NR
- D14** AUTUMN TAYLOR-WARD of 88 Allington Street, Liverpool, Merseyside L17 7AF
- D16** LARA DOWNES of 49 Gipsy Hill, Flat 3, London SE19 1QH
- D17** GABRIELLE MIDDLETON of 21 Athelstan Road, Margate, Kent CT9 2BD
- D19** MARY ENSELL of 24 Aylton Road, Huyton, Merseyside L36 2LU
- D20** HARRY WADE of Beaumont 178 Leverington Road, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire PE13 1RU

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
1 1 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

The date of service is
1 1 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Notice of Hearing for the Annual Review Listed on 21 July 2026

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendant 8 - Defendant 11

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with
(.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

☐ by other means permitted by the court
(please specify)

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)*

☒ by other electronic means (Sch 1.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

See Schedule 1 Attached

Being the ☐ claimant's ☒ defendant's
☐ solicitor's ☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☒ other *(please specify)*

Known Email for Service

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name
Manan Singh

Signed

(Claimant) (~~Defendant~~) (~~'s solicitor~~) (~~'s litigation friend~~)

Date
1 4 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

Position or office held
Partner
(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Schedule 1

1. media@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:11:57
2. info@palestineaction.org - Email sent at:11:57
3. info@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:11:57
4. pscchelmsford@gmail.com - Email sent at: 11:57
5. pscshrop@gmail.com - Email sent at:11:58
6. lincolnpalestine@gmail.com - Email sent at:11:58
7. liverpoolfopal@gmail.com - Email sent at:11:57
8. palestinesolidaritybradford@gmail.com - Email sent at:11:57
9. branches@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:11:57
10. actions@palestineaction.org - Email sent at:11:57
11. bdfdfriendsofpalestine@yahoo.com - Email sent at:11:57

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
1 1 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

The date of service is 1 1 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Notice of Hearing for the Annual Review Listed on 21 July 2026

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendant 8 - Defendant 11

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with
(.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

☒ by other means permitted by the court
(please specify)

On Claimant injunction website in accordance with para 3 of the Order of Richard Wright KC 25/07/2025

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)*

☒ by other electronic means (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

https://www.teledyne-injunction.co.uk/

Being the ☐ claimant's ☐ defendant's
☐ solicitor's ☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☐ other *(please specify)*

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name Manan Singh

Signed  Position or office held Partner

(Claimant) (~~Defendant~~) (~~'s solicitor~~) (~~'s litigation friend~~) (If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Date 1 4 / 0 5 / 2 0 2 6

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

The date of service is
3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Sealed Application Notice; Draft Order; Fifth Witness Statement of Nicholas James Wargent; and Exhibit NJW5

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendant 8 - Defendant 11

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with
(.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

☒ by other means permitted by the court
(please specify)

Email times at Schedule 1 in accordance with para 3 of the Order of Richard Wright KC dated 25/07/2025.

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)*

☒ by other electronic means (Sch 1.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

See Schedule 1 Attached

Being the ☐ claimant's ☒ defendant's
☐ solicitor's ☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☒ other *(please specify)*

Known Email for Service

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name
Manan Singh

Signed

(Claimant) (~~Defendant~~) (~~'s solicitor~~) (~~'s litigation friend~~)

Date
3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

Position or office held
Partner
(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Schedule 1

1. media@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:11:55
2. info@palestineaction.org - Email sent at:11:55
3. info@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:11:55
4. pscchelmsford@gmail.com - Email sent at: 11:56
5. pscshrop@gmail.com - Email sent at:11:56
6. lincolnpalestine@gmail.com - Email sent at:11:56
7. liverpoolfopal@gmail.com - Email sent at:11:56
8. palestinesolidaritybradford@gmail.com - Email sent at:11:56
9. branches@palestinecampaign.org - Email sent at:11:56
10. actions@palestineaction.org - Email sent at:11:56
11. bdfdfriendsofpalestine@yahoo.com - Email sent at:11:56

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve?
3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

The date of service is
3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Sealed Application Notice; Draft Order; Fifth Witness Statement of Nicholas James Wargent; and Exhibit NJW5

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendant 8 - Defendant 11

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with
(.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

☒ by other means permitted by the court
(please specify)

On Claimant injunction website in accordance with para 3 of the Order of Richard Wright KC 25/07/2025

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)*

☒ by other electronic means (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

https://www.teledyne-injunction.co.uk/

Being the ☐ claimant's ☐ defendant's
☐ solicitor's ☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☐ other *(please specify)*

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name Manan Singh

Signed  _____

(Claimant) (Defendant) ('s solicitor) ('s litigation friend)

Position or office held Partner

(If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Date 3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day

In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.

Certificate of service

Name of court High Court of Justice Kings Bench Division	Claim No. KB-2024-004175
Name of Claimant TELEDYNE UK LIMITED	
Name of Defendant JULIAN ALLEN GAO, RUBY HAMILL, DANIEL JONES, NAJAM SHAH, RICKY SOUTHALL, and Others	

On what day did you serve? 3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

The date of service is 3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

What documents did you serve?
Please attach copies of the documents you have not already filed with the court.

Notice of Hearing; Sealed Application Notice; Draft Order; Fifth Witness Statement of Nicholas James Wargent; and Exhibit NJW5

On whom did you serve?
(If appropriate include their position e.g. partner, director).

Defendants named in the Orders

How did you serve the documents?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ by first class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day

☐ by delivering to or leaving at a permitted place

☐ by personally handing it to or leaving it with (.....time left, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

☒ by other means permitted by the court *(please specify)*

In accordance with para 3 (iv) of the Order of Richard Wright KC dated 25 July 2025

☐ by Document Exchange

☐ by fax machine (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(you may want to enclose a copy of the transmission sheet)*

☐ by other electronic means (.....time sent, where document is other than a claim form) *(please specify)*

Give the address where service effected, include fax or DX number, e-mail address or other electronic identification

Being the ☐ claimant's ☐ defendant's ☐ solicitor's ☐ litigation friend

☐ usual residence

☐ last known residence

☐ place of business

☐ principal place of business

☐ last known place of business

☐ last known principal place of business

☐ principal office of the partnership

☐ principal office of the corporation

☐ principal office of the company

☐ place of business of the partnership/company/ corporation within the jurisdiction with a connection to claim

☐ other *(please specify)*

I believe that the facts stated in this certificate are true.

Full name Manan Singh

Signed  Position or office held Partner

(Claimant) (Defendant) ('s solicitor) ('s litigation friend) (If signing on behalf of firm or company)

Date 3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 2 6

Rules relating to the service of documents are contained in Part 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules (www.justice.gov.uk) and you should refer to the rules for information.

Calculation of deemed day of service of a claim

A claim form served within the UK in accordance with Part 6 of the Civil Procedure rules is deemed to be served on the second business day after the claimant has completed the steps required by CPR 7.5(1).

Calculation of the deemed day of service of documents other than the claim form (CPR 6.26)

Method of service	Deemed day of service
First class post or other service which provides for delivery on the next business day	The second day after it was posted, left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Document exchange	The second day after it was left with, delivered to or collected by the relevant service provider provided that day is a business day; or if not, the next business day after that day
Delivering the document to or leaving it at a permitted address	If it is delivered to or left at the permitted address on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day
Fax	If the transmission of the fax is completed on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was transmitted
Other electronic method	If the email or other electronic transmission is sent on a business day before 4.30pm, on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after the day on which it was sent
Personal service	If the document is served personally before 4.30pm on a business day, it is served on that day; or in any other case, on the next business day after that day


In this context 'business day' means any day except Saturday, Sunday or a bank holiday; (under the Banking and Financial Dealings Act 1971 in the part of the UK where service is to take place) includes Good Friday and Christmas Day.



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1250. Paper Size – A4

Title Number: WYK387275







Presteigne



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:1000. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: CYM839162

Presteigne



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:750. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: WA552132



Promap
LANDMARK INFORMATION

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2024. OS AC0000813445
Plotted Scale - 1:750. Paper Size - A4

Title Number: BK365055