



Bristol Airport Northside House - Plan 3G



LEASE PLAN - NSH FIRST FLOOR LEVEL

Scale 1:250




SITE REFERENCE PLAN

Scale 1:2500

KEY		TODD ARCHITECTS 2ND FLOOR TITANIC HOUSE, 6 QUEENS ROAD, BELFAST BT3 9DT, T +44 (0) 28 9024 5587, E INFO@TODDARCH.CO.UK		TODD		
<p>— DENOTES LEASE DEMISE TOTAL DEMISE AREA: 112.3m²</p> <p># DENOTES NORTHSIDE HOUSE (NSH) LOCATION</p>		Status: INFORMATION Date: 30/04/2019 Dwn by: MM Ckd by: EH Scale: VARIES Page: A4			Client: BRISTOL AIRPORT Project Name: NORTHSIDE HOUSE REFURB Drawing Title: SWISSPORT	
Rev no:	Date:	Amendment:	Drwn by:	Chk'd by:	Drawing No: 18034 - LE2-05	Revision: 0




Bristol Airport Northside House - Plan 3H



LEASE PLAN - NSH FIRST FLOOR LEVEL

Scale 1:250



SITE REFERENCE PLAN

Scale 1:2500

KEY

- DENOTES LEASE DEMISE
TOTAL DEMISE AREA: **147m²**
- # DENOTES NORTHSIDE HOUSE (NSH) LOCATION


TODD ARCHITECTS
2ND FLOOR TITANIC HOUSE,
6 QUEENS ROAD, BELFAST
BT3 9DT,
T +44 (0) 28 9024 5587,
E INFO@TODDARCH.CO.UK



INFORMATION		Status:		Client:	
		Date: 30/04/2019		Project Name: NORTHSIDE HOUSE REFURB	
Dwn by: MM		Ckd by: EH		Drawing Title: easyJet (DHL)	
Scale: VARIES		Page: A4		Drawing No: 18034 - LE2-04	
Rev no:	Date:	Amendment:	Drwn by:	Chk'd by:	Revision: 0




Bristol Airport Northside House - Plan 3I



LEASE PLAN - NSH GROUND FLOOR LEVEL

Scale 1:250



SITE REFERENCE PLAN

Scale 1:2500

KEY		TODD ARCHITECTS 2ND FLOOR TITANIC HOUSE, 6 QUEENS ROAD, BELFAST BT3 9DT, T +44 (0) 28 9024 5587, E INFO@TODDARCH.CO.UK		TODD	
— DENOTES LEASE DEMISE		Status:		Client:	
TOTAL DEMISE AREA: 49.7m²		INFORMATION		BRISTOL AIRPORT	
# DENOTES NORTHSIDE HOUSE (NSH) LOCATION		Date:		Project Name:	
		30/04/2019		NORTHSIDE HOUSE REFURB	
		Dwn by:		Drawing Title:	
		MM EH		MORSON	
		Scale:		Drawing No:	
		VARIES A4		18034 - LE2-02	
Rev no:	Date:	Amendment:	Drwn by:	Chk'd by:	Revision:
					0

CLAIM NO: KB-2024-002473

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION**

**BEFORE MR JUSTICE JACOBS
DATED 6TH AUGUST 2024**

BETWEEN:-

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
AND FIVE OTHERS

- v -

(1) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT SHOWN EGGED RED ON PLAN 1 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OTHERWISE)

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE DEFENDANTS, 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 OR ANY OF THEM TO BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

This Order prohibits you from doing certain acts. You should read this Order very carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to apply to the court to vary or discharge this Order (which is explained below).



BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE JACOBS

ON 6 AUGUST 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form dated 31 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' application for an injunction dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the witness statements of Stuart Sherbrooke Wortley dated 1 August 2024 and dated 6 August 2024, Nick Barton dated 31 July 2024, John Irving dated 31 July 2024 and Graeme Gamble dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**")

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Mr Sibley, Counsel for the Claimants and no one attending for the Defendants

AND UPON the First Claimant giving and the Court accepting the undertakings set out in Schedule 2 to this Order

AND UPON the First Claimant informing the Court that any requests from those wishing to carry out peaceful protest to designate an area for that purpose at Birmingham Airport, as defined by this Order, should be made by email to protestrequest@birminghamairport.co.uk

AND UPON the Claimants amending the sealed Claim Form and Particulars of Claim prior to service, pursuant to CPR 17.1(1), to substitute a new plan 1 for Birmingham Airport and to amend the definitions of the Defendants

DEFINITIONS

"**Birmingham Airport**" means the land outlined in red on Plan 1 to the Amended Claim Form, appended to this Order in Schedule 1 ("**Plan 1**").

"**Warning Notice**" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order.

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the First Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of Birmingham Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the First Claimant.

REVIEW

2. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court's list) with a time estimate of 2 ½ hours. The Claimant is permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton Arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the hearing. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall lapse at 4pm on the anniversary of the order (or as the case may be the latest annual review) unless, before then, the Claimant has applied for the review to take place.

SERVICE/NOTIFICATION

3. Service of the Amended Claim Form and the Application for injunction is dispensed with, pursuant to CPR 16, 6.28 and 81.4(2)(c).
4. This Order, the Amended Claim Form, Application Notice and evidence in support will be served on or notified to the Defendants by the Claimants carrying out each of the following steps:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website:
<https://www.Birminghamairport.co.uk/injunction>.
 - b. Sending an email to the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above.
 - c. Affixing a Warning Notice approximately at those locations marked with an "X" on Plan 1 setting out where these documents can be found and obtained in hard copy.
5. Service on or notification to the Defendants of any further applications or documents shall be effected by carrying out the steps in paragraphs 4a and 4b above.
6. In respect of paragraphs 4 and 5 above, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place on the date on which all the relevant steps have been carried out.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, in respect of the steps referred to at paragraphs 4 and 5, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place when the documents have all been first affixed regardless of whether they are subsequently removed.

8. A Note of the Hearing shall as soon as reasonably practicable be uploaded onto:
<https://www.Birminghamairport.co.uk/injunction>.
9. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the First Claimant's solicitors for service or notification (whose details are set out below).

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

10. Anyone 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 First Claimant's solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by email to the First Claimant's solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and Order by email at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the First Claimant's solicitors.
13. The First Claimant has liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE FIRST CLAIMANT

16. The First Claimant's solicitors and their contact details are:



(1) Stuart Wortley
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com
07712 881 393

(2) Nawaaz Allybokus
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
NawaazAllybokus@eversheds-sutherland.com
07920 590 944

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE COURT

Kings Bench Division, The Royal Courts of Justice, The Strand, London, WC2A 2LL by the Court's E-Filing service at <https://efile.cfile-app.com>

SCHEDULE 1



SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE FIRST CLAIMANT

- (1) The First Claimant will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 - EMAIL ADDRESSES

- juststopoil@protonmail.com
- juststopoilpress@protonmail.com
- info@juststopoil.org
- enquiries@extinctionrebellion.co.uk

SCHEDULE 4 - WARNING NOTICE

NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 6 AUGUST 2024 (“the Order”)

TO: PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE) (the “Defendants”)

FROM: Birmingham Airport Limited (the “First Claimant”)

This notice relates to the land known as Birmingham Airport which is shown edged red on the Plan below (the “Airport”).

The Order prohibits entering, occupying or remaining upon any part of the Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the First Claimant.



You must not do any of the above acts either yourself or by means of another person acting on your behalf, instructions or encouragement.

You must not contravene the terms of the Order and if you do, you may be in contempt of Court and sent to prison, fined or have your assets seized

Any person affected by the Order may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge it but if they wish to do so they must inform the First Claimant’s solicitors by email to the address specified below 72 hours before making such application of the nature of such application and the basis for it.

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 6 August 2024 may be viewed at: <https://www.Birminghamairport.co.uk/injunction>

Copies may also be obtained from the Information Desk or by contacting Stuart Wortley of Eversheds Sutherland on 0771 288 1393 or by email stuartwortley@eversheds-sutherland.com.



CLAIM NO: KB-2024-002473

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION**

**BEFORE MR JUSTICE JACOBS
DATED 6TH AUGUST 2024**

BETWEEN:-

(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED

AND FOUR OTHERS

- v -

(2) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT LIVERPOOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE)

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants



ORDER


PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE DEFENDANTS, 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 OR ANY OF THEM TO BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

This Order prohibits you from doing certain acts. You should read this Order very carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to apply to the court to vary or discharge this Order (which is explained below).



BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE JACOBS

ON 6 AUGUST 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form dated 31 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' application for an injunction dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the witness statements of Stuart Sherbrooke Wortley dated 1 August 2024 and dated 6 August 2024, Nick Barton dated 31 July 2024, John Irving dated 31 July 2024 and Graeme Gamble dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**")

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Mr Sibley, Counsel for the Claimants and no one attending for the Defendants

AND UPON the Second and Third Claimants giving and the Court accepting the undertakings set out in Schedule 2 to this Order

AND UPON the Second and Third Claimants informing the Court that any requests from those wishing to carry out peaceful protest to designate an area for that purpose at Liverpool Airport, as defined by this Order, should be made by email to protestrequest@liverpoolairport.com

AND UPON the Claimants amending the sealed Claim Form and Particulars of Claim prior to service, pursuant to CPR 17.1(1), to substitute a new plan 1 for Birmingham Airport and to amend the definitions of the Defendants

DEFINITIONS

"**Liverpool Airport**" means the land outlined in red on Plan 2 to the Amended Claim Form, appended to this Order in Schedule 1 ("**Plan 2**").

"**Warning Notice**" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order.

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the Second Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of Liverpool Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Second and Third Claimants.

REVIEW

2. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court's list) with a time estimate of 2 ½ hours. The Claimant is permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton Arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the hearing. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall lapse at 4pm on the anniversary of the order (or as the case may be the latest annual review) unless, before then, the Claimant has applied for the review to take place.

SERVICE/NOTIFICATION

3. Service of the Amended Claim Form and the Application for injunction is dispensed with, pursuant to CPR 16, 6.28 and 81.4(2)(c).
4. This Order, the Amended Claim Form, Application Notice and evidence in support will be served on or notified to the Defendants by the Claimants carrying out each of the following steps:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website:
<https://www.liverpoolairport.com/injunction>
 - b. Sending an email to the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above.
 - c. Affixing a Warning Notice approximately at those locations marked with an "X" on Plan 2 setting out where these documents can be found and obtained in hard copy.
5. Service on or notification to the Defendants of any further applications or documents shall be effected by carrying out the steps in paragraphs 4a and 4b above.
6. In respect of paragraphs 4 and 5 above, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place on the date on which all the relevant steps have been carried out.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, in respect of the steps referred to at paragraphs 4 and 5, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place when the documents have all been first affixed regardless of whether they are subsequently removed.

8. A Note of the Hearing shall as soon as reasonably practicable be uploaded onto:
<https://www.liverpoolairport.com/injunction>.
9. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the Second and Third Claimants' solicitors for service or notification (whose details are set out below).

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

10. Anyone 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 Second and Third Claimants' solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by email to the Second and Third Claimants' solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and Order by email at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the Second and Third Claimants' solicitors.
13. The Second and Third Claimants have liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE SECOND AND THIRD CLAIMANTS

16. The Second and Third Claimants' solicitors and their contact details are:

(1) Stuart Wortley
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com
07712 881 393

(2) Nawaaz Allybokus
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
NawaazAllybokus@eversheds-sutherland.com
07920 590 944

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE COURT

Kings Bench Division, The Royal Courts of Justice, The Strand, London, WC2A 2LL by the Court's E-Filing service at <https://efile.cefile-app.com>

SCHEDULE 1




Liverpool Airport - Plan 2

**ORBITAL
WITNESS**

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database rights 2024



Map scale 1:11,000
Assumes printed map area measures 395mm by 272mm.



SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE SECOND AND THIRD CLAIMANTS

- (1) The Second and Third Claimants will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 - EMAIL ADDRESSES

- juststopoil@protonmail.com
- juststopoilpress@protonmail.com
- info@juststopoil.org
- enquiries@extinctionrebellion.co.uk

SCHEDULE 4 - WARNING NOTICE

KB-2024-002473 High Court Injunction in Force

NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 6 AUGUST 2024 (“the Order”)

TO: PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT LIVERPOOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 2 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE) (the “**Defendants**”)

FROM: Liverpool Airport Limited and Peel L&P Investments (North) Limited (the “**Second and Third Claimants**”)

This notice relates to the land known as Liverpool Airport which is shown edged red on the Plan below (the “**Airport**”).

The Order prohibits entering, occupying or remaining upon any part of the Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Second and Third Claimants.

You must not do any of the above acts either yourself or by means of another person acting on your behalf, instructions or encouragement.

You must not contravene the terms of the Order and if you do, you may be in contempt of Court and sent to prison, fined or have your assets seized

Any person affected by the Order may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge it but if they wish to do so they must inform the Second and Third Claimants’ solicitors by email to the address specified below 72 hours before making such application of the nature of such application and the basis for it.

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 6 August 2024 may be viewed at: <https://www.liverpoolairport.com/injunction>

Copies may also be obtained from the Information Desk or by contacting Stuart Wortley of Eversheds Sutherland on 0771 288 1393 or by email stuartwortley@eversheds-sutherland.com.



CLAIM NO: KB-2024-002473

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION**

**BEFORE MR JUSTICE JACOBS
DATED 6TH AUGUST 2024**

BETWEEN:-

- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

AND THREE OTHERS

- v -

- (3) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BRISTOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 3 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE)

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE DEFENDANTS, 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 OR ANY OF THEM TO BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

This Order prohibits you from doing certain acts. You should read this Order very carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to apply to the court to vary or discharge this Order (which is explained below).



BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE JACOBS

ON 6 AUGUST 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form dated 31 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' application for an injunction dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the witness statements of Stuart Sherbrooke Wortley dated 1 August 2024 and dated 6 August 2024, Nick Barton dated 31 July 2024, John Irving dated 31 July 2024 and Graeme Gamble dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**")

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Mr Sibley, Counsel for the Claimants and no one attending for the Defendants

AND UPON the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants giving and the Court accepting the undertakings set out in Schedule 2 to this Order

AND UPON the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants informing the Court that any requests from those wishing to carry out peaceful protest to designate an area for that purpose at Bristol Airport, as defined by this Order, should be made by email to protestrequest@Bristolairport.com

AND UPON the Claimants amending the sealed Claim Form and Particulars of Claim prior to service, pursuant to CPR 17.1(1), to substitute a new plan 1 for Birmingham Airport and to amend the definitions of the Defendants

DEFINITIONS

"**Bristol Airport**" means the land shown outlined in red on Plan 3 to the Amended Claim Form, appended to this Order in Schedule 1 ("**Plan 3**").

"**Warning Notice**" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order.

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the Third Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of Bristol Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants.

REVIEW

2. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court's list) with a time estimate of 2 ½ hours. The Claimant is permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton Arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the hearing. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall lapse at 4pm on the anniversary of the order (or as the case may be the latest annual review) unless, before then, the Claimant has applied for the review to take place.

SERVICE/NOTIFICATION

3. Service of the Amended Claim Form and the Application for injunction is dispensed with, pursuant to CPR 16, 6.28 and 81.4(2)(c).
4. This Order, the Amended Claim Form, Application Notice and evidence in support will be served on or notified to the Defendants by the Claimants carrying out each of the following steps:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website:
<https://www.Bristolairport.com/injunction>
 - b. Sending an email to the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above.
 - c. Affixing a Warning Notice approximately at those locations marked with an "X" on Plan 3 setting out where these documents can be found and obtained in hard copy.
5. Service on or notification to the Defendants of any further applications or documents shall be effected by carrying out the steps in paragraphs 4a and 4b above.

6. In respect of paragraphs 4 and 5 above, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place on the date on which all the relevant steps have been carried out.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, in respect of the steps referred to at paragraphs 4 and 5, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place when the documents have all been first affixed regardless of whether they are subsequently removed.
8. A Note of the Hearing shall as soon as reasonably practicable be uploaded onto: <https://www.Bristolairport.com/injunction>.
9. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors for service or notification (whose details are set out below).

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

10. Anyone 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 Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by email to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and Order by email at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors.
13. The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants have liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH CLAIMANTS

16. The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors and their contact details are:

(1) Stuart Wortley
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com
07712 881 393

(2) Nawaaz Allybokus
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
NawaazAllybokus@eversheds-sutherland.com
07920 590 944


COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE COURT

Kings Bench Division, The Royal Courts of Justice, The Strand, London, WC2A 2LL by the Court's E-Filing service at <https://efile.cfile-app.com>


SCHEDULE 1



Bristol Airport - Plan 3



**ORBITAL
WITNESS**



SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH CLAIMANTS

(1) The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 - EMAIL ADDRESSES

- juststopoil@protonmail.com
- juststopoilpress@protonmail.com
- info@juststopoil.org
- enquiries@extinctionrebellion.co.uk

SCHEDULE 4 - WARNING NOTICE



NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 6 AUGUST 2024 (“the Order”)

TO: PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BRISTOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 3 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE) (the “Defendants”)

FROM: Bristol Airport Limited, South West Airports Limited and Bristol Developments Limited (the “Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants”)

This notice relates to the land known as Bristol Airport which is shown edged red on the Plan below (the “Airport”).

The Order prohibits entering, occupying or remaining upon any part of the Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants.


You must not do any of the above acts either yourself or by means of another person acting on your behalf, instructions or encouragement.

You must not contravene the terms of the Order and if you do, you may be in contempt of Court and sent to prison, fined or have your assets seized

Any person affected by the Order may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge it but if they wish to do so they must inform the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants’ solicitors by email to the address specified below 72 hours before making such application of the nature of such application and the basis for it.

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 6 August 2024 may be viewed at: <https://www.Bristolairport.com/injunction>.

Copies may also be obtained from the Information Desk or by contacting Stuart Wortley of Eversheds Sutherland on 0771 288 1393 or by email stuartwortley@eversheds-sutherland.com.



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

BEFORE MR JUSTICE JACOBS

DATED 6TH AUGUST 2024

BETWEEN:

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED**
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED**
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**



KB-2024-002473

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

As more particularly described in the Amended Claim Form

Defendant

ORDER

Before The Honourable Mr Justice Jacobs sitting at the Royal Courts of Justice, the Strand, London on 6 August 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form dated 31 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' application for injunctions dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application, the first witness statement of Nick Barton dated 31 July 2024, the first witness statement of John Irving dated 31 July 2024, the first witness statement of Graeme Gamble dated 31 July 2024, and the first witness statement of Stuart Wortley dated 1 August 2024 and the witness statement dated 6 August 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**")

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Mr Sibley for the Claimants and no one attending for the Defendants

AND UPON the Court granting the Claimants injunctions on 6 August 2024 in respect of the land shown outlined in red on Plans 1, 2 and 3 to the Amended Claim Form (the “**Orders**”)

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

PERMISSION TO AMEND

1. To the extent required, the Claimants have permission to amend the Claim Form and Particulars of Claim as:
 - a. To the description of the Defendants.
 - b. To substitute a new plan 1 for Birmingham Airport.

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

**CLAIM NO: KB-2024-
002473**

BETWEEN

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED**
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED**
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

Claimants

And

**PERSONS UNKNOWN
as more particularly described in the Amended Claim Form**

Defendants

**NOTE OF “WITHOUT NOTICE” HEARING
BEFORE MR JUSTICE JACOBS
LISTED FOR 6 AUGUST 2024 AT 10:30**

The hearing commenced at 10:30 on 6 August 2024. Appearing for the Claimant, Tim Morshead KC (“TM”) and Peter Sibley (“PS”) before Mr Justice Jacobs (“J”).

1. TM thanked J for taking the matter in the vacation, and referred to how Cs were among the last airports not to be protected by an injunction. He commented that the injunctions still seem to be effective, and confirmed that this was the reason these proceedings were suitable vacation business.
2. TM outlined his proposed course, namely addressing preliminary matters, outlining the relevant facts and matters concerning the airports and the title position, highlighting the evidence of the threat including sweeping up alternative remedies, then addressing the legal framework and finally by making submissions. Finally, TM proposed to take J through the draft orders.
3. J indicated that he had read the witness evidence, the skeleton, some plans, the Valero decision, the Wolverhampton decision (although some time ago), the Gatwick decision and various airport injunction cases on Westlaw.
4. J noted that the case was listed, and that there had therefore been some notice to some extent.

5. TM confirmed this but referred to the need to keep notice of the hearing to a minimum.

Preliminary matters

6. TM handed up the Heathrow airport order and hearing note, along with a short supplementary witness statement from Stuart Wortley dated 6 August 2024.
7. J took time to read the statement.
8. TM explained the 6 August 2024 Stuart Wortley statement concerned the 2012 Bristol Byelaws.
9. J confirmed that this was not central to the case, the point being that the fact that there are byelaws does not prevent an injunction from being ordered.
10. TM further explained that the 2012 byelaws leave open as a question of fact what constitutes the airport. Mr Gamble in his witness statement simply attaches a plan without expressing a view or making this clear.
11. TM also drew J's attention to Mr Wortley's first witness statement ("Wortley 1") at pg 215, where there are three mistaken names in paragraph 99.
12. TM then referred to paragraph 20 of the skeleton, and the fact that relief is sought without distinguishing between the areas Cs can directly claim trespass in relation to, and those let out or occupied by 3rd parties. TM referred to how in fact, in the City Airport injunction proceedings, this approach was not adopted and the third party areas were carved out. However, the City Airport approach has not been followed in other similar airport cases since.
13. J asked if the issue of third party areas arises in respect of all of the other injunctions.
14. TM confirmed that it did. He explained that an airport has a general power and responsibilities for the airport as a whole, but as a matter of commerciality it lets out large areas, where private organisations conduct their operations. There are lots of arrangements the details of which it is inappropriate to get involved with. The activity Cs are seeking to stop is of a character that if allowed to take place fluidly on third party areas it would undermine substantially the effectiveness of the relief in relation to the generality of the areas. Also, there is the threat of nuisance arising from protest on third party areas. There are accordingly, two proper jurisprudential bases to restrain protest on the third party areas.

Factual position and title

15. TM then made submissions on the airports and the factual position on the ground. He referred to Wortley 1 which describes the title position in detail at paragraphs 10 to 22, and appends the title documents at pages 219 to 528 of the hearing bundle. TM said it was appropriate to trust

the exercise done by the solicitors. He noted that the product for each airport is the “A” series of plans for each airport.

16. J asked if the plans were annexed to the Particulars of Claim.
17. TM confirmed this.
18. TM explained that the title number on the legend on the left hand side of the A series of plans corresponds to the areas indicated on the plan itself. The upshot is to show that C1, with reference to the plan on pg 61, is the owner and prima facie entitled to maintain an action in trespass in relation to the red line area, on plan 1, most conveniently found on the draft order at page 9 of the bundle. TM explained that one of the odd features is that none of the airports have simple arrangements for landing lights. It is a mixture of outright ownership, long occupation and sometimes on unregistered land. Even assuming no paper title in relation to this, nevertheless the areas are occupied by the equipment. Relief is needed for effective protection, and or to prevent nuisance.
19. TM referred to plan 2A on page 63 of the bundle for the position in relation to Liverpool, and to plan 3A at page 65 of the bundle for the position for Bristol.
20. TM then referred to the next stage of the exercise carried out with reference to the “B” series of plans. Wortley 1 at paragraphs 25 - 31 deals with this, and pg 62 of the bundle shows the plan for Birmingham. This plan shows the areas in some sense carved out as third party rights. The blue areas on the plan are where everything is let out to a third party. The green areas of the plan indicate areas, typically terminals, where things are more complicated; some of that area is still retained by Cs, other parts are let out.
21. TM referred to the Birmingham Air Rail link and platform and the fact that C1 has an agreement for lease in respect of this and C1 is in fact the occupier.
22. J commented that he could not see the landing lights on plan 1B.
23. TM responded that the northern lights are shown, and the southern lights are in the area shaded in brown. The Liverpool plan at pg 64 of the bundle adopted the same convention concerning blue and green land. Liverpool airport, unlike the other two, has within it public highways. Prima facie, the public has a right of protest on this. In respect of Bristol airport, the equivalent plan is on pg 66, where the same colouring convention is used.
24. TM noted that it has been possible for Bristol airport to drill down and provide more minute detail as to what is found at the green areas, at pages 67, 68, 69 of the hearing bundle. The parts outlined in blue are those bits within the green zones let out or licenced to third parties.

25. TM then addressed notification of intention to seek relief – he referred to Wortley 1 at paragraphs 32 to 37 – the major tenants were given notice. It is improbable that relief if granted would cause harm to anyone not notified but the liberty to apply provision can be relied on.

Airports

26. TM then referred to the sensitive features of airports – with reference to the witness statement of Mr Barton, at paragraphs 31 - 48, the witness statement of Mr Irving, at paragraphs 35 - 37, and the witness statement of Mr Gamble at paragraphs 36 - 38. The witnesses for Liverpool and Bristol, Gamble and Irving, follow the lead of the Birmingham witness, Barton.
27. TM summarised the evidence. He noted that it is clear from the evidence, that airports have a special sensitivity and vulnerability owing to the sheer volume of human and other traffic participating in airport activities. There is the movement of vast, delicate and dangerous machines, proximity to toxic and dangerous materials, and zones of interest for counter terrorism. It is a high stress high activity environment where there is a premium on normal behaviour and a strong interest in keeping unexpected behaviour to a minimum. There is a heightened risk as protest may be used as a mask for terrorism, with reference to pg 91 of the hearing bundle.
28. TM also noted another feature of airports, which has required other orders in airport injunction cases to have included reference to what amounts to intention or purpose in the definition of the defendants. A particular feature of airports makes this unavoidable, as one is not dealing with sealed sites, e.g. oil terminals, but sites where the public are allowed (some) access. There is no other practical way of dealing with this than by referring in some way to intention or purpose.
29. J asked what was done in previous cases in relation to the purpose point.
30. TM referred to how a distinctive feature of the draft orders in this case is that they follow the orders of Ritchie J, where he used the word purpose. The draft orders in this case respect this direction of travel from the judiciary but the wording in the Claim Form does not reflect this. The Claim Form is to be amended to ensure alignment between the descriptions in the orders and the pleadings.
31. TM also referred to another area of interest about airports, namely the economic and potential chaos factor and cascade impact of disruption and delays. Economic impacts are significant as the daily turnover is around £750,000. Airports are an integral part of life and when the wheels come off, the consequences are felt widely, as is well known.

Threat and compelling need

32. TM then turned to the next section of his submissions, namely the threat posed and the compelling need for the injunction – addressed at paragraphs 38 – 85 of Wortley 1. This sets out the history of JSO and provides a summary from 2022 onwards. The focus was on oil terminals, noting a shift in emphasis towards airports. TM quoted from an extract starting at pg 580 of the hearing bundle; a JSO post from 13 September 2023. TM noted that this was the start of a shift away from a focus on the oil industry and an admission that an injunction is an effective instrument. TM then referred to an article on pg 590 and 591 of the bundle being an article from the Mail Online relating to an undercover journalist from the Mail Online discovering JSO’s airport plans. TM then referred to JSO coming clean about their airport plans following the Mail Online article at pg 604 of the bundle.
33. J commented that this was really as a result of the Mail Online exposure of their plans.
34. TM then referred to paragraphs 71 – 80 of Wortley 1 which describes, to the extent to which he is aware, that JSO’s plan has materialised. TM referred to incidents on 2 June at Farnborough, 20 June at Stansted, 25 June at Gatwick, 27 June, 24 July at Heathrow, 29 July at Gatwick, and 30 July at Heathrow. This shows the threat specifically and on a sustained basis by campaigners. Wortley 1 describes other injunctions obtained by airports at paragraph 89.
35. J asked how similar the draft orders in this case were to the injunction order in Gatwick.
36. TM responded that Cs have laboured to align the relief sought in this case with what was granted by Ritchie J in Gatwick, which is the most refined order made in relation to airport protest injunctions.
37. One nuance noted by Ritchie J was in respect of the Gatwick railway station. Ritchie J was alive to people arriving at the rail station and not realising they were affected by the injunction, and so carved out the railway station. This had not been done here as C1 is in occupation of the whole of the railway station. TM noted that J might decide in this case that he should apply the injunction only outside of the precincts of the railway.
38. J asked why. He asked if this would be because would be protestors might not know of the injunction when stepping off a train.
39. TM responded that Ritchie J’s nervousness was as a result of people getting off the train who might not have seen the notice. Ritchie J wanted to be clear of the moment beyond which someone cannot plausibly say they did not understand what they were told not to do.
40. TM commented that Wortley 1 explains injunctions granted previously appear to have been effective. This was evidenced by the September 23 admission by JSO and, as noted in Wortley

1, a protest scheduled for City airport on 27 July shifted to central London following the obtaining of an injunction.

Effectiveness of injunctions

41. J asked why injunctions are more effective than the general law.
42. TM ventured a guess, that some are willing to take their chances in front of a magistrate or jury, but are not willing to take their chances in front of a judge.
43. TM referred to the photo evidence at page 650 of the hearing bundle. He explained that this was the law working as it should. The general law may in these cases be treated without respect by the protestors that one would wish for. But at the moment, the principle that the courts are authoritative is as it should be, and is recognised as a sign that the activity which is enjoined must not happen. There cannot be a guarantee that there will be no breaches, but perfection must not be the enemy of the good.

Alternative remedies

44. TM noted that Cs are required by the Supreme Court in the Wolverhampton decision to have regard to alternative remedies, including Byelaws and the general law. The story is that the general law is not enough. It is part of the program of the protestors to risk arrest. Cs armed with an injunction have more control over the process than when enforcement is left to public authorities. The potential for delay is reduced with breach of injunctions. With Byelaws, the available sentences are generally modest with a maximum fine of £2500.
45. New offences are now on the statute book. Mr Hallam has now been sentenced to 5 years in prison. Once that sinks in the general law may have a greater deterrent effect.
46. J asked what Mr Hallam had been sentenced for, i.e. under what statute.
47. TM replied that it was a public order offence.
48. TM further commented that 5 years is a very long sentence, and it is possible that it will have a deterrent effect in the future, but that is not felt yet. Ritchie J in the Gatwick case noted that this was something to be assessed when the injunction is on for review. At the moment, there is no evidence that the general law is causing protests to abate. The answer to the requirement to consider alternative remedies, is that as matters stand, the evidence suggests that injunctions are doing what the general law cannot do. It is hoped that it will change but at the moment that is the position.

Legal Framework

49. TM then addressed the legal framework. As indicated in the Valero decision, Ritchie J's judgment is written on the basis that this is an emerging jurisdiction. No decision has a concrete description or prescribed set of questions. The court still has a part to play in working out the right response.
50. TM referred to the Wolverhampton decision at paragraph 167 where the court sets out the conclusions at that stage about the nature of the jurisdiction. TM submitted that the key controlling characteristic is compelling need. This is the key thing that attracts the eye of equity.
51. TM noted that the Supreme Court emphasised that this jurisdiction is at an early stage at para 185. He referred to paragraphs 222 and 224 of Wolverhampton where the Supreme Court dealt with the principle of the court enjoining lawful activity.
52. Then TM referred to paragraphs 225 - 226 where the Supreme Court dealt with the fact that the Supreme Court was dealing with traveller rather than protest cases.
53. TM then referred to the decision in Cuadrilla at paragraph 50.
54. TM then referred to the synthesis of the principles in Valero at paragraphs 57 to 58, a synthesis between the principles in Wolverhampton and established practice. He referred to the checklist but confirming that this is not the be all and end all.
55. TM also referred to paragraph 66 of Valero in relation to Articles 10 and 11. He submitted that Cs say the balancing exercise does not really fall to be applied in respect of the public highways in Liverpool, the only airport with public highway. TM invited the judge, if inclined to conduct the balancing exercise, to adopt Ritchie J's approach at paragraph 66 of Valero.
56. J asked if the highway point had arisen in other Airport cases.
57. TM responded that Leeds airport was an example.

Submissions

58. TM submitted that the court has the material before it from which to make an order.
59. TM referred to how if the protestors were present, they would likely invoke their strongly held beliefs, and an argument based on the convention.
60. TM referred in this regard to Ritchie J in Valero at para 66. Furthermore, he referred to the principle that the public has no right to be on private land except for purpose of the land owner's consent.

Note of judgment

61. J held that he was prepared to grant an injunction. This case is materially the same as other airport injunction cases and even if he is not strictly bound by those other cases, he ought to afford respect to those other cases and other decisions as a matter of precedent, unless there is some material point of distinction. J was of the view that the reasoning of Ritchie J is sufficient to persuade him to grant an injunction. J held that he did not need to find anything more. He noted that he has been taken through the law and tests and is satisfied on the main points of ownership, features of airports, the compelling need and that there is no substantial defence to be advanced. Ultimately following what has been said by Ritchie J, after giving careful consideration J considered it appropriate to grant an injunction.
62. TM commended this approach, and noted the danger of reinventing the wheel.

Order

63. J reviewed the draft orders against the order from the Gatwick decision at pg 728 of the hearing bundle.
64. TM commented that the descriptions of the defendants should be the same as in Gatwick with suitable amendments.
65. J considered that the shorter definition of “Warning Notice” in the Gatwick order should be used.
66. J queried whether there needed to be any carve out for the train station at Birmingham airport.
67. TM proposed inserting a new plan to the Birmingham airport order to address this point.
68. TM noted that paragraph 2 of the draft order should be amended in line with the Drax injunction order to include procedural machinery for the review hearing.
69. J noted that the draft order by paragraph 3 dispensed with service but referred to service in subsequent paragraphs.
70. TM referred to the nuance following Wolverhampton about how in these sui generis types of injunction cases, there is “notification” rather than service.
71. J proposed changing the “service and notification” wording in the draft order to “service or notification” to deal with this issue.
72. J proposed in respect of paragraph 11 of the draft order that reference to email service on Mr Hallam should be removed as he has been sentenced to 5 years in prison.

73. TM noted that although the points discussed were discussed in respect of Birmingham airport, save for the rail way station point, the same issues would apply to the other draft orders.

74. TM noted an issue common to all, namely that undertaking 1 in schedule 2 was duplicated in the body of the order and should be removed.

There was then a 15 minute adjournment between 12:15 and 12:30.

75. TM showed the judge an amended plan for Birmingham airport adjusting the red line boundary of the injunction around the railway station.

76. J approved this.

77. J asked for draft orders to be emailed to his clerk in red line and in final “clean” form.

The hearing concluded at 12:40.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

BEFORE: THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE BOURNE

ON: 24 June 2025

B E T W E E N : -

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORT LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT LIMITED



KB-2024-002473
Claimants

-and-

(1) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION OR OTHERWISE)

(2) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT LIVERPOOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 2 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION OR OTHERWISE)

(3) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BRISTOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 3 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION OR OTHERWISE)

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE DEFENDANTS, 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 OR ANY OF THEM TO BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

This Order prohibits you from doing certain acts. You should read this Order very carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to apply to the court to vary or discharge this Order (which is explained below).

UPON the injunction made by Order dated 6 August 2024 by Jacobs J (“**the Jacobs J Order**”)

AND UPON the Claimants’ application dated 2 June 2025

AND UPON the review hearings in each of the following claims having been listed on 24 June 2025 to be heard together KB-2024-1765, KB-2024-002132, KB-2024-002317, and KB-2024-002473 (“**the Claims**”)

AND UPON reading the application and the witness evidence in support

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Miss Barden, counsel for the Claimants and there being no other attendance

AND UPON the Court being satisfied that there has been no material change in circumstances warranting amendments to or the setting aside of the relief granted by the Jacobs J Order

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Jacobs J Order shall remain in full force and effect subject to the amendment referred to in paragraph 2 below (and subject to review, as provided for in paragraph 2 of the Jacobs Order).
2. Paragraph 2 of the Jacobs J Order is amended so as to read:

“The injunction contained at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed on each anniversary of this Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court’s list). Such hearing shall be listed to be heard with the review of any injunctions made in all or any of the claims with the Claims, with a time estimate of 1 day. The Claimants are permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the review hearing.”

3. The court will provide sealed copies of this order to the Claimants’ solicitors for service or notification.

Hearing Note – First Annual Review Hearing of Airport Injunctions

24 June 2025 (Court: Court 14)

Before: Bourne J (Bourne J)

For the Claimants: Timothy Morshead KC (“**TMKC**”) with Evie Barden

ATTENDANCE

No person appeared to oppose the applications, noted that the hearing had been listed for a day due to the possibility that individuals may have wished to attend and to make representations. TMKC advised Bourne J that the hearing had been notified as required by the various Orders and that, if any member of the public wished to attend or make representations, this hearing provided the opportunity to do so.

PURPOSE OF THE HEARING

The hearing was the first annual review of airport-related newcomer injunctions granted last year. TMKC explained that the various Claimants sought continuation of the existing injunctions, with draft forms of order to continue the injunctions and to address case-management matters.

Consideration given to the approach to be adopted, proceeded on the basis that the review was not a merits rehearing. The question to be considered was whether there had been a material change in the background circumstances diminishing the need for the injunctions, having assimilated sufficient background for that review.

NOTIFICATION AND SERVICE

TMKC submitted that notification had been given as required by the Orders. Bourne J was also taken to evidence from Mr Wortley explaining how the Orders had been served last year, with a typographical correction to paragraph 11.2: the date should read 21 June 2024, not 21 August 2024.

CLAIMANTS’ SUBMISSIONS

TMKC submitted that a concise, de minimis approach should be adopted, consistent with the approach in the Valero review hearing, because there had been no material change that undermined the basis on which the injunctions had been granted.

The Claimants’ position was that the injunctions should be reviewed together, rather than formally consolidated, because that was good case management. The Bourne J agreed.

TMKC submitted that there remained a compelling need for the injunctions. Although Just Stop Oil had made a March 2025 announcement suggesting that direct action would stop, subsequent communications and reports, including the GB News report and the 14/15 June 2025 Seeds of Rebellion event, made it unsafe to treat that announcement as a complete renunciation of direct action.

TMKC explained that the Claimants also relied on evidence that other groups, including Youth Demand, Extinction Rebellion and Fossil Fuel London, had not renounced direct action, and that a lone campaigner could act without affiliation to any group.

TMKC submitted that airports were particularly sensitive environments: the public cannot be kept out, protestors may intermingle with passengers, disruption can have cascading effects, and security concerns mean that a high premium is placed on orderly conduct.

TMKC referred to the police correspondence. The National Police Coordination Centre email taking account of the existence and effectiveness of injunctions; local police advice to London City Airport was that an injunction remained useful.

Discussion on Gatwick Airport and potential breach of their injunctions in July 2025, no knowledge as to whether committal applications were made and why not, if not.

TMKC submitted that, subject to the above, the absence of airport direct action since the injunctions were made was consistent with the injunctions working as a deterrent, rather than demonstrating that they were no longer necessary.

On proportionality and Convention rights, TMKC submitted that there had been no relevant change in the law, that the balancing exercise undertaken last year could be relied on subject to updated evidence, and that Article 10 and Article 11 rights could be exercised away from the airport areas.

FORM OF ORDER SOUGHT

TMKC invited Bourne J to retain the existing descriptive approach to “persons unknown”, rather than reducing the description to “persons unknown” only, noting Soole J’s approach in the Cambridge case, MBA Acres and the need for defendants to be defined as precisely as possible.

TMKC also invited the Court not to require permission before any application for committal. TMKC submitted that any issues arising from trivial or overzealous enforcement could be dealt with at the committal hearing, that no such applications had yet been made, and that there was no pattern of overzealous enforcement by the Claimants.

TMKC explained that the Claimants sought to homogenise the orders where appropriate. In relation to London City Airport, the relevant Claimants sought an amended plan to reflect a current ownership position, including an additional area let to a third party.

Hearing adjourned for Bourne J to consider matters ahead of issuing judgment.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand
London, WC2A 2LL

Wednesday, 26th August 2025

BEFORE:

MR JUSTICE BOURNE

BETWEEN:

LONDON CITY AIRPORT LTD & ORS

Claimants

- and -

PERSONS UNKNOWN

Defendants

MR T MORSHEAD KC, MS E BARDEN (instructed by Eversheds Sutherland International LLP) appeared on behalf of the Claimant
THE DEFENDANTS were not present and not represented

JUDGMENT

(Approved)

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

This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part other than in accordance with relevant licence or with the express consent of the Authority. All rights are reserved.

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

1. MR JUSTICE BOURNE: At this hearing I conducted the first annual review of injunctions granted at the separate hearings of four claims last year, concerning activities by environmental protestors at a total of ten airports at different locations in England. The relevant airports are identified in each order.
2. The claimants were represented by Mr Morshead, King’s Counsel and Ms Baden of counsel. There was no appearance by any defendant or by anyone expressing opposition to the continuation of the injunctions.
3. The injunctions were sought because in 2024, airports in England and elsewhere became targets in campaigns of disruptive environmental protest, notably by the campaigning group, “Just Stop Oil” (“JSO”). Individual airports and groups of airports sought injunctive relief against “Persons Unknown”, invoking the “newcomer” jurisdiction as explained by the Supreme Court in *Wolverhampton City Council v London Gypsies and Travellers* [2023] UKSC 47, [2024] 1 AC 983 (“Wolverhampton”).
4. I have read the judgments given when the original injunctions were granted of Julian Knowles J (20 June 2024, KB-2024-176) HHJ Coe KC (5 July, KB-2024-002132) and Ritchie J (19 July 2024, KB-2024-002317). I have also seen a note of what was said by Jacob J in KB-2024-002473 on 6 August 2024.
5. By way of context, I note that orders were also made at hearings in other claims concerning Heathrow (Julian Knowles J, 24 July 2024), Gatwick (Ritchie J, 19 July 2024) and Southend Airports (Farbey J, 14 August 2024). This review does not encompass those three cases.
6. Each judge was satisfied that an injunction was necessary to restrain the threat of tortious conduct and that it was just and convenient to make an order. In particular, because of threats of unlawful action by protest groups, viewed in the light of some previous incidents, and the potential for such action to cause health and safety risks (to the public, airport staff, emergency services and/or the protestors themselves) and delay and disruption to the public. In addition, each judge was satisfied that it was appropriate to grant injunction against “Persons Unknown.”

7. I shall note increase the length of this judgment or extend the corpus of judicial discussions of this broad subject by repeating the statements of legal principle and factual considerations, which were set out by the judges when granting the injunctions last year.
8. It is, in particular, unnecessary for me to explore some distinctive characteristics of these cases which were considered by the judges, notably the fact that the claims concern a combination of (1) land owned by the claimants, (2) land not owned by the claimants but on which there is airport infrastructure and (3) public highways in and around the airports. The injunction granted to London City Airport covers land in category (1) only, whereas the injunctions in the other three cases cover all three categories. The claimants are not seeking any geographical expansion of the injunctions granted last year. London City Airport seeks, and I will grant, permission to amend to reflect a change of ownership of one specific area.
9. The nature of a review hearing of this kind was considered in *Wolverhampton* at paragraph 225, where the Supreme Court observed that the hearing:

“...will give 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 has emerged, whether there is any proper justification for continuance; and whether and on what basis, a further order ought to be made.”

10. In *High Speed Two (HS2) Ltd & Anor v Persons Unknown* [2024] EWHC 1277 (KB), Richie J described the court’s task at a review hearing:

“Drawing these authorities together, on a review of an interim injunction against PUs [Persons Unknown] 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.

33. 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.”

11. I have therefore considered whether, since last year’s injunction orders were made, there has been any material change affecting, diminishing or removing the need for them to be in place.
12. Each application for review is supported by a witness statement by Stuart Wortley, a partner in Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP, who represent the claimants. He sets out a chronology of incidents and events, occurring both before and since last year’s injunctions.
13. Of the events postdating any or all of the injunctions, Mr Moreshead emphasises several, including the following:-
 - (a) On 19 July 2024, one of the JSO founders, Roger Hallam, was found guilty with others of conspiring to organised protests to block the N25 motorway in November 2022. He was sentenced to five years in prison, later reduced on appeal to four years.
 - (b) On 24 July 2024, ten JSO activists were arrested at Heathrow Airport, seemingly equipped to be able to cut through fences and/or affix themselves to parts of the land or aircraft. Of those individuals, nine were later found guilty by a jury of conspiracy to cause a public nuisance. Five were sentenced to terms in prison of up to 15 months, and four were given suspended sentences.
 - (c) On 27 July 2024 a protest which was due to occur at London City Airport, was relocated to the Department of Transport.
 - (d) On 29 July 2024, eight JSO activists were arrested at Gatwick Airport on suspicion of interfering with public infrastructure.

(e) On 30 July 2024, two JSO activists were arrested at Heathrow Airport after spraying orange paint around the Terminal 5 entrance hall and on destination boards in the departure lounge. Following a criminal trial, the jury was unable to return a verdict.

(f) On 31 July 2024, a protest by JSO and Fossil Free London, was held at the Docklands Light Railway Station, at London City Airport. That being an area excluded from the red line of the injunction.

(g) On 1 August 2024, six JSO activists were blocked access to the departure gates at Heathrow Terminal 5.

(h) On 5 August 2024, five JSO activists were arrested on their way to Manchester Airport and were in possession of bolt cutters, angle grinders, glue, sand and banners reading “oil kills”. Four of these individuals were subsequently found guilty of conspiracy to commit a public nuisance and then sentenced to terms of imprisonment, ranging between 18 and 30 months.

(i) On 21 February 2025, XR held a demonstration at Inverness Airport against climate change.

(j) On 27 May 2025, JSO made an announcement which at least gave the impression that it had now decided to withdraw from mounting disruptive protests of a direct action nature.

(k) However, on 18 May 2025, GB News reported that JSO was considering a “dramatic U-turn” and on 21 May 2025, JSO sent a link to its subscribers with the comment, “GB News was right for once. We are ‘plotting a comeback’.”

(l) On 21 May 2025, London City Airport received intelligence information from the Metropolitan Police of a protest by environmental protest groups, which had been planned at Heathrow Airport, to be held at the Sofitel Hotel on 20 May 2025, where an annual general meeting for Shell was being held and which was within the redline boundary of the injunction obtained by that airport. The protest was relocated to the

Shell head office, “in order to avoid the risk of associated penalties for breaching the injunction.”

(m) Over the weekend of 14 and 15 June 2025, JSO arranged an event described as “Seeds of Rebellion”, which seemingly was part of a training programme – a “summer of resistance training” – where attenders would be taught how “to plan actions that cut through” and to “plant the seeds of the coming non-violent revolution.”

(n) JSO’s fundraising page currently invites donations for – “[A] New campaign [that] is in the works”

14. Mr Wortley’s evidence also mentions activities of other protest groups opposed to the use of fossil fuels including Youth Demand, Extinction Rebellion and Fossil Free London. He refers to disruptive protest activity in 2024 and 2025 by Extinction Rebellion, though not at airports. He also exhibited an email sent by the Metropolitan Police to London City Airport’s security team on 21 May 2025, which referred to the incident relating to the Shell AGM and said:

“...The injunction at [Heathrow Airport] had a real impact on the Shell protest yesterday and builds on your experiences. To remove an injunction now, would open up to further protest. And whilst JSO have stepped down, there appear to be a cycle of new groups emerging and this cannot be ruled out, so maintaining it would be very much recommended.”

15. I accept Mr Moreshead’s submission that that advice from the police is a relevant consideration. Although the announcement by JSO on 21 March 2025 could signal a reduction from the risk of unlawful activity at the airports, there is also clear evidence of a possible U-turn from that announcement. And, as Mr Morshead submits, even if JSO left the scene, it is too early to tell what the effect of that would be, having regard to the possibility of some JSO members continuing to support direct action, and to the continued existence of other protest groups. Nor is it possible to conclude that the risk has been materially reduced or removed by the imprisonment of some JSO activists referred to above.

16. Meanwhile, the substantial, though not total lack of direct action at the airports since the grant of the injunctions is consistent with the injunctions having proved to be an effective deterrent. I accept that removing the injunctions at present would create a real risk of a resumption of activity at airports.
17. When granting the injunctions, the judges last year concluded that enforcement of bylaws and criminal proceedings did not provide an adequate alternative remedy. That, in my view, has not changed.
18. In the circumstances considered as a whole, I conclude that there has been no material change which removes or seriously diminishes the justification or the rationale for the injunctions, and that they should continue in force.
19. Turning to the form of the order, Mr Morshead showed me the decision of Nicklin J in *MBR Acres Limited and Others v John Curtin & Persons Unknown* [2025] EWHC 331 (KB), which took a different approach of directing an injunction in a protest case, “**contra mundum**”, rather than by describing categories of defendants by reference to the conduct to be prohibited, which would also make service of the claim unnecessary. Nicklin J noted that the court must consider what other or better solutions may be available, having regard to enhanced police and local authority powers. He also indicated that orders should include a requirement that the court’s permission be obtained before any application is made to commit for contempt of court.
20. Mr Morshead submitted that it would be better in this case to retain a description of the intended defendants, by reference to the conduct being enjoined, and that that course was followed in a later decision of Soole J in *Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the University of Cambridge v Persons Unknown* [2025] EWHC 724 (KB). He also submitted that a requirement for consent for committal proceedings should not be necessary, having regard to the safeguards built into the injunction and to the impact which applications for consent could have on costs and court resources.
21. In the present cases, the judges last year found it appropriate to describe or define the defendants by specific reference to the type of conduct to be enjoined. Although Nicklin J has identified a possible different approach, it seems to me that on a review

hearing, I should not change the approach taken by the previous judges, where the underlying circumstances have not materially changed. I am also mindful of the need, emphasised by the Supreme Court in *Wolverhampton* at paragraph 221, for defendants in injunctions to be defined as precisely as possible. It seems to me that that also favours a continuation of the approach taken last year.

22. Nor am I persuaded to depart from what was ordered last year by adopting a standard wording to define or describe the prohibited acts in the four cases before me. The differences in wording have not created any difficulty for me in conducting this review, and any potential defendant who has already become aware of the injunction in respect of any specific airport may already be aware of the existing wording, and that factor militates against a change.
23. I also accept the submission that it is not necessary to insert a provision requiring consent or permission to be obtained for any contempt application in the event of a breach of the injunction. Although such a provision could provide a helpful safeguard in some “**contra mundum**” cases, as described by Nicklin J in *MVR Acres*, in the present cases, no enforcement issue has arisen so far. That is by contrast with *MBR Acres*, where Nicklin J vigorously criticised the conduct of claimants who pursued a committal application, which he described as frivolous and bordering on vexatious. As Mr Morshead said, claimants who choose to commence committal proceedings for trivial breaches do so at their own risk. The courts have repeatedly said that, in cases which do not appear to have been cited to the court in *MBR Acres*, such as *Sectorguard Plc v Diene Plc* [2009] EWHC 2693 (Ch), per Briggs J at paragraph 46. Meanwhile, in the circumstances of the present case, I have no reason to expect that such an issue will arise.
24. It seems to me, by way of confirmation, that the steps taken to publicise the orders last year, remain appropriate and sufficient.
25. I will provide for the next review to take place in one year from now. It will remain open for anyone to apply to vary or discharge the orders before then. The cases will again be listed together upon that occasion, but I see no need to consolidate them.

26. I shall ask counsel to finalise the terms of an order whose effect is that the injunctions granted last year will remain in force. For practical reasons, and in principle, that seems to me preferable to the alternative of granting entirely new injunctions.

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

Lower Ground, 46 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JE

Email: civil@epiqglobal.co.uk

This transcript has been approved by the Judge

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

N244 Application notice (06.22)

© Crown copyright 2022
Reproduced by Thomson Reuters

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.

1. The orders of Jacobs J Orders are attached, together with the Bourne J Orders.
2. The Bourne J Orders and the Jacobs J Orders together provide that:
 - a) the injunctions granted pursuant to the Jacobs J Orders are to be reviewed at 12 month intervals; and
 - b) the hearing at which such review is to be considered is to be listed to “ *be heard with the review of any injunctions made in all or any of the claims with the Claims, with a time estimate of 1 day.*”
3. The Claims are defined in the Bourne J Orders as the claims in actions KB-2024-1765, KB-2024-002132, KB-2024-002317, and KB-2024-002473 (“**the Claims**”).
4. The Claimants in the remaining Claims also seek review of the injunctions and have, by Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP, also made applications of even date to the same effect as this application.
5. The Court is invited to make an order on the papers in the form of the draft order. The Claimants will notify the Defendants of any order made by the Court and the application following the making of the order.

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



- 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

2

Month

June

Year

2026

Full name

Alexander James Wright

Name of applicant's legal representative's firm

Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP

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

Legal Director

Applicant's address to which documents should be sent.

Building and street

Two New Bailey

Second line of address

6 Stanley Street

Town or city

Salford

County (optional)

Postcode

M	3		5	G	X	
---	---	--	---	---	---	--

If applicable

Phone number

+44 161 831 8582

Fax phone number

DX number

Your Ref.

292659.000057/WRIGHTAX

Email

alexwright@eversheds-sutherland.com

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING’S BENCH DIVISION

BEFORE: MRS JUSTICE STACEY DBE

DATED: 16 JUNE 2026

BETWEEN:-

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED**
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED**
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED**
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT LIMITED**



- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN AS DESCRIBED IN THE CLAIM FORM

Defendants

ORDER

UPON the Claimants’ claim by the Claim Form dated 31 July 2024 (as amended)

AND UPON the Claimants’ application for an injunction dated 31 July 2024

AND UPON the making of an injunction by order dated 6 August 2024 by Mr Justice Jacobs (“**the Orders**”)

AND UPON the review hearings in each of the claims KB-2024-001765, KB-2024-002132, KB-2024-002317 and KB-2024-2473 (“**the Claims**”) having been listed to be heard together on 24 June 2025 (“**the 2025 Review Hearing**”)

AND UPON the Orders dated 24 June 2025 of Bourne J following the hearing of the 2025 Review Hearing in respect of the Claims

AND UPON the Claimants’ application dated 2 June 2026 (“**the Application**”)

AND UPON the Court making the order without a hearing on the basis a hearing would not be appropriate

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Orders shall be reviewed at a hearing on 24 June 2026 or a date thereafter as soon as is convenient for the Court, together with the review hearing in claims KB-2024-002132 and KB-2024-002317 with a time estimate of 1 day.
2. The Claimants shall serve the Application and this order on the Defendants by carrying out the steps set out in paragraph 5 of the Orders.
3. A person affected by this order may make an application have to it set aside, varied or stayed within 7 days after the order is served on them.

Wright, Alexander

From: KB Judges Listing Office <KBJudgesListingOffice@Justice.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 June 2026 15:45
To: Wright, Alexander; Owen, Elin; EvershedsCourtClerk; Stuart Wortley - New Mailbox (2026); 'NawaazAllybokus@eversheds-sutherland.com'; a@eversheds.com; Martin, Steve
Subject: KB-2024-002473 Birmingham Airport Limited and others -v- Unknown and others

Dear all,

In accordance with the Order of Mrs Justice Stracey dated 16th June 2026:

The **Review hearing** of the Injunction Orders made on 24th June 2026 following '*the 2025 Review Hearing*' has been listed for:

30th June 2026 for 1 day before a High Court Judge, in person.

The Judge and time of the hearing will be confirmed on the working day before on the Daily Cause List (from 3pm): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/royal-courts-of-justice-cause-list/royal-courts-of-justice-daily-cause-list#kings-bench-judges-daily-cause-list>

Please treat this email as a formal listing notice.

Please forward a copy of this listing notice to all interested parties.

Kind regards



Subash Vasudevan

Judges Listing Office Team Leader

8x8 Contact Centre Supervisor


Room WG04 | King's Bench Division | HMCTS | Royal Courts of Justice | Strand | London | WC2A 2LL
DX: 44450 Strand | T: 020 3936 8957 | W: www.gov.uk/hmcts



[Here is how HMCTS uses personal data about you.](#)



This e-mail and any attachments is intended only for the attention of the addressee(s). Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, please destroy all copies and inform the sender by return e-mail. Internet e-mail is not a secure medium. Any reply to this message could be intercepted and read by someone else. Please bear that in mind when deciding whether to send material in response to this message by e-mail. This e-mail (whether you are the sender or the recipient) may be monitored, recorded and retained by the Ministry of Justice. Monitoring / blocking software may be used, and e-mail content may be read at



any time. You have a responsibility to ensure laws are not broken when composing or forwarding e-mails and their contents.

Party: Claimants
Name: A Wright
Number: First
Date: 11.06.26
Exhibits:
"AJW1 – AJW23"

CLAIM NO: KB-2024-002473

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

**(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED**

Claimants

- v -

**PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM**

Defendants

WITNESS STATEMENT OF

ALEXANDER JAMES WRIGHT

I **ALEXANDER JAMES WRIGHT** of Two New Bailey, 6 Stanley Street, Salford M3 5GX WILL SAY as follows:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 I am a Legal Director in the firm of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP and have conduct of these proceedings on behalf of the Claimants. I am duly authorised to make this statement on the Claimants' behalf.
- 1.2 Save where otherwise stated, the facts contained in this statement are within my own knowledge and belief and, where they are not, I refer to the source of that information.
- 1.3 The documents to which I shall refer in the course of this statement are to be found in the exhibits marked "**AJW1 – AJW23**".
- 1.4 On 6 August 2024, Jacobs J granted injunctions to restrain the Defendants from entering, occupying or remaining on Birmingham Airport, Liverpool John Lennon Airport and Bristol Airport until varied, discharged or extended by further order ("**the 2024 Orders**") – copies of which are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW1**.
- 1.5 Paragraph 4 of the 2024 Orders provided for each of those injunctions to be reviewed by the Court periodically at intervals not exceeding 12 months.
- 1.6 The first review hearing was heard on 24 June 2025 ("**the First Review Hearing**") and the injunctions granted pursuant to the 2024 Orders were continued for a further 12 months

by Orders dated 24 June 2025 of Bourne J (“**the 2025 Orders**”) – copies of which are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW2**.

1.7 I make this witness statement for the purposes of the second annual review hearing which has been listed to be heard on 30 June 2026.

1.8 This witness statement supplements:

1.8.1 the witness statement of Nick Barton dated 31 July 2024 made on behalf of the First Claimant (“**the N Barton Statement**”);

1.8.2 the witness statement of John Irving dated 31 July 2024 made on behalf of the Second and Third Claimants (“**the J Irving Statement**”);

1.8.3 the witness statement of Graeme Gamble dated 31 July 2024 made on behalf of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants (“**the G Gamble Statement**”);

1.8.4 the witness statement of Stuart Wortley dated 1 August 2024 (“**the First S Wortley Statement**”); and

1.8.5 the witness statements of Stuart Wortley dated 6 June 2025 (“**the Second S Wortley Statement**”) and 16 June 2025 (“**the Third S Wortley Statement**”) which were both made on behalf of the Claimants for the purposes of the First Review Hearing (together with the First S Wortley Statement, “**the S Wortley Statements**”).

2. **BACKGROUND**


2.1 The background to these proceedings is more particularly set out in the N Barton Statement, the J Irving Statement, the G Gamble Statement and the S Wortley Statements.

2.2 For present purposes it is sufficient to note that the injunctions were sought and obtained:

2.2.1 to protect Birmingham Airport, Liverpool John Lennon Airport and Bristol Airport against the threat of direct/unlawful protest activity; and

2.2.2 a number of injunctions were granted in similar terms in respect of various airports across the country between 20 June and 14 August 2024 – such injunctions being:

	Airport(s)	Action Number	Judge / Date of Order
1	London City Airport	KB-2024-001765	Mr Justice Julian Knowles 20 June 2024
2	Manchester Airport, Stansted Airport and East Midlands Airport	KB-2024-002132	HHJ Rosalind Coe 5 July 2024
3	Heathrow Airport	KB-2024-002210	Mr Justice Julian Knowles 10 July 2024
4	Leeds Bradford Airport, London Luton Airport and Newcastle International Airport	KB-2024-002317	Mr Justice Ritchie 18 July 2024 (amended by the slip rule on 19 July 2024)
5	Gatwick Airport	KB-2024-002336	Mr Justice Ritchie 19 July 2024
6	Birmingham Airport, Bristol Airport and Liverpool Airport	KB-2024-002473	Mr Justice Jacobs 6 August 2024
7	Southend Airport	KB-2024-002596	Mrs Justice Farbey 14 August 2024



- 2.3 This firm acted in four out of the seven actions listed above (numbers 1, 2, 4 and 6) ("**the Claims**"). However, our instructions arrived over time rather than all at once, and so multiple hearings were needed, despite the common ground between the different matters.
- 2.4 Although the precise terms of the injunction orders granted in the Claims vary slightly, each of them provides for an annual review.
- 2.5 So as to make better use of the Court's time, the various Claimants in the Claims identified numbers 1, 2, 4 and 6 in the table above in paragraph 2.2 agreed in 2025 to join together and to ask the Court to undertake the first annual review of the injunctions granted in the Claims at the same hearing.
- 2.6 As noted above, Bourne J continued the injunctions for a further 12 months at the First Review Hearing. I exhibit a copy of the judgment of Bourne J from that hearing at **Exhibit AJW3**.
- 2.7 I make this witness statement in support of the second annual review of the injunctions granted pursuant to the 2024 Orders in respect of Birmingham Airport, Liverpool John Lennon Airport and Bristol Airport. I will be repeating or adopting much of the content of this witness statement in my statements in support of the annual reviews of the injunctions granted in the other actions.

3. **THE 2024 ORDERS AND THE 2025 ORDERS**

3.1 The 2025 Orders are substantively on the same terms and provide:

- 3.1.1 at paragraph 1, that the 2024 Orders "*shall remain in full force and effect, subject to the variations thereto set out in the schedule to this order (and subject to review, as provided for in paragraph 2 of the Jacobs Order)*"; and
- 3.1.2 at paragraph 2 for a variation to paragraph 2 of the 2024 Orders.

3.2 The 2024 Orders, as varied by the 2025 Orders, are substantively on the same terms and provide:

- 3.2.1 for the injunction to take "*immediate effect*" and until "*unless varied, discharged or extended by further order...*"; and
- 3.2.2 at paragraph 4:

"The injunction contained at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed on each anniversary of this Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court's list). Such hearing shall be listed to be heard with the review of any injunctions made in all or any of the claims with the Claims, with a time estimate of 1 day. The Claimants are permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the review hearing".

3.3 The 2026 review hearing is listed to be heard on 30 June 2026, being a date which complies with the requirements of the 2025 Orders and the 2024 Orders (as varied).

3.4 I will file and serve a further witness statement confirming the steps taken by the Claimants to file and serve the Claimants' evidence and additional documents ahead of the 2026 annual review hearing.

4. **SERVICE OF THE 2025 ORDERS**

4.1 The 2025 Orders, in so far as they relate to Birmingham Airport, Liverpool John Lennon Airport and Bristol Airport, were served in accordance with paragraph 5 of the 2024 Orders by:

- 4.1.1 a copy of the 2025 Order being uploaded to each of the individual airports' injunction websites. I have been informed by:
- 4.1.1.1 Kristin Garrett, General Counsel for Birmingham Airport, that a copy of the relevant 2025 Order was uploaded by a relevant member of staff to the Birmingham Airport injunction website on 27 June 2025;
 - 4.1.1.2 John Irving that a copy of the relevant 2025 Order was uploaded by a relevant member of staff to the Liverpool John Lennon Airport injunction website on 30 June 2025; and
 - 4.1.1.3 Graeme Gamble that a copy of the relevant 2025 Order was uploaded by a relevant member of staff to the Bristol Airport injunction website on 1 July 2025.

Printouts from each of the individual airports' injunction websites are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW4**, confirming that a copy of the relevant 2025 Order was uploaded and continues to be available on those websites.


- 4.1.2 the continuing presence of warning notices at the locations marked with an "X" on the plans to the 2024 Orders (being the plans at **Exhibit AJW5**), which I cover further below at paragraph 4.4; and
- 4.1.3 whilst not strictly required under the terms of the 2024 Orders, a copy of the 2025 Order was affixed at the locations marked with an "X" on the plans to the 2024 Orders (being the plans at **Exhibit AJW5**) at Liverpool John Lennon Airport. I have been informed by:
- 4.1.3.1 John Irving that a copy of the 2025 Order was so affixed at the relevant locations at Liverpool John Lennon Airport on 30 June 2025; and
 - 4.1.3.2 Kristin Garrett, General Counsel for Birmingham Airport, and Graeme Gamble, Chief Operating Officer for Bristol Airport that a copy of the 2025 Order was not so affixed at Birmingham Airport and Bristol Airport respectively.

4.2 In addition to the above steps, paragraph 5 of the 2024 Orders required a copy of the 2025 Orders to be served by an email sent to each of the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to the 2024 Orders. During the course of preparing this witness statement and for the second annual review hearing more generally, I was unable to locate a copy of such an email on this firm's file for these proceedings. I therefore subsequently:

- 4.2.1 instructed relevant colleagues to carry out a search of our document management system and the email accounts of Stuart Wortley (who had conduct of these proceedings on behalf of the Claimants at the time of the First Review Hearing but who has since left my firm) and Emma Payne (who assisted Mr Wortley at the time and who has also since left my firm) for such an email and have been informed that such an email could not be located; and
- 4.2.2 spoke with Mr Wortley by telephone on 9 June 2026 to discuss the matter of such an email further. Mr Wortley advised me that he could not readily recall sending such an email and that he would need to consult this firm's file to confirm matters.

4.3 As a consequence, I promptly served the 2025 Orders by email on 9 June 2026, a copy of which is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW6**.

4.4 I am told by Kristin Garrett, General Counsel for Birmingham Airport, John Irving, Chief Executive Officer of Liverpool John Lennon Airport, and Graeme Gamble, Chief Operating Officer of Bristol Airport that a regime is in place at each of their respective airports to



ensure that the warning notices remain in place, that replacement warning notices are affixed as and when necessary and that warning notices continue to remain in place at the required locations – in accordance with the terms of the 2024 Orders.

5. THE AIRPORT BYELAWS AND PLANS

- 5.1 The injunctions granted in this action and in actions 2 and 4 in the table above were based on the relevant airport byelaws (and therefore extend to all of the land which is subject to the byelaws including land over which the Claimant(s) would not be entitled to legal possession – including for example highways land and areas which are demised to third parties).
- 5.2 The injunctions in this case currently extend to the land edged red on Plan 1 (Birmingham Airport), Plan 2 (Liverpool John Lennon Airport) and Plan 3 (Bristol Airport) to the 2024 Orders – a copy of the relevant plans are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW7**.
- 5.3 I am informed by Kristin Garrett (General Counsel for Birmingham Airport) and other members of her in-house legal team that:
- 5.3.1 there have been no changes to the Birmingham Airport Byelaws 2021 and that the Plan attached to the Birmingham Airport Order dated 6 August 2024 remains accurate;
 - 5.3.2 third party occupiers within the 'red line' of the injunction order boundary will be informed ahead of the second annual review hearing that an application has been made to continue the injunction in respect of Birmingham Airport for a further 12 months; and
 - 5.3.3 it is now the case that:
 - 5.3.3.1 around 13.6 million passengers travelled through the airport in 2025;
 - 5.3.3.2 c.1,000 members of staff are now employed directly by the First Claimant (up from c.900) and that c.9,300 are employed across Birmingham Airport more widely; and
 - 5.3.3.3 31 commercial airlines operate from Birmingham Airport rather than 30.
- 5.4 I am informed by John Irving, Chief Executive Officer of Liverpool John Lennon Airport that:
- 5.4.1 there have been no changes to the Liverpool John Lennon Airport Byelaws 2022 and that the Plan attached to the Liverpool John Lennon Airport Order dated 6 August 2024 remains accurate; and
 - 5.4.2 third party occupiers within the 'red line' of the injunction order boundary have been informed that an application has been made to continue the injunction in respect of Liverpool John Lennon Airport for a further 12 months – Mr Irving has informed me that no responses have been received following that notification.
- 5.5 I am informed by Graeme Gamble, Chief Operating Officer of Bristol Airport that:
- 5.5.1 there have been no changes to the Bristol Airport Byelaws 2012 and that the Plan attached to the Bristol Airport Order dated 6 August 2024 remains accurate; and
 - 5.5.2 third party occupiers within the 'red line' of the injunction order boundary have been informed that an application has been made to continue the injunction in respect of Bristol Airport for a further 12 months – Mr Gamble has informed me that no responses have been received following that notification.

6. **HEALTH AND SAFETY RISK / RISK OF HARM**

6.1 The health and safety risks and risks of harm presented by direct/unlawful protest activity at the airports in question are detailed in the N Barton Statement, the J Irving Statement and the G Gamble Statement. By way of summary, however, these include but are not limited to:

6.1.1 the Claimants' ability, at their respective airports, to ensure:

6.1.1.1 the safe operation of aircraft;

6.1.1.2 the safe movement of vehicles and persons on the runways / taxiways and other operational areas, to avoid collisions and damage to aircraft;

6.1.1.3 the ability of firefighting and rescue services to respond to incidents or accidents with the necessary urgency;

6.1.2 the inevitable delays or cancellations to scheduled flight arrivals and departures that direct/unlawful protest activity would bring, resulting in inevitable financial harm, operational disruption, and more general disruption and delay to members of the public;

6.1.3 the diversion of the Claimants' and wider public resources (e.g. police resources), which would be diverted as a matter of urgency into responding to any emergency caused by direct/unlawful protest activity; and

6.1.4 impacting counter-terrorism and police operations at the respective airports.

6.2 I understand from Kristin Garrett, General Counsel for Birmingham Airport, John Irving, Chief Executive Officer of Liverpool John Lennon Airport, and Graeme Gamble, Chief Operating Officer of Bristol Airport, that the potential implications for counter-terrorism operations at their respective airports is of particular concern in the light of the recent raising of the terrorism threat level in the UK by the Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre, on 30 April 2026, from 'substantial' to 'severe' – meaning that "*an attack is highly likely*". The raising of this threat level is evidenced by the printout taken from MI5's website ([Threat Levels | MI5 - The Security Service](#)) which is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW8**.

6.3 In relation to such potential implications for counter-terrorism operations, I would draw attention to:

6.3.1 the previous evidence of Nicholas Barton, Chief Executive Officer of Birmingham Airport, in these proceedings as set out at paragraph 37 in the N Barton Statement:

"37. All airports are a potential target for terrorist activity (which explains why they are routinely patrolled by police carrying firearms) meaning:-

37.1. there is heightened security and any activity which is out of the normal is particularly dangerous. Any protest activity could be interpreted (whether correctly or not) by the security services at airports as a potential threat, meaning that the police or security services may intervene with significant knock-on effects. If the protestors pose no security or counter-terrorism threat, that would be a distraction for the police and our security team and a diversion of resources which are necessary for the counter-terrorism work they carry out to keep members of the public safe; and

37.2 there is also always the potential that the protests are, or turn, violent or are, in fact, used as cover for actual terrorist attacks".

6.3.2 the following comments of Ritchie J in his judgment in *Leeds Bradford Airport Ltd & Ors v Persons Unknown* [2024] EWHC 2274 (KB) (being his judgment from

the hearing at which the 2024 Orders in action KB-2024-002317 were granted) at [30-31]:

"30. Secondly, I need to look at the institutions which are bringing these applications. Airports are a part of the national infrastructure which are acutely sensitive to terrorist threats and are highly regulated in relation to safety, maintenance and security. They are also complicated organisations, involving the movement of thousands of members of the public, close to highly combustible materials and within fast-moving, huge pieces of equipment. Such organisations are acutely sensitive to chaotic disruption caused by unlawful direct action.

31. I also take into account the fear, which I think is justified, of the Chief Executive Officers, that terrorism is facilitated by chaos..."


6.3.3 the recent incident at Southend Airport, referred to further below at paragraph 13.2, which demonstrates, in my view, the heightened security concerns that there are at airports and how the activities of those at them can be interpreted by airport security services as a possible protest action, giving rise to a potential security threat – necessitating the need for energy and resources to be diverted in order to address them.

7. **CONTINUING THREAT: PROTESTS TARGETING THE OIL & GAS SECTOR – POST 2025 REVIEW HEARING**

7.1 I am informed by Kristin Garrett (General Counsel for Birmingham Airport), John Irving (Chief Executive Officer of Liverpool John Lennon Airport) and Graeme Gamble (Chief Operating Officer of Bristol Airport) respectively that there have been no incidents of protests (lawful or otherwise) at Birmingham Airport, Liverpool John Lennon Airport or Bristol Airport since the 2025 Review Hearing.

7.2 I exhibit at **Exhibit AJW9** a chronology of protest incidents since the 2025 Review Hearing which have targeted the oil and gas sector and organisations perceived to support or facilitate it ("**the Chronology**"), together with a printout of the relevant websites referenced within it for each incident – the source of which are noted in the Chronology. I would draw particular attention to:

Date	Location	Brief Details
03 July 2025	London	Extinction Rebellion supporters blockaded the entrance to the Energy Insurance London Conference.
05 July 2025	UK Wide	'Insure our Survival' Campaign: a seven-day environmental / anti-fossil fuels protest as part of Extinction Rebellion's Summer of Action.
05 July 2025	London Oxford Airport	Extinction Rebellion supporters marched to the airport to draw attention to the number of private jets carrying what were asserted to be ultra-wealthy passengers.
07 July 2025	Various, UK	Members of Extinction Rebellion protested outside of different branches of insurance brokers, Marsh as part of the national day of action against insurance businesses.
09 July 2025	Inverness Airport	Protestors led by Extinction Rebellion Scotland protested outside the terminal to campaign against private jet company Blackbird Air.
09 July 2025	London	Extinction Rebellion supporters disrupted the British Insurance Awards by blocking the red carpet. Two activists were detained after getting into the venue and planning to take to the stage to drop a banner.



11 July 2025	Shrewsbury	Extinction Rebellion supporters targeted the offices of Marsh and Howden in an insurance-related protest relating to fossil fuels with protestors calling for the support of new projects to be ended.
16 July 2025	London	Extinction Rebellion supporters targeted AIG as part of the Insure Our Survival campaign.
21 July 2025	Reading	Two banners appeared above the A329 motorway reading "Your Planet Needs You" and "Tax The Rich". Extinction Rebellion claimed responsibility.
21 July 2025	Oxford	Extinction Rebellion supporters staged a 'crime scene' at Barclays, protesting about the bank financing the fossil fuel industry.
23 July 2025	London	Five Extinction Rebellion protestors dressed as scientists and occupied the lobby of Prudential Regulation Authority demanding capital requirements on fossil fuels in the insurance and banking sectors.
26 July 2025	Edinburgh	Ten Greenpeace activists arrested after suspending themselves from a bridge outside Edinburgh. They dangled themselves 25m above the water line, stopping a tanker delivering for 24 hours
28 July 2025	London	Fossil Free London activists dressed as robbers emblazoned with the Norwegian flag staged a "heist" at the Bank of England to highlight the "daylight robbery" that approval of the application for exploitation of the Rosebank oil field would entail.
22 August 2025	UK Wide	"Shut The System" announced that it is embarking on a "Summer of Sabotage" targeting businesses it considers to be the largest contributors to climate destruction.
05 September 2025	London	Three climate protestors from Climate Resistance were carried out after disrupting the Reform UK party conference.
08 September 2025	London	Extinction Rebellion announce its 'Insure Our Survival' campaign, set to run from 8-22 September with large-scale demonstrations planned, targeting companies that are enabling fossil fuel projects.
09 September 2025	London	Extinction Rebellion protestors staged protests at the London offices of AXA and AIG, blocking access to the buildings.
15 September 2025	Reading	Extinction Rebellion activists held a "die-in" at Barclays Bank in Reading, where protestors lay on the ground to simulate death, to link the funding of fossil fuels projects with climate change and global deaths
16 September 2025	Ipswich	Extinction Rebellion activists took part in a global demonstration against large insurance companies calling on the companies to stop funding fossil fuels.
18 September 2025	Stansted Airport	Two young people who spray-painted two private jets at Stansted Airport in June 2024 were found guilty of criminal damage at Chelmsford Crown Court. They had cut through the wire perimeter fence and sprayed paint onto two private jets as part of a Just Stop Oil protest, to demand the UK government to negotiate a treaty to phase out oil and gas by 2030.

22 September 2025	Glasgow	Extinction Rebellion held a protest outside of AXA's office accusing it of "keeping killers safe" by insuring or investing in, amongst other things, fossil fuel projects.
05 November 2025	London	Fossil Free London campaigners disrupted BP panel event at Simmons & Simmons LLP.
04 December 2025	London	Fossil Free London campaigners disrupted Oil Executive awards dinner in London with attendees including Shell, BP and Ithica Energy.
15 January 2026	London / Manchester	Environmental and humanitarian protestors rallied at Zurich offices demanding it drops contracts with Shell, Chevron, Maersk and General Dynamics.
19 January 2026	London	Extinction Rebellion staged a protest outside Macquarie Group Headquarters to protest against expansion at Farnborough Airport. Two activists occupied the entrance to the building unfurling a banner that calls for a ban on private jets and urged the investment firm to sever its connection to fossil fuels.
05 May 2026	London	Activists from Fossil Free London staged a protest outside Equinor's offices, piling life-sized body bags outside the building while one campaigner dressed as an oil executive stood on top of them.
06 May 2026	York	Protestors, claiming to be associated with Boycott Bloody Insurance, protested outside Aviva's boardroom in York whilst they had their AGM.
06 May 2026	London	Fossil Free London protested outside Shell HQ ahead of quarterly profits which are due to be announced on 7 May 2026.
07 May 2026	London	Climate activists disrupted Barclays shareholder meeting.

7.3 The incidents set out above and in the Chronology demonstrate that there continues to be a strong and active protest movement against the fossil fuel industry and associated sectors/industries more broadly which shows no signs of abating.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL / CLIMATE CAMPAIGN GROUPS

8.1 Just Stop Oil (JSO)

8.1.1 The S Wortley Statements, made on behalf of the Claimants for the purposes of the First Review Hearing, explained that:

8.1.1.1 JSO had announced on 27 March 2025 that it was "*hanging up the hi vis*" and that it was, in short, ceasing its activities; and

8.1.1.2 contradictory statements were subsequently made on behalf of and/or by JSO which suggested that the Just Stop Oil campaign was a continuing campaign notwithstanding the above announcement.

8.1.2 I note that:

8.1.2.1 the JSO website:

(a) states at various points that "*Just Stop Oil ended its street campaign in 2025*" and/or "*In 2024 Just Stop Oil successfully won its original demand of 'no new oil and gas' and on March 27th 2025 announced an end to the campaign of action. However, our*

*supporters will continue to tell the truth in court, to speak out for our political prisoners and to help build what comes next” – relevant screenshots, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW10**;*

- (b) states on its homepage, directly above a link to the campaign group Take Back Power’s website (a campaign group which I cover further below at paragraph 8.2), that:

“!! New project alert !!

The rich are killing us. To stop them and fix our broken country we need to...

Take back POWER”

A screenshot, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, showing this is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW11**.

- (c) further states on its homepage that:

“Just Stop Oil launched in 2022, demanding the UK Government stop licensing all new oil, gas and coal projects. In 2024 the UK government met our original demand. Civil resistance works.

But revolutionary change is needed now more than ever. Corrupt politicians are serving the interests of billionaires. Ordinary people are struggling to survive, and the media is shifting blame from their mates on mega yachts to the people in small boats. Meanwhile, the world is getting hotter and hotter. Nothing short of a political and economic revolution is going to get us out of this mess.

*It’s time to **Take Back Power**”*

A screenshot, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, showing this is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW12**.

- 8.1.2.2 I am not aware of any incidents involving direct/unlawful protest activity attributable to JSO since the 2025 Review Hearing; and

- 8.1.2.3 notwithstanding the above, the JSO website and affiliated social media channels (including Instagram, Facebook and Twitter) appear to remain active – as evidenced by the printouts, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, exhibited at **Exhibit AJW13**.

- 8.1.3 Noting the reference on the JSO homepage and link to the Take Back Power website, it strongly appears to me that Take Back Power is a successor to JSO and I refer also to an article in the Guardian newspaper from 25 April 2025, a copy of which is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW14**, which states:

“Many of those involved with [Take Back Power] are seasoned activists – despite being in their early 20s – having taking part in actions with Extinction Rebellion, Just Stop Oil, Animal Rising and other groups in recent years”.

8.2 Take Back Power

- 8.2.1 I became aware of the group in or around December 2025 when activists threw custard and apple crumble at a case containing the crown jewels at the Tower of London (an article, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, from Take Back Power’s website on this incident is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW15**).

8.2.2 Take Back Power describes itself on its homepage as “a nonviolent civil resistance group in the UK. We aim to put the 99% in charge through citizen’s assemblies. We are ordinary people from all walks of life who believe that in order to fix Britain, we have to tax the rich. And we don’t think the rich should get a veto. We want the people to decide how we tax the rich through a legally-binding citizen’s assembly – a House of the People. It’s time for the 99% to have 99% of a say!” (a printout of Take Back Power’s website, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW16**).

8.2.3 I note that there is an ‘about us’ section on Take Back Power’s website which states:

“What is Take Back Power?”

Take Back Power is a nonviolent civil resistance group in the UK. We aim to put the 99% in charge through citizen’s assemblies. We are ordinary people from all walks of life who believe that in order to fix Britain, taxing the rich is an essential first step, and we want ordinary people to decide how.

Why does Take Back Power engage in disruptive direct action?

Nobody likes disruption, least of all the people disrupting, however history shows us that disruption is a necessary part of social change. Disruptive direct action brought us livable working conditions, the weekend, universal suffrage, and civil rights for marginalised communities. More recently, it saw the demand of Just Stop Oil become government policy. The evidence is clear that though people may not like the messenger, or the method of delivery, they hear the message. Ultimately this leads to political pressure and eventual social change...”

Relevant printouts, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW17**.

8.2.4 Take Back Power’s website details a number of incidents involving their activists/supporters since December 2025:

3 December 2025	Activists entered the lobby of The Ritz and dumped large piles of horse manure beneath the hotel's 25-foot Christmas tree.
6 December 2025	Activists threw custard and apple crumble at a case containing the crown jewels at the Tower of London
6 February 2026	Two activists locked themselves in front of Carriage Gate, blocking access to Parliament
5 March 2026	Fifteen Take Back Power activists were arrested by the police on suspicion of conspiracy to commit theft.
14 March 2026	Take Back Power activists took various food items, without paying, from supermarkets across four UK cities: Manchester, London, Exeter and Truro
19 April 2026	Seven Take Back Power activists were arrested by the police on suspicion of conspiracy to commit theft.
27 April 2026	Take Back Power activists staged a protest at Sotheby’s auction house.
30 April 2026	Take Back Power activists occupied a Ferrari dealership in Berkeley
1 May 2026	Take Back Power activists: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • took various food items, without paying, from a supermarket in Brixton; • occupied the luxury department store Liberty; and • disrupted access to the luxury hotel, Claridge’s.

Printouts, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, from the Take Back Power website covering the above incidents are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW18**.

8.2.5 A clear target of the Take Back Power group is the 'super-rich'. This gives rise to particular concern for the Claimants and the subject airports because:

8.2.5.1 there are private jet facilities at all of the subject airports and indeed at all of the airports which are the subject of the Claims;

8.2.5.2 the 'super-rich' are users, if not perceived users, of such facilities;

8.2.5.3 JSO and Extinction Rebellion activists have previously targeted private jet facilities at airports. I refer to:

(a) the incidents referred to in the table above at paragraph 7.2 on:

(1) 5 July 2025: Extinction Rebellion supporters marched to London Oxford Airport to draw attention to the number of private jets carrying ultra-wealthy passengers;

(2) 9 July 2025: Protestors led by Extinction Rebellion Scotland protested outside the terminal to campaign against private jet company Blackbird Air; and

(3) 19 January 2026: Extinction Rebellion staged a protest outside Macquarie Group Headquarters to protest against expansion at Farnborough Airport. Two activists occupied the entrance to the building unfurling a banner that calls for a ban on private jets and urged the investment firm to sever its connection to fossil fuels.

(b) the previous incident at Stansted Airport, on 20 June 2024, which involved two Just Stop Oil activists unlawfully gaining entry to the airport and spray-painting two private jets – for which those involved were found guilty of criminal damage at Chelmsford Crown Court in September 2025, receiving (a) a five month custodial sentence suspended for twelve months; and (b) a six week custodial sentence suspended for eight months plus 20 days rehabilitative activity. It was reported that this necessitated extensive professional cleaning, at a cost of c.£12,000 (a copy of relevant articles taken from JSO's website, printed out by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW19**); and

8.2.5.4 Take Back Power has a clear and evidenced history for taking direct action.

8.2.6 I am instructed that the Claimants are accordingly very concerned that their airports will become the focus of direct action by members of Take Back Power, given the presence of private jet facilities at their respective airports, in the absence of the continuation of the protection afforded by the injunction.

8.3 Extinction Rebellion

8.3.1 Extinction Rebellion remains an active organisation both in the UK and internationally, as evidenced by the incidents detailed in the Chronology, and one which, noting the concerns set out immediately above, has directly targeted action against private jet facilities in the period since the 2025 Review Hearing.

8.4 Fossil Free London

8.4.1 Fossil Free London's website (fossilfreelondon.org) describes the protest group as "a climate justice organisation dedicated to disrupting the fossil fuel industry here in our city. Through direct action, strategic campaigning, and movement building, we challenge the social licence of elites and corporate polluters". A

screenshot, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, showing this page is attached at **Exhibit AJW20**.

8.4.2 Fossil Free London has carried out a number of protests in the period since the 2025 Review Hearing, as evidenced by the Chronology.

8.5 Youth Demand

8.5.1 Youth Demand is the junior branch of JSO (formerly known as Youth Climate Swarm). I note that their website, like JSO’s website, directs visitors to Take Back Power’s website. A printout, taken by my colleague Meghan Clifford on 3 June 2026, from Youth Demand’s website is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW21**.

8.6 Whilst the JSO announcement in March 2025 and the apparent lack of protest action directly attributable to this group since the 2025 Review Hearing may indicate that the JSO campaign is no longer active, it appears, from the evidence above, that its members have very likely migrated to Take Back Power or other organisations.

8.7 Though the names and tactics may change and evolve over time, possibly in an attempt to exploit potential loopholes in unlawful protest injunction orders, for a number of the activists the primary objective remains disruptive demonstrations against organisations that they believe stand opposed to their demands, which includes those perceived to be facilitating and/or supporting the fossil fuel industry. That this is the case is demonstrated, in my view, by the evidenced links between Just Stop Oil, Extinction Rebellion and Youth Demand with Take Back Power and the involvement of members of these groups with it. Consequently, there remains a continued risk to the Claimants' airports that they will be the target of direct action in the absence of the protection afforded by the injunctions.

9. **OTHER AIRPORT INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS**

9.1 I am aware from checking their respective publicly accessible websites that the injunctions granted in 2024 in respect of those airports not covered by the Claims, referred to at paragraph 2.2.2 above, were continued at their first annual review hearing in 2025 - respectively:

	Airport(s)	Action Number	Judge / Date of Order
3	Heathrow Airport	KB-2024-002210	Mr Justice Turner 23 July 2025
5	Gatwick Airport	KB-2024-002336	Mr Duncan Atkinson KC (Sitting as a Deputy Judge in the High Court) 18 July 2025
7	Southend Airport	KB-2024-002596	His Honour Judge Freedman (Sitting as a Judge of the High Court) 22 October 2025

9.2 I am aware, from reviewing its publicly accessible website, that the second annual review hearing of the injunction granted in respect of Southend Airport and Heathrow Airport have been listed to be heard on 2 July 2026 and 9 July 2026 respectively. I do not know what the position is in respect of Gatwick Airport.

10. **WIDER INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS**

10.1 I am aware from this firm’s involvement in the matters or from checking the relevant publicly accessible websites of the following injunctions that have been granted more broadly to protect against the threat of unlawful environmental based protests:

Claim Number	Property	Claimant(s)	Duration of Injunction

QB-2022-001259	Shell Centre Tower	Shell International Petroleum Company Limited	Final injunction granted on 3 December 2024 until 23:59 on 3 December 2029 subject to annual review. At the most recent review hearing on 17 October 2025 the Court continued the injunction.
QB-2022-001241	Shell Haven Site	Shell UK Limited	Final injunction granted on 3 December 2024 until 23:59 on 3 December 2029 subject to annual review. At the most recent review hearing on 17 October 2025 the Court continued the injunction.
QB-2022-001420	Petrol filling stations	Shell UK Oil Products Limited	Final injunction granted on 3 December 2024 until 23:59 on 3 December 2029 subject to annual review. At the most recent review hearing on 17 October 2025 the Court continued the injunction.
PT-2022-000303	Buncefield Oil Terminal and the Kingsbury Oil Terminal	United Kingdom Oil Pipelines Limited and West London Pipeline and Storage Limited	Final injunction granted until 20 October 2028 subject to annual review. At the most recent review hearing on 13 November 2025 the Court continued the injunction.
QB-2022-000904	Pembroke oil refinery and jetties, Manchester oil terminal, Kingsbury oil terminal, Plymouth oil terminal, Cardiff terminal, Avonmouth terminal and Pembrokeshire terminal	Valero Energy Ltd, Valero Logistics UK Ltd and Valero Pembrokeshire Oil Terminal Ltd	Final injunction granted until 13 December 2028 or further order in the meantime following a hearing on 17 January 2024. At the most recent review hearing on 16 February 2026, the Court continued the injunction.
QB-2022-001098	Fawley Complex, Hythe Terminal, Avonmouth Terminal, Birmingham Terminal, Purfleet Terminal, West London Terminal, Hartland Park Logistics Hub and Alton	Esso Petroleum Company Limited and Exxonmobil Chemical Limited	Final injunction granted on 29 January 2024 until 11 July 2028 subject to annual review on 18 July of each year. At the most recent review hearing on 9 July 2025

	compound Holybourne	at	the Court continued the injunction. A further review hearing has been listed to be heard on 22 July 2026.
--	------------------------	----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

11. **DETERRENT EFFECT OF THE INJUNCTIONS**

11.1 The Claimants continue to have no objection to protests which are lawful and do not interfere with others' rights subject to those wishing to carry out a peaceful protest at the airports, making a request for the Claimants to designate an area for that purpose in accordance with the final recital in the 2024 Orders. In asking the Court to continue the injunctions granted by the 2024 Orders, the Claimants seek only to restrain direct/unlawful protest activity that goes beyond that which is peaceful and lawful and causes disruption to those seeking to go about their lawful business at the airports in question.

11.2 Noting the continued lack of direct/unlawful protest activity at the airports in question, alongside the incidents referred to within the Chronology, the Claimants infer that the protestors involved in these incidents (or some of them at least) have been careful to ensure that their unlawful behaviour has taken place at premises which are not protected by injunctions so that they are not at risk of proceedings for contempt of court. I would also draw attention to:

11.2.1 the following comments of Swift J in his judgment in *Exolum Pipeline System Limited & Others v Persons Unknown & Another* [2025] EWHC 1913 (KB) at [14]:

"14. The continuation of the Order made by Bennathan J has become necessary as orders of this type have themselves become features of what appear to be contests of attrition between activist organisations, such as Just Stop Oil, and any event or operation that those activists consider will, if disrupted, obtain publicity for and advance their cause. The attacks that Just Stop Oil undertakes are essentially opportunistic. As one or other target is made less accessible by orders such as the one now under consideration, activists will turn their attention somewhere else. The application to continue the Order made in 2022 rests on the premise that were this order to be discharged these terminals would once again be targeted and, having previously been the subject of an injunction, those terminals would be all the more an attractive target. Experience shows that such pessimism is warranted. I fear that, once made, the need for orders such as this one can almost become self-perpetuating, in that any decision to remove the order would, from the point of view of the activists, wave a flag above these terminals marking their return to the category of targets for disruption. Even though Just Stop Oil and other likeminded organisations may be opportunistic, experience shows that they are also persistent and will take any opportunity that presents itself".

11.2.2 paragraphs 20 and 31-32 of the First S Wortley Statement:

20 *"The fact that the protest on 27.07.24 was relocated from London City Airport to the Department of Transport and the fact that the JSO and Fossil Free London protestors conducted their protest from outside the red line of the injunction plan demonstrate that the injunction granted by Mr Justice Julian Knowles in that case on 20.06.24 served its purpose. In both instances peaceful protests went ahead but without causing unlawful interference to users of London City Airport"*

31 *"On 21.05.25, the Metropolitan Police sent an email to the security team at London City Airport which included the following:-*

"... the injunction at HAL [Heathrow Airport Limited] had a real impact on the Shell protest yesterday and builds on your experiences. To remove an injunction now would open up to further protest and whilst JSO have stepped

down there appears to be a cycle of new groups emerging and this cannot be ruled out so maintaining it would be very much recommended."

- 32 *"I believe the reference to "... the Shell protest ..." relates to the Annual General Meeting of Shell plc held at the Soffitel Hotel at Heathrow Terminal 5 on 20.05.25. The Metropolitan Police told London City Airport's security team that a protest by environmental protest groups:-*

"were forced to hold their protest at the Shell head office in central London rather than the AGM location at a hotel within the Heathrow Airport injunctioned area, in order to avoid the risk of associated penalties for breaching of the injunction."

- 11.3 The deterrent effect of injunction orders, such as those granted in these proceedings, is further evidenced I would respectfully suggest by the apparent willingness of those engaged in unlawful direct protest action to 'take their chances' of not being convicted in any subsequent criminal proceedings arising from such action where there is no protective injunction order in place. Whilst I acknowledge that criminal convictions do sometimes follow in such circumstances there are many instances of that not being the case – by way of example, I am aware that:
- 11.3.1 the jury at the initial trial of two JSO activists in January 2025, who sprayed departure boards at Heathrow Airport with orange paint in July 2024, failed to reach a majority decision. They were subsequently found guilty of criminal damage at a retrial in June 2026; and
 - 11.3.2 three JSO activists were found not guilty of causing a public nuisance in October 2025 by a jury for spraying Stonehenge with orange powder in 2024;
 - 11.3.3 three JSO activists were found not guilty of causing a public nuisance in September 2025 after climbing gantries on the M25 in 2022;
 - 11.3.4 eight JSO activists were found not guilty of intentionally or recklessly causing a public nuisance in August 2025 after blocking entrances to petrol stations in August 2022;
 - 11.3.5 the jury at the initial trial of a JSO supporter in July 2025, who climbed a gantry on the M25 in November 2022, failed to reach a majority decision; and
 - 11.3.6 five Palestine Action activists were cleared in February 2026 of aggravated burglary after Elbit Systems' (a UK subsidiary of an Israeli defence firm) was targeted on 6 August 2024. They were also charged with criminal damage and violent disorder but the jury reached partial or no verdicts on those counts. Four of the activists were subsequently found guilty of criminal damage at a retrial in May 2026.

Copies of news articles reporting on the above are exhibited at **Exhibit AJW22**.

12. **RESPONSE TO THE CLAIMS**

- 12.1 I can confirm that no acknowledgment of service, admission or defence has been received on behalf of the Defendants and that nobody has ever engaged with these proceedings.
- 12.2 I am informed by Kristin Garrett, General Counsel for Birmingham Airport, John Irving, Chief Executive Officer of Liverpool John Lennon Airport, and Graeme Gamble, Chief Operating Officer of Bristol Airport that the Claimants are not aware of the identity of any individuals who threaten to engage in direct/unlawful protest activity at their respective airports.

13. **FULL AND FRANK DISCLOSURE**

13.1 The Claimants are aware and mindful of their continuing duty to provide full and frank disclosure to the Court and consider that this duty has been complied with via the provision of this witness statement.

13.2 In accordance with that duty, I make reference to an incident at London Southend Airport on 8 June 2026, on which the text of a briefing note reporting on such incident, which was shared with Claire Acklam (Senior Legal Counsel of Leeds Bradford Airport) by Southend Airport's Head of Security, is exhibited at **Exhibit AJW23**. The briefing note states:

"Briefing Note Incident London Southend Airport 08/06/2026

Around 05.00 hrs on 08/06/2026 a group of 48 students arrived at London Southend Airport. They went straight to security. Only 1 had a hold bag. During the security screening process, one of the group was found to have a Just Stop Oil (JSO) orange hat in her bag. This had Just Stop Oil and their skull logo on it. The same student had a tin of 'Super Glue' hairspray. When asked why she had the items, she stated that someone had given it to her as a dare to carry for fresher week and gave very vague answers to questions asked. Another student was found to have a cabin bag with 3 handheld 'walkie talkie' radios in it. These were covered in coloured glass beads to look like child's toys, but were of a good quality Motorola Brand. When asked, her explanation was her friends preferred to use them rather than mobile phones on a night out. The girl was very argumentative and challenging towards security staff. All were well spoken students who appeared to be associated with Kings College and UCL, given the logos on their clothing. Two further large tins of the same style hair spray were found in other students bags.

Once through security, a number of students appeared from the rest rooms with bright orange t shirts on (the same colour orange as JSO). The T shirts had writing on which read 'Malta Hockey tour 2026'. At the same time, small groups started to position themselves all around the terminal, at or near to exit doors to the apron. The booking was confirmed as being made by 1 person, who had booked 24 flights a month ago, and the other 24 a week before departure . In the 24 hrs prior to departure, there were also another 50 people booked on the Malta flight, which easyJet stated was unusual activity for this route. Police were called and they positioned around the terminal. Other flights were boarded with Police at the gates to clear the terminal down, leaving only the Malta flight passengers.

When Police arrived, the students behaviour was observed. It appeared several older people were briefly communicating with the student group, but were not sitting with them. The older people were in smaller groups of 2 and were constantly walking around the terminal. Lots of texting was taking place, with many of the students appearing to pick up phones at exactly the same time to read texts. There appeared to be more movement around the terminal than would be usual for a delayed flight.

When the Police had enough resources, airport staff spoke to the organisers. The student group did not say they had any association with the older people. The main group of 48 students were taken back to CSA and conversations had with them. This did not ascertain much information, as all appeared to say exactly the same, however stories varied a lot as to where they were staying in Malta. All students had their bags searched (with their own consent) and nothing further was found. This was done in the presence of Police. Once cleared they were allowed to fly. It was noticed by airport security staff that a lot of the clothing in the bags appeared old and the toiletries were mainly half used items and cheap non branded perfumes

Once concluded, on the face of it, the incident did 'appear' to be a large group of students going on a hockey tour. We were unable to link anything to the adults who were seen talking with them. At this time, we do not know if the group had any other intentions, however we dealt with the incident as a potential protest related incident until it was clarified otherwise. The details of the LSA injunction were given to the organisers. The final outcome was a 2 hour delay, which disrupted operations in the terminal and required Police attendance".

13.3 Quite what the aims/motivations of those involved were is unclear from the above briefing note, but it does reinforce in my view the comments made above at paragraph 6 on the


risks and harm presented by direct/unlawful protest activity at the airports and how, especially given the currently heightened terrorism threat level in the UK, protest at airports could be interpreted by airport security services as a possible terror threat – necessitating the need for energy and resources to be diverted in order to address it.

14. **CONCLUSION**

- 14.1 I am informed by Kristin Garrett, General Counsel for Birmingham Airport, John Irving, Chief Executive Officer of Liverpool John Lennon Airport and Graeme Gamble, Chief Operating Officer of Bristol Airport that the Claimants’ directors have concluded that they should respectfully request the Court to order that the injunctions remain in full force and effect, subject to a review in 12 months’ time as provided by the 2024 Orders. I understand that they reached this decision after having considered carefully whether the threat of unlawful action has abated materially and having formed the view that it has not abated for the purposes of this year’s review hearing given the evidence set out above, and in particular, the elevated terrorism threat level. If the injunctions are continued in full force and effect, subject to a review in 12 months’ time, the Claimants will reassess matters afresh next year.
- 14.2 The impact of climate change continues to be firmly on the public agenda, continues to attract strong feelings and is still a subject about which campaigners are willing to contemplate disruptive action. The inference drawn by the Claimants (and by me) is that the injunctions granted over time have influenced the pattern of protest, with disruptive action being focused principally on targets which do not have the benefit of the Court’s protection by way of injunction. The Claimants therefore remain very concerned that protest groups, including but not limited to those referred to in this witness statement, will undertake disruptive direct action by way of trespass at the subject airports and/or causing a private or public nuisance on or around them if the injunctions were now to be lifted.
- 14.3 As is clear from the evidence, any such disruptive direct action would cause significant harm. There would be an impact on the Claimants’ operations, the operations of the airlines and businesses operating from them, the travelling public as well as the associated financial impact for all concerned.
- 14.4 The Claimants consider that the injunctions have had a deterrent effect and prevent the irreparable and serious potential harm that might be caused should the Defendants undertake any direct/unlawful protest activity in or around their respective airports. It is for this reason that they seek the injunctions remain in full force.
- 14.5 The risks are especially acute at this time of year: most of the incidents in which UK airports were targeted by environmental protestors in 2024 occurred between late June and August 2024 - the busiest period for holiday travel.

15. **NOTICE OF THE REVIEW HEARING**

- 15.1 The Claimants intend to give notice of the review hearing in the manner provided for in paragraph 5 of the 2024 Orders – namely by:
- 15.1.1 Uploading a copy of the application dated 2 June 2026, the draft Order, a copy of this witness statement and exhibits and details of the review hearing to each of the injunction websites;
- 15.1.2 sending copies of the documents referred to in the previous paragraph to the email addresses referred to in Schedule 3 to the 2024 Orders plus the following additional email addresses:
- 15.1.2.1 info@takebackpower.net and press@takebackpower.net which are understood to be linked to Take Back Power;
- 15.1.2.2 shut_the_system_info@proton.me, which is understood to be linked to Shut the System;




15.1.2.3 campaigner@fossilfreelondon.org and operations@fossilfreelondon.org which are understood to be linked to Fossil Free London; and

15.1.2.4 YouthDemandPress@protonmail.com and youthdemand@proton.me, which are understood to be linked to Youth Demand.

15.1.3 affixing a notice at each of the warning notice locations at each airport referring to the time and date of the review hearing and explaining where copies of the additional papers can be found and obtained in hard copy.

I believe that the facts stated in this Witness Statement and Exhibits 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.

I am duly authorised to make this statement on behalf of the Claimants.



Alexander James Wright

Legal Director, Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP

11 June 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants

- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW1

This is the exhibit marked "AJW1" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



CLAIM NO: KB-2024-002473

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION**

**BEFORE MR JUSTICE JACOBS
DATED 6TH AUGUST 2024**

BETWEEN:-

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
AND FIVE OTHERS

- v -

(1) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT SHOWN EGGED RED ON PLAN 1 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OTHERWISE)

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE DEFENDANTS, 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 OR ANY OF THEM TO BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

This Order prohibits you from doing certain acts. You should read this Order very carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to apply to the court to vary or discharge this Order (which is explained below).



BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE JACOBS

ON 6 AUGUST 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form dated 31 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' application for an injunction dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the witness statements of Stuart Sherbrooke Wortley dated 1 August 2024 and dated 6 August 2024, Nick Barton dated 31 July 2024, John Irving dated 31 July 2024 and Graeme Gamble dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**")

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Mr Sibley, Counsel for the Claimants and no one attending for the Defendants

AND UPON the First Claimant giving and the Court accepting the undertakings set out in Schedule 2 to this Order

AND UPON the First Claimant informing the Court that any requests from those wishing to carry out peaceful protest to designate an area for that purpose at Birmingham Airport, as defined by this Order, should be made by email to protestrequest@birminghamairport.co.uk

AND UPON the Claimants amending the sealed Claim Form and Particulars of Claim prior to service, pursuant to CPR 17.1(1), to substitute a new plan 1 for Birmingham Airport and to amend the definitions of the Defendants

DEFINITIONS

"**Birmingham Airport**" means the land outlined in red on Plan 1 to the Amended Claim Form, appended to this Order in Schedule 1 ("**Plan 1**").

"**Warning Notice**" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order.

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the First Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of Birmingham Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the First Claimant.

REVIEW

2. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court's list) with a time estimate of 2 ½ hours. The Claimant is permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton Arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the hearing. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall lapse at 4pm on the anniversary of the order (or as the case may be the latest annual review) unless, before then, the Claimant has applied for the review to take place.

SERVICE/NOTIFICATION

3. Service of the Amended Claim Form and the Application for injunction is dispensed with, pursuant to CPR 16, 6.28 and 81.4(2)(c).
4. This Order, the Amended Claim Form, Application Notice and evidence in support will be served on or notified to the Defendants by the Claimants carrying out each of the following steps:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website:
<https://www.Birminghamairport.co.uk/injunction>.
 - b. Sending an email to the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above.
 - c. Affixing a Warning Notice approximately at those locations marked with an "X" on Plan 1 setting out where these documents can be found and obtained in hard copy.
5. Service on or notification to the Defendants of any further applications or documents shall be effected by carrying out the steps in paragraphs 4a and 4b above.
6. In respect of paragraphs 4 and 5 above, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place on the date on which all the relevant steps have been carried out.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, in respect of the steps referred to at paragraphs 4 and 5, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place when the documents have all been first affixed regardless of whether they are subsequently removed.

8. A Note of the Hearing shall as soon as reasonably practicable be uploaded onto:
<https://www.Birminghamairport.co.uk/injunction>.
9. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the First Claimant's solicitors for service or notification (whose details are set out below).

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

10. Anyone 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 First Claimant's solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by email to the First Claimant's solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and Order by email at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the First Claimant's solicitors.
13. The First Claimant has liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE FIRST CLAIMANT

16. The First Claimant's solicitors and their contact details are:



(1) Stuart Wortley
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com
07712 881 393

(2) Nawaaz Allybokus
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
NawaazAllybokus@eversheds-sutherland.com
07920 590 944

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE COURT

Kings Bench Division, The Royal Courts of Justice, The Strand, London, WC2A 2LL by the Court's E-Filing service at <https://efile.cfile-app.com>

SCHEDULE 1




SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE FIRST CLAIMANT

- (1) The First Claimant will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 - EMAIL ADDRESSES

- juststopoil@protonmail.com
- juststopoilpress@protonmail.com
- info@juststopoil.org
- enquiries@extinctionrebellion.co.uk

SCHEDULE 4 - WARNING NOTICE



NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 6 AUGUST 2024 (“the Order”)

TO: PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE) (the “Defendants”)

FROM: Birmingham Airport Limited (the “First Claimant”)

This notice relates to the land known as Birmingham Airport which is shown edged red on the Plan below (the “Airport”).

The Order prohibits entering, occupying or remaining upon any part of the Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the First Claimant.


You must not do any of the above acts either yourself or by means of another person acting on your behalf, instructions or encouragement.

You must not contravene the terms of the Order and if you do, you may be in contempt of Court and sent to prison, fined or have your assets seized

Any person affected by the Order may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge it but if they wish to do so they must inform the First Claimant’s solicitors by email to the address specified below 72 hours before making such application of the nature of such application and the basis for it.

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 6 August 2024 may be viewed at: <https://www.Birminghamairport.co.uk/injunction>

Copies may also be obtained from the Information Desk or by contacting Stuart Wortley of Eversheds Sutherland on 0771 288 1393 or by email stuartwortley@eversheds-sutherland.com.



CLAIM NO: KB-2024-002473

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION**

**BEFORE MR JUSTICE JACOBS
DATED 6TH AUGUST 2024**

BETWEEN:-

(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED

AND FOUR OTHERS

- v -

(2) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT LIVERPOOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE)

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE DEFENDANTS, 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 OR ANY OF THEM TO BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

This Order prohibits you from doing certain acts. You should read this Order very carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to apply to the court to vary or discharge this Order (which is explained below).



BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE JACOBS

ON 6 AUGUST 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form dated 31 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' application for an injunction dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the witness statements of Stuart Sherbrooke Wortley dated 1 August 2024 and dated 6 August 2024, Nick Barton dated 31 July 2024, John Irving dated 31 July 2024 and Graeme Gamble dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**")

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Mr Sibley, Counsel for the Claimants and no one attending for the Defendants

AND UPON the Second and Third Claimants giving and the Court accepting the undertakings set out in Schedule 2 to this Order

AND UPON the Second and Third Claimants informing the Court that any requests from those wishing to carry out peaceful protest to designate an area for that purpose at Liverpool Airport, as defined by this Order, should be made by email to protestrequest@liverpoolairport.com

AND UPON the Claimants amending the sealed Claim Form and Particulars of Claim prior to service, pursuant to CPR 17.1(1), to substitute a new plan 1 for Birmingham Airport and to amend the definitions of the Defendants

DEFINITIONS

"**Liverpool Airport**" means the land outlined in red on Plan 2 to the Amended Claim Form, appended to this Order in Schedule 1 ("**Plan 2**").

"**Warning Notice**" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order.

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the Second Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of Liverpool Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Second and Third Claimants.

REVIEW

2. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court's list) with a time estimate of 2 ½ hours. The Claimant is permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton Arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the hearing. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall lapse at 4pm on the anniversary of the order (or as the case may be the latest annual review) unless, before then, the Claimant has applied for the review to take place.

SERVICE/NOTIFICATION

3. Service of the Amended Claim Form and the Application for injunction is dispensed with, pursuant to CPR 16, 6.28 and 81.4(2)(c).
4. This Order, the Amended Claim Form, Application Notice and evidence in support will be served on or notified to the Defendants by the Claimants carrying out each of the following steps:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website:
<https://www.liverpoolairport.com/injunction>
 - b. Sending an email to the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above.
 - c. Affixing a Warning Notice approximately at those locations marked with an "X" on Plan 2 setting out where these documents can be found and obtained in hard copy.
5. Service on or notification to the Defendants of any further applications or documents shall be effected by carrying out the steps in paragraphs 4a and 4b above.
6. In respect of paragraphs 4 and 5 above, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place on the date on which all the relevant steps have been carried out.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, in respect of the steps referred to at paragraphs 4 and 5, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place when the documents have all been first affixed regardless of whether they are subsequently removed.

8. A Note of the Hearing shall as soon as reasonably practicable be uploaded onto:
<https://www.liverpoolairport.com/injunction>.
9. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the Second and Third Claimants' solicitors for service or notification (whose details are set out below).

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

10. Anyone 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 Second and Third Claimants' solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by email to the Second and Third Claimants' solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and Order by email at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the Second and Third Claimants' solicitors.
13. The Second and Third Claimants have liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE SECOND AND THIRD CLAIMANTS

16. The Second and Third Claimants' solicitors and their contact details are:

(1) Stuart Wortley
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com
07712 881 393

(2) Nawaaz Allybokus
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
NawaazAllybokus@eversheds-sutherland.com
07920 590 944

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE COURT

Kings Bench Division, The Royal Courts of Justice, The Strand, London, WC2A 2LL by the Court's E-Filing service at <https://efile.cfile-app.com>

SCHEDULE 1



SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE SECOND AND THIRD CLAIMANTS

- (1) The Second and Third Claimants will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 - EMAIL ADDRESSES

- juststopoil@protonmail.com
- juststopoilpress@protonmail.com
- info@juststopoil.org
- enquiries@extinctionrebellion.co.uk

SCHEDULE 4 - WARNING NOTICE

KB-2024-002473 High Court Injunction in Force

NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 6 AUGUST 2024 (“the Order”)

TO: PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT LIVERPOOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 2 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE) (the “**Defendants**”)

FROM: Liverpool Airport Limited and Peel L&P Investments (North) Limited (the “**Second and Third Claimants**”)

This notice relates to the land known as Liverpool Airport which is shown edged red on the Plan below (the “**Airport**”).

The Order prohibits entering, occupying or remaining upon any part of the Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Second and Third Claimants.

You must not do any of the above acts either yourself or by means of another person acting on your behalf, instructions or encouragement.

You must not contravene the terms of the Order and if you do, you may be in contempt of Court and sent to prison, fined or have your assets seized

Any person affected by the Order may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge it but if they wish to do so they must inform the Second and Third Claimants’ solicitors by email to the address specified below 72 hours before making such application of the nature of such application and the basis for it.

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 6 August 2024 may be viewed at: <https://www.liverpoolairport.com/injunction>

Copies may also be obtained from the Information Desk or by contacting Stuart Wortley of Eversheds Sutherland on 0771 288 1393 or by email stuartwortley@eversheds-sutherland.com.



CLAIM NO: KB-2024-002473

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION**

**BEFORE MR JUSTICE JACOBS
DATED 6TH AUGUST 2024**

BETWEEN:-

- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

AND THREE OTHERS

- v -

- (3) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BRISTOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 3 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE)

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE DEFENDANTS, 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 OR ANY OF THEM TO BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

This Order prohibits you from doing certain acts. You should read this Order very carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to apply to the court to vary or discharge this Order (which is explained below).



BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE JACOBS

ON 6 AUGUST 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form dated 31 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' application for an injunction dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the witness statements of Stuart Sherbrooke Wortley dated 1 August 2024 and dated 6 August 2024, Nick Barton dated 31 July 2024, John Irving dated 31 July 2024 and Graeme Gamble dated 31 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**")

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Mr Sibley, Counsel for the Claimants and no one attending for the Defendants

AND UPON the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants giving and the Court accepting the undertakings set out in Schedule 2 to this Order

AND UPON the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants informing the Court that any requests from those wishing to carry out peaceful protest to designate an area for that purpose at Bristol Airport, as defined by this Order, should be made by email to protestrequest@Bristolairport.com

AND UPON the Claimants amending the sealed Claim Form and Particulars of Claim prior to service, pursuant to CPR 17.1(1), to substitute a new plan 1 for Birmingham Airport and to amend the definitions of the Defendants

DEFINITIONS

"**Bristol Airport**" means the land shown outlined in red on Plan 3 to the Amended Claim Form, appended to this Order in Schedule 1 ("**Plan 3**").

"**Warning Notice**" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order.

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the Third Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of Bristol Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants.

REVIEW

2. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court's list) with a time estimate of 2 ½ hours. The Claimant is permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton Arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the hearing. The injunction set out at paragraph 1 of this Order shall lapse at 4pm on the anniversary of the order (or as the case may be the latest annual review) unless, before then, the Claimant has applied for the review to take place.

SERVICE/NOTIFICATION

3. Service of the Amended Claim Form and the Application for injunction is dispensed with, pursuant to CPR 16, 6.28 and 81.4(2)(c).
4. This Order, the Amended Claim Form, Application Notice and evidence in support will be served on or notified to the Defendants by the Claimants carrying out each of the following steps:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website:
<https://www.Bristolairport.com/injunction>
 - b. Sending an email to the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above.
 - c. Affixing a Warning Notice approximately at those locations marked with an "X" on Plan 3 setting out where these documents can be found and obtained in hard copy.
5. Service on or notification to the Defendants of any further applications or documents shall be effected by carrying out the steps in paragraphs 4a and 4b above.

6. In respect of paragraphs 4 and 5 above, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place on the date on which all the relevant steps have been carried out.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, in respect of the steps referred to at paragraphs 4 and 5, effective service or notification will be deemed to have taken place when the documents have all been first affixed regardless of whether they are subsequently removed.
8. A Note of the Hearing shall as soon as reasonably practicable be uploaded onto: <https://www.Bristolairport.com/injunction>.
9. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors for service or notification (whose details are set out below).

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

10. Anyone 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 Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by email to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and Order by email at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors.
13. The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants have liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH CLAIMANTS

16. The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants' solicitors and their contact details are:

(1) Stuart Wortley
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com
07712 881 393

(2) Nawaaz Allybokus
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
NawaazAllybokus@eversheds-sutherland.com
07920 590 944

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE COURT

Kings Bench Division, The Royal Courts of Justice, The Strand, London, WC2A 2LL by the Court's E-Filing service at <https://efile.cfile-app.com>

SCHEDULE 1



Bristol Airport - Plan 3

ORBITAL
WITNESS



SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH CLAIMANTS

(1) The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 - EMAIL ADDRESSES

- juststopoil@protonmail.com
- juststopoilpress@protonmail.com
- info@juststopoil.org
- enquiries@extinctionrebellion.co.uk

SCHEDULE 4 - WARNING NOTICE



NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 6 AUGUST 2024 (“the Order”)

TO: PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BRISTOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 3 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE) (the “Defendants”)

FROM: Bristol Airport Limited, South West Airports Limited and Bristol Developments Limited (the “Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants”)

This notice relates to the land known as Bristol Airport which is shown edged red on the Plan below (the “Airport”).

The Order prohibits entering, occupying or remaining upon any part of the Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants.


You must not do any of the above acts either yourself or by means of another person acting on your behalf, instructions or encouragement.

You must not contravene the terms of the Order and if you do, you may be in contempt of Court and sent to prison, fined or have your assets seized

Any person affected by the Order may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge it but if they wish to do so they must inform the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants’ solicitors by email to the address specified below 72 hours before making such application of the nature of such application and the basis for it.

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 6 August 2024 may be viewed at: <https://www.Bristolairport.com/injunction>.

Copies may also be obtained from the Information Desk or by contacting Stuart Wortley of Eversheds Sutherland on 0771 288 1393 or by email stuartwortley@eversheds-sutherland.com.



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants

- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW2

This is the exhibit marked "AJW2" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

BEFORE: THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE BOURNE

ON: 24 June 2025

B E T W E E N : -

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORT LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT LIMITED



KB-2024-002473
Claimants

-and-

(1) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION OR OTHERWISE)

(2) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT LIVERPOOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 2 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION OR OTHERWISE)

(3) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT WHO ENTER OR REMAIN ON THE PREMISES AT BRISTOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 3 TO THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION OR OTHERWISE)

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

IF YOU, THE DEFENDANTS, 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 OR ANY OF THEM TO BREACH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE IMPRISONED, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

This Order prohibits you from doing certain acts. You should read this Order very carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to apply to the court to vary or discharge this Order (which is explained below).

UPON the injunction made by Order dated 6 August 2024 by Jacobs J (“**the Jacobs J Order**”)

AND UPON the Claimants’ application dated 2 June 2025

AND UPON the review hearings in each of the following claims having been listed on 24 June 2025 to be heard together KB-2024-1765, KB-2024-002132, KB-2024-002317, and KB-2024-002473 (“**the Claims**”)

AND UPON reading the application and the witness evidence in support

AND UPON hearing Mr Morshead K.C. and Miss Barden, counsel for the Claimants and there being no other attendance

AND UPON the Court being satisfied that there has been no material change in circumstances warranting amendments to or the setting aside of the relief granted by the Jacobs J Order

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Jacobs J Order shall remain in full force and effect subject to the amendment referred to in paragraph 2 below (and subject to review, as provided for in paragraph 2 of the Jacobs Order).
2. Paragraph 2 of the Jacobs J Order is amended so as to read:

“The injunction contained at paragraph 1 of this Order shall be reviewed on each anniversary of this Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court’s list). Such hearing shall be listed to be heard with the review of any injunctions made in all or any of the claims with the Claims, with a time estimate of 1 day. The Claimants are permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the review hearing.”

3. The court will provide sealed copies of this order to the Claimants’ solicitors for service or notification.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants

- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW3

This is the exhibit marked "AJW3" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand
London, WC2A 2LL

Wednesday, 26th August 2025

BEFORE:

MR JUSTICE BOURNE

BETWEEN:

LONDON CITY AIRPORT LTD & ORS

Claimants

- and -

PERSONS UNKNOWN

Defendants

MR T MORSHEAD KC, MS E BARDEN (instructed by Eversheds Sutherland International LLP) appeared on behalf of the Claimant
THE DEFENDANTS were not present and not represented

JUDGMENT

(Approved)

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

This Transcript is Crown Copyright. It may not be reproduced in whole or in part other than in accordance with relevant licence or with the express consent of the Authority. All rights are reserved.

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

1. MR JUSTICE BOURNE: At this hearing I conducted the first annual review of injunctions granted at the separate hearings of four claims last year, concerning activities by environmental protestors at a total of ten airports at different locations in England. The relevant airports are identified in each order.
2. The claimants were represented by Mr Morshead, King’s Counsel and Ms Baden of counsel. There was no appearance by any defendant or by anyone expressing opposition to the continuation of the injunctions.
3. The injunctions were sought because in 2024, airports in England and elsewhere became targets in campaigns of disruptive environmental protest, notably by the campaigning group, “Just Stop Oil” (“JSO”). Individual airports and groups of airports sought injunctive relief against “Persons Unknown”, invoking the “newcomer” jurisdiction as explained by the Supreme Court in *Wolverhampton City Council v London Gypsies and Travellers* [2023] UKSC 47, [2024] 1 AC 983 (“Wolverhampton”).
4. I have read the judgments given when the original injunctions were granted of Julian Knowles J (20 June 2024, KB-2024-176) HHJ Coe KC (5 July, KB-2024-002132) and Ritchie J (19 July 2024, KB-2024-002317). I have also seen a note of what was said by Jacob J in KB-2024-002473 on 6 August 2024.
5. By way of context, I note that orders were also made at hearings in other claims concerning Heathrow (Julian Knowles J, 24 July 2024), Gatwick (Ritchie J, 19 July 2024) and Southend Airports (Farbey J, 14 August 2024). This review does not encompass those three cases.
6. Each judge was satisfied that an injunction was necessary to restrain the threat of tortious conduct and that it was just and convenient to make an order. In particular, because of threats of unlawful action by protest groups, viewed in the light of some previous incidents, and the potential for such action to cause health and safety risks (to the public, airport staff, emergency services and/or the protestors themselves) and delay and disruption to the public. In addition, each judge was satisfied that it was appropriate to grant injunction against “Persons Unknown.”

7. I shall note increase the length of this judgment or extend the corpus of judicial discussions of this broad subject by repeating the statements of legal principle and factual considerations, which were set out by the judges when granting the injunctions last year.
8. It is, in particular, unnecessary for me to explore some distinctive characteristics of these cases which were considered by the judges, notably the fact that the claims concern a combination of (1) land owned by the claimants, (2) land not owned by the claimants but on which there is airport infrastructure and (3) public highways in and around the airports. The injunction granted to London City Airport covers land in category (1) only, whereas the injunctions in the other three cases cover all three categories. The claimants are not seeking any geographical expansion of the injunctions granted last year. London City Airport seeks, and I will grant, permission to amend to reflect a change of ownership of one specific area.
9. The nature of a review hearing of this kind was considered in *Wolverhampton* at paragraph 225, where the Supreme Court observed that the hearing:

“...will give 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 has emerged, whether there is any proper justification for continuance; and whether and on what basis, a further order ought to be made.”

10. In *High Speed Two (HS2) Ltd & Anor v Persons Unknown* [2024] EWHC 1277 (KB), Richie J described the court’s task at a review hearing:

“Drawing these authorities together, on a review of an interim injunction against PUs [Persons Unknown] 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.

33. 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.”

11. I have therefore considered whether, since last year’s injunction orders were made, there has been any material change affecting, diminishing or removing the need for them to be in place.
12. Each application for review is supported by a witness statement by Stuart Wortley, a partner in Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP, who represent the claimants. He sets out a chronology of incidents and events, occurring both before and since last year’s injunctions.
13. Of the events postdating any or all of the injunctions, Mr Moreshead emphasises several, including the following:-
 - (a) On 19 July 2024, one of the JSO founders, Roger Hallam, was found guilty with others of conspiring to organised protests to block the N25 motorway in November 2022. He was sentenced to five years in prison, later reduced on appeal to four years.
 - (b) On 24 July 2024, ten JSO activists were arrested at Heathrow Airport, seemingly equipped to be able to cut through fences and/or affix themselves to parts of the land or aircraft. Of those individuals, nine were later found guilty by a jury of conspiracy to cause a public nuisance. Five were sentenced to terms in prison of up to 15 months, and four were given suspended sentences.
 - (c) On 27 July 2024 a protest which was due to occur at London City Airport, was relocated to the Department of Transport.
 - (d) On 29 July 2024, eight JSO activists were arrested at Gatwick Airport on suspicion of interfering with public infrastructure.

(e) On 30 July 2024, two JSO activists were arrested at Heathrow Airport after spraying orange paint around the Terminal 5 entrance hall and on destination boards in the departure lounge. Following a criminal trial, the jury was unable to return a verdict.

(f) On 31 July 2024, a protest by JSO and Fossil Free London, was held at the Docklands Light Railway Station, at London City Airport. That being an area excluded from the red line of the injunction.

(g) On 1 August 2024, six JSO activists were blocked access to the departure gates at Heathrow Terminal 5.

(h) On 5 August 2024, five JSO activists were arrested on their way to Manchester Airport and were in possession of bolt cutters, angle grinders, glue, sand and banners reading “oil kills”. Four of these individuals were subsequently found guilty of conspiracy to commit a public nuisance and then sentenced to terms of imprisonment, ranging between 18 and 30 months.

(i) On 21 February 2025, XR held a demonstration at Inverness Airport against climate change.

(j) On 27 May 2025, JSO made an announcement which at least gave the impression that it had now decided to withdraw from mounting disruptive protests of a direct action nature.

(k) However, on 18 May 2025, GB News reported that JSO was considering a “dramatic U-turn” and on 21 May 2025, JSO sent a link to its subscribers with the comment, “GB News was right for once. We are ‘plotting a comeback’.”

(l) On 21 May 2025, London City Airport received intelligence information from the Metropolitan Police of a protest by environmental protest groups, which had been planned at Heathrow Airport, to be held at the Sofitel Hotel on 20 May 2025, where an annual general meeting for Shell was being held and which was within the redline boundary of the injunction obtained by that airport. The protest was relocated to the

Shell head office, “in order to avoid the risk of associated penalties for breaching the injunction.”

(m) Over the weekend of 14 and 15 June 2025, JSO arranged an event described as “Seeds of Rebellion”, which seemingly was part of a training programme – a “summer of resistance training” – where attenders would be taught how “to plan actions that cut through” and to “plant the seeds of the coming non-violent revolution.”

(n) JSO’s fundraising page currently invites donations for – “[A] New campaign [that] is in the works”

14. Mr Wortley’s evidence also mentions activities of other protest groups opposed to the use of fossil fuels including Youth Demand, Extinction Rebellion and Fossil Free London. He refers to disruptive protest activity in 2024 and 2025 by Extinction Rebellion, though not at airports. He also exhibited an email sent by the Metropolitan Police to London City Airport’s security team on 21 May 2025, which referred to the incident relating to the Shell AGM and said:

“...The injunction at [Heathrow Airport] had a real impact on the Shell protest yesterday and builds on your experiences. To remove an injunction now, would open up to further protest. And whilst JSO have stepped down, there appear to be a cycle of new groups emerging and this cannot be ruled out, so maintaining it would be very much recommended.”

15. I accept Mr Moreshead’s submission that that advice from the police is a relevant consideration. Although the announcement by JSO on 21 March 2025 could signal a reduction from the risk of unlawful activity at the airports, there is also clear evidence of a possible U-turn from that announcement. And, as Mr Morshead submits, even if JSO left the scene, it is too early to tell what the effect of that would be, having regard to the possibility of some JSO members continuing to support direct action, and to the continued existence of other protest groups. Nor is it possible to conclude that the risk has been materially reduced or removed by the imprisonment of some JSO activists referred to above.

16. Meanwhile, the substantial, though not total lack of direct action at the airports since the grant of the injunctions is consistent with the injunctions having proved to be an effective deterrent. I accept that removing the injunctions at present would create a real risk of a resumption of activity at airports.
17. When granting the injunctions, the judges last year concluded that enforcement of bylaws and criminal proceedings did not provide an adequate alternative remedy. That, in my view, has not changed.
18. In the circumstances considered as a whole, I conclude that there has been no material change which removes or seriously diminishes the justification or the rationale for the injunctions, and that they should continue in force.
19. Turning to the form of the order, Mr Morshead showed me the decision of Nicklin J in *MBR Acres Limited and Others v John Curtin & Persons Unknown* [2025] EWHC 331 (KB), which took a different approach of directing an injunction in a protest case, “**contra mundum**”, rather than by describing categories of defendants by reference to the conduct to be prohibited, which would also make service of the claim unnecessary. Nicklin J noted that the court must consider what other or better solutions may be available, having regard to enhanced police and local authority powers. He also indicated that orders should include a requirement that the court’s permission be obtained before any application is made to commit for contempt of court.
20. Mr Morshead submitted that it would be better in this case to retain a description of the intended defendants, by reference to the conduct being enjoined, and that that course was followed in a later decision of Soole J in *Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the University of Cambridge v Persons Unknown* [2025] EWHC 724 (KB). He also submitted that a requirement for consent for committal proceedings should not be necessary, having regard to the safeguards built into the injunction and to the impact which applications for consent could have on costs and court resources.
21. In the present cases, the judges last year found it appropriate to describe or define the defendants by specific reference to the type of conduct to be enjoined. Although Nicklin J has identified a possible different approach, it seems to me that on a review

hearing, I should not change the approach taken by the previous judges, where the underlying circumstances have not materially changed. I am also mindful of the need, emphasised by the Supreme Court in *Wolverhampton* at paragraph 221, for defendants in injunctions to be defined as precisely as possible. It seems to me that that also favours a continuation of the approach taken last year.

22. Nor am I persuaded to depart from what was ordered last year by adopting a standard wording to define or describe the prohibited acts in the four cases before me. The differences in wording have not created any difficulty for me in conducting this review, and any potential defendant who has already become aware of the injunction in respect of any specific airport may already be aware of the existing wording, and that factor militates against a change.
23. I also accept the submission that it is not necessary to insert a provision requiring consent or permission to be obtained for any contempt application in the event of a breach of the injunction. Although such a provision could provide a helpful safeguard in some “**contra mundum**” cases, as described by Nicklin J in *MVR Acres*, in the present cases, no enforcement issue has arisen so far. That is by contrast with *MBR Acres*, where Nicklin J vigorously criticised the conduct of claimants who pursued a committal application, which he described as frivolous and bordering on vexatious. As Mr Morshead said, claimants who choose to commence committal proceedings for trivial breaches do so at their own risk. The courts have repeatedly said that, in cases which do not appear to have been cited to the court in *MBR Acres*, such as *Sectorguard Plc v Diene Plc* [2009] EWHC 2693 (Ch), per Briggs J at paragraph 46. Meanwhile, in the circumstances of the present case, I have no reason to expect that such an issue will arise.
24. It seems to me, by way of confirmation, that the steps taken to publicise the orders last year, remain appropriate and sufficient.
25. I will provide for the next review to take place in one year from now. It will remain open for anyone to apply to vary or discharge the orders before then. The cases will again be listed together upon that occasion, but I see no need to consolidate them.

26. I shall ask counsel to finalise the terms of an order whose effect is that the injunctions granted last year will remain in force. For practical reasons, and in principle, that seems to me preferable to the alternative of granting entirely new injunctions.

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

Lower Ground, 46 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JE

Email: civil@epiqglobal.co.uk

This transcript has been approved by the Judge

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants

- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW4

This is the exhibit marked "AJW4" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Injunction

Birmingham Airport Injunction Order

On 6 August 2024 the High Court granted Birmingham Airport Limited an injunction, which prohibits anyone from entering, occupying or remaining upon any part of Birmingham Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without our permission.

Anyone found to be in breach of the Order could be sent to prison, fined or have assets seized for contempt of Court.

Documents relating to the Injunction and hearing on 6 August 2024 can be found on the links of this page:

- [Sealed Order](#)
- [Sealed Order granting permission to amend Claim Form](#)
- [Amended Claim Form](#)
- [Plan 1 to the Claim Form](#)
- [Amended Particulars of Claim](#)
- [Plans 1A and 1B](#)
- [Hearing Bundle](#)
- [Skeleton Argument](#)
- [Note of the Hearing](#)

On 24th June 2025 the High Court extended the injunction

- [Sealed Order](#)

Documents relating to the Injunction Review hearing on 24th June 2025 can be found below:

- [Supplemental Hearing Bundle](#)
- [Airports - Skeleton](#)
- [Airports - Chronology](#)
- [Airport Injunction Renewal](#)

Injunction

Liverpool John Lennon Airport injunction

On 6 August 2024, the High Court granted the airport an injunction which prohibits anyone from entering, occupying or remaining on Liverpool Airport in connection with any fossil fuel or other environmental campaign.

Anyone breaching the injunction might be imprisoned for up to two years, fined and/or have their assets seized for contempt of court.

Documents relating to the Injunction can be found on this page via the links below:

1. The [Sealed Order](#)
2. The [Sealed Order regarding permission to attend claim for costs](#)
3. The [Amended Claim Form](#)
4. [Liverpool Airport – Map 2](#)
5. The [Amended D&C](#)
6. The [Hearing Bundle \(Part 1 | Part 2\)](#)
7. The [Skeleton Argument](#)
8. The [Notes of the Hearing](#)

On 24 June 2025 the High Court extended the injunction

1. The [Sealed Order](#)
2. The [Injunction renewal](#)

Documents relating to the Injunction Review Hearing on 24th June 2025 can be found below:

1. The [Supplemental Hearing Bundle](#)
2. The [Claimants' chronology](#)
3. The [Claimants' skeleton arguments](#)

Bristol Airport Injunction

On 6 August 2024, the High Court granted Bristol Airport Limited an injunction to prohibit anyone from entering, occupying or remaining on Bristol Airport (as shown in Bristol Airport-Plan3 attached to the Injunction Order) in connection with Just Stop Oil (or other environmental campaign or protest groups) without the consent of Bristol Airport Limited.

Anyone breaching the injunction might be imprisoned for up to 2 years, fined and/or have their assets seized for contempt of court.

On 24 June 2025 the High Court extended the injunction.

Documents relating to the Injunction and the Hearing on 6 August 2024 can be obtained using the links below:

[The Sealed Order dated 6 August 2024](#)

[The Sealed Order granting permission to amend claim form dated 7 August 2024](#)

[The Sealed Order granting permission to change the Bristol Airport Injunction web address dated 12 August 2024](#)

[The Amended Claim form](#)

[Bristol Airport-Plan 3](#)

[Amended PoC](#)

[The Hearing Bundle \(Part 1\)](#)

[The Hearing Bundle \(Part 2\)](#)

[The Skeleton Argument](#)

[The Note of the Hearing](#)

Documents relating to the Injunction Review Hearing on 24 June 2025 can be found below:

[BHX N244 Renewal 02.06.25 Part 1](#)

[BHX N244 Renewal 02.06.25 Part 2](#)

[Sealed Order 24.06.25](#)

[The Skeleton Argument](#)

[Chronology](#)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW5

This is the exhibit marked "AJW5" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.





Liverpool Airport - Plan 2



Map scale 1:11,000
Assumes printed map area measures 395mm by 272mm.

ORBITAL WITNESS






Bristol Airport - Plan 3



**ORBITAL
WITNESS**



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW6

This is the exhibit marked "AJW6" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Owen, Elin

From: Wright, Alexander
Sent: 09 June 2026 15:58
To: enquiries@extinctionrebellion.co.uk; juststopoilpress@protonmail.com; info@juststopoil.org; juststopoil@protonmail.com
Subject: Birmingham Airport, Liverpool John Lennon Airport and Bristol Airport Injunction - Order from 2025 Review Hearing (24 June 2025)
Attachments: Bristol Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329812.1).pdf; Liverpool Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329806.1).pdf; Birmingham Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329811.1).pdf

To whom it may concern

We write further to the first review hearing heard by Bourne J on 24 June 2025 (“**the First Review Hearing**”) in respect of the injunctions granted in these proceedings by Order dated 6 August 2024 by Jacobs J.

We attach a copy of the Order of Bourne J from the First Review Hearing by way of service on you.

The precise terms of each order can be viewed from the webpage address referred to in the table below, at which copies of all applicable documents can be viewed also.

Airport	Action Number	Webpage address
Birmingham Airport	KB-2024-2473	Injunction Birmingham Airport Website
Liverpool John Lennon Airport		Liverpool John Lennon Airport
Bristol Airport		Bristol Airport Injunction

Regards

Alex Wright | Legal Director | Real Estate Disputes | Eversheds Sutherland

T: +44 161 831 8582

M: +44 7500 578 620

www.linkedin.com/in/alexwrighteversheds

www.eversheds-sutherland.com

Eversheds Sutherland

Helping our clients, our people and our communities to thrive



Owen, Elin

From: Wright, Alexander
Sent: 09 June 2026 16:02
To: enquiries@extinctionrebellion.uk
Subject: Birmingham Airport, Liverpool John Lennon Airport and Bristol Airport Injunction - Order from 2025 Review Hearing (24 June 2025)
Attachments: Bristol Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329812.1).pdf; Liverpool Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329806.1).pdf; Birmingham Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329811.1).pdf

To whom it may concern

We write further to the first review hearing heard by Bourne J on 24 June 2025 (“**the First Review Hearing**”) in respect of the injunctions granted in these proceedings by Order dated 6 August 2024 by Jacobs J.

We attach a copy of the Order of Bourne J from the First Review Hearing by way of service on you.

The precise terms of each order can be viewed from the webpage address referred to in the table below, at which copies of all applicable documents can be viewed also.

Airport	Action Number	Webpage address
Birmingham Airport	KB-2024-2473	Injunction Birmingham Airport Website
Liverpool John Lennon Airport		Liverpool John Lennon Airport
Bristol Airport		Bristol Airport Injunction

Regards

Alex Wright | Legal Director | Real Estate Disputes | Eversheds Sutherland

T: +44 161 831 8582


M: +44 7500 578 620

www.linkedin.com/in/alexwrighteversheds

www.eversheds-sutherland.com

Eversheds Sutherland

Helping our clients, our people and our communities to thrive



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -


PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW7


This is the exhibit marked "AJW7" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.








Bristol Airport - Plan 3



**ORBITAL
WITNESS**



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW8

This is the exhibit marked "AJW8" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Terrorism threat levels



What are terrorism threat levels?

Terrorism threat levels indicate the likelihood of a terrorist attack in the UK. There are two published threat levels.

There are 5 categories at which the threat levels could be set:

- LOW - an attack is highly unlikely
- MODERATE - an attack is possible, but not likely
- SUBSTANTIAL - an attack is likely
- SEVERE - an attack is highly likely
- CRITICAL - an attack is highly likely in the near future

Members of the public should always remain alert to the danger of terrorism and report any suspicious activity to the police on 999 or the anti-terrorist hotline: 0800 789 321. If your information does not relate to an imminent threat, you can also [contact MI5](#).

Current national threat level

The threat to the UK (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland) from all forms of terrorism is SEVERE.*

Current Northern Ireland-related Terrorism in Northern Ireland threat level

The threat to Northern Ireland from Northern Ireland-related terrorism is SUBSTANTIAL.

*The national terrorism threat level covers all forms of terrorism aside from Northern Ireland-related terrorism in Northern Ireland.

Threat level change alerts



To receive threat level updates, subscribe to our [threat level alert RSS feed](#). This will require an RSS reader or browser extension.

How are threat levels decided?

The [Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre \(JTAC\)](#) is responsible for setting the threat level for the UK from terrorism, and the threat level from Northern Ireland Related Terrorism in Northern Ireland.

Both threat levels are kept under regular review.

In reaching an assessment on the appropriate threat level, several factors are considered.

These include:

- Available intelligence. This will often involve making judgements about the threat based on a range of information, which is often fragmentary, including the level and nature of current terrorist activity, comparison with events in other countries and previous attacks. Intelligence is only ever likely to reveal part of the picture.
- Terrorist capability. An examination of what is known about what a terrorist could do based on previous attacks or from intelligence.
- Terrorist intentions. Using intelligence and publicly available information to examine the overall aims of the terrorists and the ways they may achieve them including what sort of targets they would consider attacking.
- Timescale. The threat level expresses the likelihood of an attack in the near term. We know from past incidents that some attacks take years to plan, while others are put together more quickly. In the absence of specific intelligence, a judgement will need to be made about how close an attack might be to fruition.

What does this mean for you?

Vigilance is vital regardless of the current national threat level. Sharing national threat levels with the general public keeps everyone informed. It explains the context for the various security measures (for example airport security or bag searches) which we may encounter.

Changes to threat levels in themselves do not necessarily require specific responses from the public. They are a tool for security practitioners and the police to use in determining what protective security response may be required. If you are a business/site looking for advice and guidance - or even a general member of the public - go to the [NPSA website](#) or [ProtectUK](#) for further support and guidance.


If you have information about possible terrorist activity, you can call the Anti-Terrorist Hotline confidentially on 0800 789 321.

For warnings about urgent threats (for example, a possible bomb threat) please call 999.

For more advice on what to look out for, take a look at [this page](#).

Are there threat levels for other countries?

Advice about foreign travel, including the threat from terrorism in other countries, is published on the [FCDO website](#).



Countering terrorism

MI5 is responsible for investigating all forms of terrorist threat to the UK. Our role is to identify, investigate and work with partners to disrupt all forms of terrorist threat in the UK and against UK interests overseas.

[Find out more](#)

Threat level history

Since 2006, information about the national threat level has been published. In September 2010 the threat level for Northern Ireland-related terrorism began to be published.

In July 2019 changes were made to the terrorism threat level system, to reflect the threat posed by all forms of terrorism, irrespective of ideology.

National Threat Level

Date	Threat Level
30 April 2026	SEVERE
9 February 2022	SUBSTANTIAL
15 November 2021	SEVERE
4 February 2021	SUBSTANTIAL
3 November 2020	SEVERE
4 November 2019	SUBSTANTIAL
23 July 2019	SEVERE

Northern Irish Related Terrorism in Northern Ireland Threat Level

Date	Threat Level
6 March 2024	SUBSTANTIAL
28 March 2023	SEVERE
22 March 2022	SUBSTANTIAL
23 July 2019	SEVERE

Threat levels prior to July 2019

Date	Threat from international terrorism	Threat from Northern Ireland-related terrorism	
		in Northern Ireland	in Great Britain
1 March 2018	SEVERE	SEVERE	MODERATE
17 September 2017	SEVERE	SEVERE	SUBSTANTIAL
15 September 2017	CRITICAL	SEVERE	SUBSTANTIAL
27 May 2017	SEVERE	SEVERE	SUBSTANTIAL
23 May 2017	CRITICAL	SEVERE	SUBSTANTIAL
11 May 2016	SEVERE	SEVERE	SUBSTANTIAL
29 August 2014	SEVERE	SEVERE	MODERATE
24 October 2012	SUBSTANTIAL	SEVERE	MODERATE
11 July 2011	SUBSTANTIAL	SEVERE	SUBSTANTIAL
24 September 2010	SEVERE	SEVERE (first published)	SUBSTANTIAL (first published)

Date	Threat from international terrorism	Threat from Northern Ireland-related terrorism	
		in Northern Ireland	in Great Britain
22 January 2010	SEVERE		
20 July 2009	SUBSTANTIAL		
4 July 2007	SEVERE		
30 June 2007	CRITICAL		
13 August 2006	SEVERE		
10 August 2006	CRITICAL		
1 August 2006	SEVERE (first published)		



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW9

This is the exhibit marked "AJW9" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Incidents from July 2025

<u>Date of Event/press</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Brief details of event etc.</u>	<u>Link to source of informations</u>
02/07/2025	Sheffield	Protest by Extinction Rebellion outside Aviva offices - calling for the business to refuse to insure oil, gas and coal companies.	https://www.thestar.co.uk/news/opinion/aviva-employees-challenged-to-be-climate-heroes-5214141
03/07/2025	London	Extinction Rebellion supporters blockaded the entrance to the Energy Insurance London Conference.	https://extinctionrebellion.uk/2025/07/03/insurance-conference-blockade-heralds-nationwide-week-of-action/
05/07/2025	UK Wide	Insure our Survival Campaign: a seven-day environmental / anti-fossil fuels protest as part of Extinction Rebellion's Summer of Action.	https://extinctionrebellion.uk/2025/07/02/insure-our-survival-campaign-wave-of-action-2025-anniversary/
05/07/2025	London Oxford Airport	Extinction Rebellion supporters marched to the airport to draw attention to the number of private jets carrying ultra-wealthy passengers.	https://www.thecooldown.com/green-business/oxid-airport-private-jet-flights-oxford-extinction-rebellion-carbon-footprint/
07/07/2025	Various, UK	Members of Extinction Rebellion protested outside of different branches of insurance brokers, Marsh, including in Penrith, Carlisle and Kendal as part of the national day of action against insurance businesses.	https://cwherald.com/news/extinction-rebellion-protest-outside-insurance-brokers/
09/07/2025	Inverness Airport	Protestors led by Extinction Rebellion Scotland protested outside the terminal to campaign against private jet company Blackbird Air.	https://xrsotland.org/2025/02/extinction-rebellion-scotland-and-scientist-rebellion-denmark-protest-private-jets-company-blackbird/
09/07/2025	London	Extinction Rebellion supporters disrupted the British Insurance Awards by blocking the red carpet. Two activists were detained after getting into the venue and planning to take to the stage to drop a banner.	https://extinctionrebellion.uk/2025/07/09/breaking-climate-activists-detained-at-the-oscars-of-the-insurance-industry/
11/07/2025	Shrewsbury	Extinction Rebellion supporters targeted the offices of Marsh and Howden in an insurance-related protest relating to fossil fuels with protestors calling for the support of new projects to be ended.	https://www.insurancetimes.co.uk/news/extinction-rebellion-target-howden-and-marsh-offices-in-shrewsbury/1455779.article
16/07/2025	London	Extinction Rebellion supporters targeted AIG as part of the Insure Our Survival campaign.	https://extinctionrebellion.uk/2025/07/16/rebels-target-insurance-hq-standing-in-solidarity-with-detained-kenyan-protesters/
21/07/2025	Reading	Two banners appeared above the A329 motorway reading "Your Planet Needs You" and "Tax The Rich". Extinction Rebellion claimed responsibility.	https://www.readingchronicle.co.uk/news/25330083.reading-extinction-rebellion-protest-a329-motorway/
21/07/2025	Oxford	Extinction Rebellion supporters staged a 'crime scene' at Barclays, protesting about the bank financing the fossil fuel industry.	https://www.thisisoxfordshire.co.uk/news/25331812.extinction-rebellion-protesters-die-demonstration/
23/07/2025	London	Five Extinction Rebellion protestors dressed as scientists and occupied the lobby of Prudential Regulation Authority demanding capital requirements on fossil fuels in the insurance and banking sectors.	https://extinctionrebellion.uk/2025/07/23/scientists-for-xr-occupy-the-bank-of-england/
26/07/2025	Edinburgh	Ten Greenpeace activists arrested after suspending themselves from a bridge outside Edinburgh. They dangled themselves 25m above the water line, stopping a tanker delivering for 24 hours	https://news.sky.com/story/ten-greenpeace-activists-arrested-after-suspending-themselves-from-bridge-outside-edinburgh-13402046
28/07/2025	London	Fossil Free London activists dressed as robbers emblazoned with the Norwegian flag staged a "heist" at the Bank of England to highlight the "daylight robbery" that approval of the application for exploitation of the Rosebank oil field would entail.	https://www.morningstaronline.co.uk/article/bank-england-heist-ministers-face-fresh-anti-rosebank-oil-field-protests
22/08/2025	UK Wide	"Shut The System" announced that it is embarking on a "Summer of Sabotage" targeting businesses it considers to be the largest contributors to climate destruction - cutting power to Carlcays' Barclaycard's Northampton Headquarters	https://morningstaronline.co.uk/article/activists-cut-utilities-worlds-biggest-fossil-fuel-investors-declaring-summer-sabotage
23/08/2026	Hertfordshire	Extinction Rebellion activists staged a protest against Howden Insurance and its involvement with fossil fuel projects.	https://www.whitimes.co.uk/news/25416588.welwyn-garden-city-extinction-rebellion-protest-howden/
05/09/2025	London	Three climate protestors from Climate Resistance were carried out after disrupting the Reform UK party conference.	https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/nigel Farage-reform-clacton-angela-rayner-b2821237.html
07/09/2025	UK Wide	Various protest groups staged protests across the country against Rosebank, the UK's largest untapped oil field.	https://www.thecanary.co/uk/news/2025/09/07/fossil-fuel-protests-starmer/
08/09/2025	London	Extinction Rebellion (XR) confirmed plans to target companies it says are enabling fossil fuel projects - including Axa and AIG.	https://www.insurancetimes.co.uk/news/two-insurers-named-as-targets-in-next-extinction-rebellion-climate-protest-offensive/1456087.article
08/09/2025	London	Insure our Survival' activists staged protests at the London City offices of Axa and AIG blockig access and calling on insurers to stop underwriting fossil fuel risks.	https://www.insurancetimes.co.uk/news/protesters-project-toxic-images-onto-insurers-city-offices/1456314.article
15/09/2025	Reading	Extinction Rebellion activists "held a "die-in" at Barclays Bank in Reading, where protestors lay on the ground to simulate death, to link the funding of fossil fuels projects with climate change and global deaths	https://rdg.today/extinction-rebellion-protester-stage-die-in-at-barclays-bank-in-reading/
16/09/2025	Ipswich	Extinction Rebellion activists took part in a global demonstration against large insurance companies calling on the companies to stop funding fossil fuels.	https://www.ipswichstar.co.uk/news/25466328.extinction-rebellion-holds-protest-ipswich-axa-offices/

18/09/2025	Stansted Airport	Two young people who spray-painted two private jets at Stansted Airport in June 2024 were found guilty of criminal damage at Chelmsford Crown Court. They had cut through the wire perimeter fence and sprayed paint onto two private jets as part of a Just Stop Oil protest, to demand the UK government to negotiate a treaty to phase out oil and gas by 2030.	https://juststopoil.org/2025/09/18/wash-it-off-private-jet-sprayers-found-guilty/
22/09/2025	Glasgow	Extinction Rebellion held a protest outside of AXA's office accusing it of "keeping killers safe" by insuring or investing in, amongst other things, fossil fuel projects.	https://morningstaronline.co.uk/article/insurance-giant-accused-keeping-killers-safe-glasgow-protest
05/11/2025	London	Fossil Free London campaigners disrupted BP panel event at Simmons & Simmons LLP.	Activists disrupt BP panel over hurricane-fuelling profits Morning Star
04/12/2025	London	Fossil Free London campaigners disrupted Oil Executive awards dinner in London with attendees including Shell, BP and Ithica Energy.	Campaigners disrupt Oil Executive awards dinner in London - Canary
10/12/2025	Southampton	Climate activist group 'Cut the Ties to Fossil Fuels' staged a climate demonstration in Southampton, with one arrest made.	Arrest made as climate activists stage protest in Southampton
15/01/2026	London / Manchester	Environmental and humanitarian protestors rallied at Zurich offices demanding it drops contracts with Shell, Chevron, Maersk and General Dynamics.	Protesters call on Zurich Insurance to drop deals with Shell and General Dynamics - Canary
19/01/2026	London	Extinction Rebellion staged a protest outside Macquarie Group Headquarters to protest against expansion at Farnborough Airport. Two activists occupied the entrance to the building unfurling a banner that calls for a ban on private jets and urged the investment firm to sever its connection to fossil fuels.	https://www.reutersconnect.com/item/activists-stage-extinction-rebellion-protest-against-private-jet-expansion-in-london/dGFnOnJldXRlcnMuY29tLDIwMjY6bmV3c21sX01UMVnJUEEwMDBPRjIjXU1k
01/04/2026	London	Fossil Free London supporters protested outside US Embassy in London in response to the increase in oil company profits in the wake of the war in Iran.	https://www.thecanary.co/uk/news/2026/04/01/cut-ties-to-big-oil-to-stop-energy-crisis-sparked-by-trumps-war-on-iran-protest-footage/
05/05/2026	London	Activists from Fossil Free London staged a protest outside Equinor's offices, piling life-sized body bags outside the building while one campaigner dressed as an oil executive stood on top of them.	https://fossilfreelondon.org/photocall-body-bags-piled-outside-equinor-as-q1-profit-spike-expected-from-iran-war/
06/05/2026	York	Protestors, claiming to be associated with Boycott Bloody Insurance, protested outside Aviva's boardroom in York whilst they had their AGM.	Protesters take aim at Aviva as shareholder meetings face disruption
06/05/2026	London	Fossil Free London protested outside Shell HQ ahead of quarterly profits which are due to be announced on 7 May 2026.	Fossil Free London pours fake blood outside Shell offices as it 'makes a killing' from the Iran war Morning Star
07/05/2026	London	Climate activists disrupted Barclays shareholder meeting.	Barclays shareholder meeting targeted by Palestine and climate activists The Independent
08/06/2026	Southend Airport	See Briefing Note referred to in accompanying Alex Wright Witness Statement	See Briefing Note referred to in accompanying Alex Wright Witness Statement

Aviva employees challenged to be climate heroes.

Employees arriving for work at Aviva last Wednesday were met with a cheery group of Extinction Rebellion activists challenging them to become climate heroes.

They were handed leaflets explaining how their business could stop oil gas and coal companies from burning down the planet by refusing to insure them.

Heather, from [Extinction Rebellion](#), explained:

"[Insurance](#) is the weak spot that could stop the fossil fuel industry from exploiting more oil, gas and coal, driving the accelerating climate crisis. Without insurance, the fossil fuel industry would have to stop its planet-wrecking operations because it wouldn't be able to afford the financial costs if something went wrong. By effectively insuring the climate emergency, the insurance industry is helping to create the extreme weather that floods and overheats homes, workplaces and schools, threatens our food supply and is likely to lead to conflict and more places becoming uninhabitable. It also causes increasing disruption to nature."



Sean, who held a placard saying "Help. This is an urgent Nature and Climate Emergency", said, "The insurance industry could be climate heroes and use their 'superpower' to shut down the fossil fuel industry and help save our entire civilisation, and the biosphere that we rely on for life. We're here at [Aviva](#) today because they are insuring fossil fuel projects that are destroying all of our futures. We are pleased that Aviva has agreed to stop insuring new fossil fuel projects, but demand that they stop insuring oil, gas and coal projects."

The campaigners also visited AON on Napier Street, an insurance broker. Letters were sent to both companies.

XR's Insure Our Survival campaign has already made the insurance industry sit up, take notice and act. In February and October last year thousands of XR activists, acting alongside a global campaign coalition called Insure Our Future, staged a week-long series of actions across the world. Sheffield XR supported the lobby of the British Insurance and Brokers Association Conference in Manchester last May.

After repeated mass visits to the offices of insurers in the City of London and in towns and cities across the UK, giant global insurer Zurich announced that it would no longer insure new oil and gas projects.

■



Insurance conference blockade heralds nationwide week of action

July 03, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

Supporters of Extinction Rebellion’s Insure Our Survival campaign have this morning (Thursday 3 July) blockaded the main entrance to the Energy Insurance London conference [1] in Blackfriars with a five-metre banner. The blockaders have one simple demand for the delegates: stop insuring new fossil fuel projects.

The protest comes at the start of a national wave of action against the insurance companies that are ensuring climate chaos by continuing to underwrite fossil fuels. [2]

This morning’s blockade has forced delegates to duck under the banner or walk around it to access the building. Samba drummers add to a jubilant and defiant atmosphere. XR supporters are inviting delegates, with flyers and business cards, to be “climate heroes” by joining a small but growing network [3] of insurance professionals helping to bring about a rapid transition away from fossil fuels.

The conference's main sponsor Axa became a climate leader back in 2017 when it became the first insurer to start ruling out support for coal, but its reputation has slipped in recent years as it has not kept pace with developments and has failed to rule out support for new oil and gas [4]. Most controversially, Axa is amongst the

insurers of Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) export terminals, which export fracked methane from the US Gulf Coast which is poisoning the groundwater of local communities. [5] If built, these terminals will export the equivalent of 239 coal plants' worth of greenhouse gas annually [6, 7].

The conference covers a range of sources of energy, but it's known as one of the oiliest events in the insurance calendar. One item on the agenda is a panel discussion entitled The Trump Effect and "Drill Baby, Drill", saying "the return of President Trump to the White House has certainly reinvigorated the energy conversation worldwide" [8].

Earlier this month, a groundbreaking report showed the real-world impact of climate campaigns focusing on the insurance industry. The independent research shows that after insurers adopt formal exclusion policies, the number of insured coal mines drops by 16%, insured coal volumes fall by 56% and affected mines are more likely to scale down or shut entirely. The research was conducted by University of Zurich and the SFI Swiss Finance Institute using Freedom of Information searches. [9, 10, 11]

Also this month new analysis of tactics and strategies available to climate protectors, authored by the Social Change Lab highlighted the unique potential for campaigning on insurance to bring about change. [12]

One of the people blockading the entrance, Sue Hampton, 68, a grandma, Quaker and ex-teacher from Berkhamsted, said: *"No matter how much we scale up renewable energy, that won't stop climate breakdown. We need to rapidly phase-out of coal, oil and gas if we are going to have any chance of staying within the Paris Agreement targets which were agreed by the whole world. Insurance companies have a special opportunity and responsibility to withdraw support from all fossil fuel projects now. A managed transition is still possible."*

Another blockader, Alex Penson, 42, biologist from north London. said: *"Coal, oil and gas projects are flooding and burning the world right now. We urge delegates to push for exclusion policies within their companies and connect with a growing network of insurance professionals doing this."*



Insure Our Survival Campaign Marks First Anniversary with Nationwide Wave of Action Targeting Fossil Fuel Insurers

July 02, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

Media enquiries:

insureoursurvival@gmail.com

XR UK press team: press@extinctionrebellion.uk, 07756136396

For immediate release

This July, the Insure Our Survival (IOS) campaign marks one powerful year of mobilisation.

Over the past 12 months, IOS has coordinated more than 150 actions, targeting 27 insurance firms in over 40 towns and cities. Now, the momentum is accelerating. From 2–14 July, a UK-wide Wave of Action will ramp up pressure on the insurers enabling climate destruction. Across the country, activists will expose the “dirty insurers” underwriting and brokering some of the world’s most devastating fossil fuel projects—including the East African Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP), Mozambique LNG, Arctic LNG 2, and Papua LNG.

Fossil fuel companies cannot operate without insurance. That makes insurers the hidden enablers of climate breakdown—profiting from disaster while claiming neutrality. But they’re no longer in the shadows. They are a critical weak link in the fossil fuel chain—and campaigners are stepping up to break it.

GLOBAL PROJECTS, LOCAL CONSEQUENCES

EACOP is already displacing thousands in Uganda and Tanzania, violating human rights, threatening food and water supplies, and endangering protected ecosystems. LNG projects in Papua New Guinea, Mozambique, and the Russian Arctic are linked to militarisation, the destruction of Indigenous lands, and irreversible ecological damage [1, 2, 3, 4]. These are just a few of the 400+ carbon bombs currently in development [5].

But the impacts aren’t confined to distant places.

“By backing these fossil fuel projects, insurers are not only fuelling climate breakdown and human rights abuses—they’re also making life harder here in the UK,” said Lucy Porter, a spokesperson for Insure Our Survival.

“When extreme weather floods our homes, when food prices surge, and when small businesses can no longer afford insurance, we must ask: who is enabling this chaos? Insurers who continue to underwrite new oil, gas, and coal projects are complicit—not just in destruction abroad, but in rising suffering at home.”

LOCAL ACTION, GLOBAL RESISTANCE

Throughout the Wave of Action, communities across the UK will organise creative and disruptive protests outside the offices of targeted insurers and brokers. From city centres to rural high streets, IOS is calling on people to make visible the connection between fossil fuel insurance and the cost of climate chaos.



“Insurance giants like Lloyd’s, Liberty Mutual, AIG, Tokio Marine, Brit, Chaucer, and brokers like Marsh have the power to stop destructive fossil fuel projects like EACOP—but instead, they choose to back industries driving climate collapse, human rights abuses, hunger, war, and displacement.

Right now, 11 climate activists in Uganda have been brutally detained for speaking out against EACOP’s new funders. While insurers protect the profits of the richest 1%, communities around the world are paying the price—facing deadly heatwaves, floods, droughts, and devastation.

How long must we raise the alarm before they act? It’s time they chose people over profit, justice over destruction, and life over collapse. We can’t escape to Mars. This is our only home—and we will not stop fighting for it.”

— *Nicholas Omonuk, End Fossil Occupy Uganda*

WHAT’S NEXT: A GLOBAL ESCALATION

Following the UK Wave of Action, IOS will launch its international phase—escalating and expanding efforts worldwide. The campaign will work with global activists to confront dirty insurers and brokers in every region, turning scattered actions into a united front against the industry’s role in climate injustice.

“We don’t have 20 years to stop these projects. We barely have time to avoid irreversible collapse,” said Porter. “That’s why we’re escalating now—together, across borders, communities, and every dirty insurer’s threshold.”

TAKE ACTION

- **Join the IOS Telegram** for updates, action support, and resources:
<https://t.me/+wV2EEWPpMJtLMzQ0>
- **Visit the IOS website** and sign up to get involved:
[InsureOurSurvival.org](https://insureoursurvival.org)
- **Socials**
Instagram: <https://xrb.link/GA8tN8nk5>
Bluesky: <https://xrb.link/jz6Y7618>
- **Media enquiries:** insureoursurvival@gmail.com

References

[1] [‘Monstrous’ east African oil project will emit vast amounts of carbon, data shows](#)

[2] [Death, violence and endless delay: Inside Africa’s most troubled energy project](#)

[3] [Explainer: Russia’s ambitions and challenges in Arctic](#)

[4] [More banks rule out support for TotalEnergies’ Papua LNG project](#)

[5] [Carbon bombs under the spotlight](#)

London Oxford Airport: Extinction Rebellion to hold protest

Oxford Airport

Environmentalists at Extinction Rebellion will be protesting at London Oxford Airport near Kidlington against private jets.

The group claim it is the “most energy-intensive form of flying” at the airport formerly known as Kidlington Airport, claiming each jet will emit “substantially more carbon per passenger than commercial flights”.

Taking place on Saturday, July 5, protesters will assemble at 10am for a march from the west end of Kidlington High Street to the entrance of the airport.

They say the demonstration will be peaceful.

It comes after protesters from Palestine Action were widely condemned by national politicians after breaking into RAF Brize Norton overnight on Thursday, June 19 and sprayed red paint into the engines of two Airbus Voyager aircrafts and onto the runway.

This prompted Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer to condemn the actions of the protesters as “disgraceful”.

He added: “Our Armed Forces represent the very best of Britain and put their lives on the line for us every day. It is our responsibility to support those who defend us.”

Now another stunt is planned in the county by the Extinction Rebellion group.

A file image of Extinction Rebellion protesters. Image: PA Freya Chambers, an activist with Extinction Rebellion Oxford, said: “As global temperatures continue to rise, now is the time to drastically cut emissions – starting with luxury private flights.

“Instead, the UK is now being hailed as the private jet capital of Europe.

“Oxford Airport is a hub for private flights by the wealthy elite, while the local community pays the price in pollution and an accelerating climate crisis.”

She added: “According to Civil Aviation Authority data, 13,774 private flights went to or from Oxford Airport in 2024.

“This is an average of 38 private jets every single day. At least 28 per cent of those were empty of passengers.

"These private jets are used like taxis by the super-rich to make short, one-way journeys within the UK and Europe.

"Globally, almost half of all private flights in 2023 were shorter than 500 km - that's about the same as London to Edinburgh - and Oxford follows this trend."

A general view of London Oxford Airport. Picture: Richard Cave She said the group is calling for an end to private jet travel, and that the increase in air passenger duty for domestic private jet travel introduced by the government "is not enough".

"We need decisive action to decarbonise aviation, starting with stopping unnecessary private flights that only benefit the wealthy one per cent," she added.

Thames Valley Police and Oxford Airport have both been contacted for further comment on the planned protest.

■

Extinction Rebellion protest outside insurance brokers



Members of XR North Lakes are out on the streets of Penrith today, protesting outside the offices of insurance broker Marsh.

The placard-waving protestors are taking part in a national day of action against insurance businesses which they say are “enabling” the fossil fuel industry by insuring high profile global projects.

Protests also took place at the offices of Marsh Commercial in Carlisle and Kendal.

Allan Todd, former teacher and climate activist, of Keswick, said: “Marsh is one of a number of insurance brokers which continue to facilitate fossil-fuel projects that drive the climate and ecological crises.

“Our action today is also part of the wider Road to Belem campaign, run by the Climate Justice Coalition in the run-up to COP30. We need to act now to avert the worst impacts of climate change and make the planet as habitable as possible for future generations.”

This national week of action will be followed by an international wave of action in September, in solidarity with activists on the front line of the new oil and gas projects.



EXTINCTION REBELLION SCOTLAND AND SCIENTIST REBELLION DENMARK PROTEST PRIVATE JETS COMPANY, BLACKBIRD

February 16, 2025

Extinction Rebellion Scotland and Scientist Rebellion Denmark protested at Inverness Airport in Scotland and Billund Airport in Denmark. They were highlighting the contradictions between Blackbird Air's CEO Anders Povlsen private jets enterprise and his Wildland commitment to nature.



Credit: Siobhan Chalmers @_schal


Protesters waved banners outside Inverness Airport in Scotland declaring 'Ban Private Jets' and 'Blackbird Nae mAir' accompanied by others dressed as "blackbirds". A huge banner was laid on the ground with words from the Wildland Ltd. company website "We're in a climate emergency. We need to step up and take action".

Watch Chris Packham's [message to the protest](#).

The protestors were calling for Anders Povlsen “to step up and take action”, close down Blackbird Air and invest in clean transportation.

The protests were connected by an innovative [two-way live link](#) displayed on monitors at both Inverness Airport and at the Blackbird HQ in Billund Airport Denmark.

XR Scotland and SR Denmark call into account the contradictory behaviours of a so-called “eco-billionaire”. One of the largest landowners in Scotland, Povlsen owns Blackbird Air, a luxury private jet business which is set to expand. At the same time Povlsen operates Wildland, a private enterprise which acknowledges the urgent need to act on the climate emergency.



Credit: Siobhan Chalmers @_schal

The use of private jets has soared in recent years, with the resulting climate-heating emissions rising by 50%. Passengers in larger private jets caused more CO2 emissions in an hour than the average person did in a year. Aviation fuel remains untaxed while those using a car to get to work pay their taxes at the pumps.

The aviation industry is promoting Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) but the UK SAF mandate only requires that 2% of the UK's total jet fuel demand be met by SAF in 2025, increasing to 10% in 2030. SAF is always blended with fossil fuels as around 65% of so-called sustainable fuel is kerosene.

However, some airlines and countries are changing. The Danish company, Lego, is closing its private jet division this year. Amsterdam's Schiphol airport announced a ban on private jets in April 2023. Belgium has introduced new taxes on private jets and France is expected to follow.

Dr Sarah Birkby from Extinction Rebellion Highlands and Islands and Moray said:

'It is completely contradictory to state the importance of acting on the climate emergency and at the same time run a private jet company. The time when people, no matter how rich, could say one thing and do the exact opposite is over. As Wildland Ltd itself declares, we need people to step up and take action'.

Dr Anthony Graham from Scientists for Extinction Rebellion stated:

"The evidence is clear: our current emissions pathway is incompatible with a safe planet. Every tonne of CO₂ fuels climate change, yet private jets – used by the wealthiest 0.003% – emit disproportionate amounts, worsening both the climate crisis and inequality. Scientists for Extinction Rebellion urge action on luxury emissions, stressing that those with the most power must lead by example."

Finlay Asher, a spokesperson for Safe Landing, a global community of aviation workers, said:

"At Safe Landing, our aviation community are firmly of the position that there needs to be a rapid reduction in private jets in favour of cleaner and greener forms of travel. And as a Scottish aerospace engineer, I'd love to see Scotland lead the way and pioneer the genuinely sustainable future of flight. Rather than catering to carbon-intensive flying for an elite minority, Inverness Airport could instead become our green gateway for essential island air travel."

Alex Cochrane from Extinction Rebellion Scotland said:

"Private jets are the quickest way to burn fossil fuels and produce on average 10 times more CO₂ emissions per passenger than commercial flights. Though Blackbird Air states on their website 'Our private jets feature the latest safety innovations and energy-efficient engines', the aviation industry expects worldwide another 8,500 private jets will enter service by 2033 (including Blackbird), far outstripping any efficiency gains."



Climate Activists Detained at the “Oscars of the Insurance Industry”

July 09, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

[Early images](#)

“INSURING DISASTER, NOT SURVIVAL”

LONDON 9th July — Climate activists with the Insure Our Survival campaign disrupted the “Oscars of the insurance industry” British Insurance Awards at the Royal Albert Hall tonight, calling out the industry for profiting from climate chaos and genocide in Gaza, while pushing ordinary people to the brink.

Two activists were detained for several hours after getting into the venue and planning to take to the stage to drop a banner. Both have now been released and stand by their actions, saying: “Stop funding ecoside. Stop funding genocide.”

As the insurance elite gathered to celebrate their accomplishments this year, activists outside held a die-in on the red carpet, making it hard for attendees to enter. They added a theatrical “F***ing Up the Planet Awards” mocking the biggest insurers for backing oil pipelines, displacing communities, insuring arms exporters and ignoring the climate science.

“These companies talk about resilience, but they’re the ones insuring oil pipelines while dropping cover for flood-hit homes,” said Lucy Porter, a spokesperson for Insure Our Survival. “They’re not part of the solution — they’re complicit in the collapse.”




Photo credit: Denise Baker

The income made for those in the industry does not come without a cost, at home and abroad. Even in their own communities, we are seeing flooding and destruction of homes. 5.7 million properties in England are currently at risk of flooding [1]. In 2024 alone, the UK saw over £1.6 billion in insured flood losses, with thousands of families displaced [2]. In Yorkshire, Cumbria, and South Wales, some households now face £2,000+ annual flood insurance premiums — or have been refused coverage entirely [3]. Meanwhile, insurers continue to back new fossil fuel infrastructure that worsens

the crisis, including the East African Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP) and Arctic LNG 2 [4] [5].

AXA and Allianz have come under fire for financial and insurance ties to firms complicit in the Israeli occupation of Palestine, including companies supplying bulldozers, weapons, and surveillance tech used in home demolitions and military operations [6] [7].

“They insure against the destruction of homes abroad, and then leave homes here unprotected,” said another campaign spokesperson. “Their business model is a disaster — so long as it doesn’t affect their balance sheets.”

BRITISH INSURANCE AWARDS: A CELEBRATION OF CLIMATE HYPOCRISY

While the British Insurance Awards claim to reward “innovation and responsibility,” many winners continue to underwrite fossil fuel expansion — a direct violation of international climate goals [8].

Insurers and brokers being called out include:

- Lloyd’s of London — still insuring coal, tar sands, and Arctic oil through its syndicates [9].
- Chubb, AIG — major underwriters of extreme oil and gas projects around the world [10].
- AXA — linked to fossil fuel underwriting and arms-related human rights concerns [6].
- Marsh McLennan — brokers fossil fuel deals including pipelines and coal plants [11].

Many insurers at the British Insurance Awards — including Allianz, Aviva, AXA, Zurich, AIG, RSA, Chubb, QBE, and Liberty Mutual — are not only complicit in climate chaos, but also profit from militarised violence.

They insure or invest in companies supplying military equipment to Israel, including:

- Boeing
- Lockheed Martin
- Elbit Systems
- Maersk (used in military logistics) [12][13][14]

INSURE PEOPLE, NOT POLLUTION

This crisis is personal. Flooding, fires, and heatwaves are here, and insurers are abandoning households while enabling destruction abroad.

It's time to turn public anger into action.

- 👉 Join the campaign. Demand insurers drop fossil fuels.
- 👉 Expose their hypocrisy.
- 👉 Insure our survival — not collapse.

🔗 [[Insure our Survival website](#)]

NOTES FOR EDITORS

1. Environment Agency – Flood Risk Management Plan Highlights:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/flood-risk-management-plan-highlights>
2. Association of British Insurers – 2024 Flood Losses:
<https://www.abi.org.uk/news/news-articles/2024/03/abi-publishes-flood-losses/>
3. The Guardian – UK Flooding Leaves Households with Soaring Insurance Bills:
<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/oct/25/uk-flooding-home-insurance-premiums-cost>
4. StopEACOP – List of Insurers:
<https://www.stopeacop.net/insurers>
5. [Arctic LNG 2 Terminal – Global Energy Monitor](#)
6. [Who Profits – The Israeli Occupation Industry](#)
7. [– corporate occupation](#)
8. [Underwriting the Transition: A deep-dive transition plan guide for insurance and reinsurance underwriting portfolios – United Nations Environment – Finance Initiative](#)
9. Insure Our Future – Lloyd's Scorecard 2024:
[Insure Our Future Global](#)
10. Insure Our Future – Chubb and AIG Fossil Fuel Exposure:
[Insure Our Future Global](#)
11. BankTrack – Marsh McLennan and EACOP:
[BankTrack – East African Crude Oil Pipeline \(EACOP\)](#)
12. Don't Buy Into Occupation – Corporate Complicity Report:
<https://dontbuyintooccupation.org/>
13. AXA profiting off genocide:
[AXA: Profiting off genocide](#)

14. Corporate Watch – Elbit Systems Profile:
[Elbit Systems Company Profile – Corporate Watch](#)

About Extinction Rebellion

Extinction Rebellion (XR) is a decentralised, international and politically non-partisan movement using nonviolent direct action and civil disobedience to persuade governments to act justly on the Climate and Ecological Emergency.

[Donate](#) | Support our work

[What Emergency?](#) | Read about the true scale of the climate crisis

[Why Citizens' Assemblies?](#) | Breaking the political deadlock

[XR UK Local Groups](#) | View a map of all local groups

[XR UK website](#) | Find out more about XR UK

[XR Global website](#) | Discover what's going on in XR around the globe

Time has almost entirely run out to address the climate and ecological crisis which is upon us, including the sixth mass species extinction, global pollution, and increasingly rapid climate change. If urgent and radical action isn't taken, we're heading towards 4 ° C warming, leading to societal collapse and mass loss of life. The younger generation, racially marginalised communities and the Global South are on the frontline. No one will escape the devastating impacts.

Extinction Rebellion target Howden and Marsh offices in Shrewsbury

'We need insurers to stop making things worse and step up to be climate heroes,' says protester

Extinction Rebellion targeted the offices of brokers Marsh and Howden in Shrewsbury in an insurance-related protest.



The group went to Marsh's office in Abbey Foregate at 10am on 11 July 2025, before marching up Wyle Cop to visit Howden's branch on the High Street.

The protest was related to fossil fuels, with protesters calling for the support of new projects to be ended. It featured placards, banners and a Grim Reaper,

One protester said: "Here in Shrewsbury we're already feeling the effects of climate breakdown.

"Shropshire farmers are struggling with the current drought. Homes and businesses are suffering as once in a hundred year floods now happen annually.

“We need insurers to stop making things worse and step up to be climate heroes.”

Other protest

The protest came amid supporters of Extinction Rebellion’s Insure our Survival campaign targeting the offices of insurance companies up and down the country in a national wave of action last week.

During the week, Marsh’s Manchester office in Belvedere, Booth Street, was also targeted, with protesters holding a large Stop Eacop (East African Crude Oil Pipeline) banner.

Eacop is a pipeline that is set to transport oil produced from Uganda’s Lake Albert oilfields to the port of Tanga in Tanzania.

One protester said: “We are already seeing the catastrophic effects of climate chaos on our TV screens.

“Instead of displacing poor people to pipe oil across Africa so that big oil can make even more money, we should be leaving it in the ground. Our message is simple – oil companies need to stop drilling and start paying.”



Rebels target insurance HQ in solidarity with detained Ugandan protesters - Extinction Rebellion UK



Rebels target insurance HQ in solidarity with detained Ugandan protesters

July 16, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

Press contacts: Dorothea Hackman 07710 269195 | XR UK press team 07756136396

[BREAKING PHOTOS](#) | [PERMANENT ARCHIVE](#)

Extinction Rebellion rebels target AIG as part of a national wave of Insure Our Survival actions against insurance companies fanning the flames of climate risk.

At 12 noon today, July 16th, 2025, protesters were at the offices of AIG in Fenchurch Street, London, demanding it does not insure the East Africa Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP).

Two letters were delivered – one on behalf of local people directly affected by EACOP and another from the #StopEACOP campaign UK.



Outside AIG, activists in red #StopEACOP suits held a die-in by an EACOP pipeline, and others waved fans declaring 'FANNING THE FLAMES OF CLIMATE RISK' while throwing documents entitled 'UNDERWRITING FOSSIL FUELS' and 'INVESTING IN FOSSIL FUELS' into a mock fire.

Zaki Mamdoo, Campaign Coordinator at StopEACOP said: "Activists and defenders outside AIG's offices today stand shoulder-to-shoulder with communities whose lands, livelihoods, and futures have been sacrificed for the EACOP, its associated projects and the repressive conditions that have followed. This demonstration is a reminder that the destruction we face is not accidental; it is the result of a global system that prioritises profit over people, and places corporate power above human life. The struggle for climate justice demands that ordinary people everywhere confront the institutions responsible for this harm because those causing it operate globally, and so must our resistance."

73-year-old retired lecturer and grandmother from Camden Dorothea Hackman said: "Insurance companies like AIG wield immense power and could bring an end to the fossil fuel era. Instead, they collude with short-term profiteering polluters and fan the flames of climate risk."

As a result of global pressure, including from Extinction Rebellion, Insure our Future and the StopEACOP campaign [1], 30 major insurers have pulled out of EACOP to date[2]. However, AIG has still to rule out insuring EACOP.

EACOP is a 'carbon bomb' [3], which would unleash 379 million tons of climate-heating pollution – more than 25 times the combined annual emissions of Uganda and Tanzania the host nations. [4] This will fuel extreme weather worldwide and intensify deadly flooding, landslides, heatwaves, and droughts that are already frequent even in the UK [5].

Insurers are complicit in the climate crisis as oil, gas, and coal industries are legally obliged to insure their operations.

In addition to profits from underwriting insurance, client premiums represent immense funds for insurance companies like AIG – globally, £27 trillion of assets are under management, with UK insurers having £1.8 trillion, and much of this is invested in fossil fuels. [6,7]

This is an unsustainable contradiction. While their investment and underwriting continue to give a lifeline to the fossil fuel companies, already over a third of weather-related claims are for climate-attributed losses.[8]

Meanwhile, climate change is doubling or even tripling the cost of home insurance for ordinary homeowners [9] and coverage is denied to many households impacted by climate change.[10]

Yet the size of the renewable energy insurance market is still under 30 per cent of the fossil fuel insurance market.[11] This mismatch of priorities is an obstacle to the urgently needed transition to clean energy. [12]

EACOP has already displaced thousands of families in Uganda and Tanzania and is threatening food and water security and violating human rights, while disturbing critical ecosystems including Lake Victoria and Murchison Falls National Park [13, 14].

TotalEnergies, the majority shareholder and investor of EACOP, is accused by the UN special rapporteur on environmental defenders of 'grave human rights violations against those opposing the projects and against the local communities, particularly in Kingfisher'. [15]

At time of writing, 11 activists, the KCB11, have been detained and refused bail for 84 days for attempting to deliver a letter to Kenya Commercial Bank in Kampala.

"It's hard to imagine a more vivid picture of corporate-state collusion than activists being led into a trap and arrested for trying to share their concerns about a fossil fuel project characterised by rights and environmental harms," said Brad Adams, Executive Director at Climate Rights International.[16]

These national days of action in July will be followed by a wave of international action in September, in solidarity with activists on the front line of new oil and gas projects.

Notes to editors

[1] Insurance Week of Action 2024 – Extinction Rebellion UK
<https://extinctionrebellion.uk/act-now/campaigns/insure-our-future/>

[2] Who's backing the pipeline and who's ruled it out?
<https://www.stopeacop.net/insurers-checklist>

- [3] Carbon Bombs – LINGO
<https://www.leave-it-in-the-ground.org/projects/carbon-bombs/>
- [4] 'Monstrous' east African oil project will emit vast amounts of carbon, data shows
<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/oct/27/east-african-crude-oil-pipeline-carbon>
- [5] How climate change worsens heatwaves, droughts, wildfires and floods
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-58073295>
- [6] United Nations, 8 June 2021, 'Secretary General's closing remarks to Insurance
<https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/statement/2021-06-08/secretary-generals-closing-remarks-insurance-development-forum#:~:text=I%20have%20recently%20been%20calling,for%20small%20businesses%20and%20individuals>.
- [7] Development Forum 5 Association of British Insurers, 'Briefing: Insurers as Investors
<https://www.abi.org.uk/data-and-resources/tools-and-resources/regulation/insurers-as-investors/>
- [8] Climate change accounts for over a third of insured weather losses this century and rising
<https://global.insure-our-future.com/scorecard-2024-insurers-climate-losses/>
- [9] How insurers are using climate change as an excuse to TRIPLE the cost of home cover
<https://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-12748421/How-insurers-using-climate-change-excuse-TRIPLE-cost-home-cover.html>
- [10] Uncovering the Role of Insurance Companies in Fueling the Climate Crisis
<https://bank.green/blog/insuring-climate-crisis>
- [11] Insure our Future, December 2024, 'Within our power, 2024 scorecard on insurance, climate change and the energy transition
<https://global.insure-our-future.com/scorecard-2024-report/>
- [12] Insuring disaster: the insurance industry's support for fossil fuels January 2025
<https://green-alliance.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Insuring-disaster.pdf>
- [13] "Our Trust is Broken": Loss of Land and Livelihoods for Oil Development in Uganda
HRW
<https://www.hrw.org/report/2023/07/10/our-trust-broken/loss-land-and-livelihoods-oil-development-uganda>
- [14] "I was evicted and left homeless" Exploring social and environmental (in)justice along the East African Crude Oil Pipeline Project March 2025
<https://www.hakidefenders.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/EACOP-REPORT.pdf>
- [15] Urgent call: TotalEnergies and its shareholders must take immediate action to protect environmental defenders in Uganda in the context of the Tilenta/Kingfisher and EACOP projects June 22, 2025
<https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2025->

[16] Release peaceful climate activists unlawfully detained for 70 days
<https://cri.org/uganda-release-peaceful-climate-activists-unlawfully-held-in-detention/>

About Extinction Rebellion

Extinction Rebellion (XR) is a decentralised, international and politically non-partisan movement using nonviolent direct action and civil disobedience to persuade governments to act justly on the Climate and Ecological Emergency.

[Donate](#) | Support our work

[What Emergency?](#) | Read about the true scale of the climate crisis

[Why Citizens' Assemblies?](#) | Breaking the political deadlock

[XR UK Local Groups](#) | View a map of all local groups

[XR UK website](#) | Find out more about XR UK

[XR Global website](#) | Discover what's going on in XR around the globe

Time has almost entirely run out to address the climate and ecological crisis which is upon us, including the sixth mass species extinction, global pollution, and increasingly rapid climate change. If urgent and radical action isn't taken, we're heading towards 4°C warming, leading to societal collapse and mass loss of life. The younger generation, racially marginalised communities and the Global South are on the frontline. No one will escape the devastating impacts.



Reading: Extinction Rebellion protest above A329 motorway

The Tax the Rich banner by Extinction Rebellion activists dropped above the A329M between Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell. *(Image: Extinction Rebellion)*

Two mystery banners were seen on a bridge over a busy motorway.

The banners above the A329M bore the slogan 'Your Planet Needs You' while the other said 'Tax the Rich,' and both have since been claimed by Extinction Rebellion.

"Heatwaves are becoming fiercer and more frequent, and not addressing the climate crisis will be far more costly than tackling it," said an Extinction Rebellion spokesperson.

"There is also a growing call for the super-wealthy to be taxed. According to Oxfam, a 2% tax on extreme wealth over £10 million could raise £24 billion every year.

"78% of the British public say they support this. Money raised could supercharge the UK's efforts to tackle climate change."

Greenpeace has called for a one-off "National Renewal Tax" of 2.5% on individual wealth above £10m, to be paid annually over the five years of this parliamentary term, which could raise between £130bn and £183bn. This tax would be paid by 0.1% of the UK population.

The National Renewal Tax on the super-rich could raise between £26bn and £36.6bn on average each year.

"Funds raised would be 'more than enough' to pay for insulating homes, supporting vulnerable households with winter energy bills, providing free bus travel to under 25s, implementing a scrappage scheme for polluting vehicles, retraining works for green energy jobs, upgrading ports, and supporting farmers to clean up waters and return land to nature," the spokesperson said.

"According to a new report, the potential UK economic losses by 2040 due to stranded fossil-fuel assets is £113bn.

"Of the £88bn held in fossil fuel assets by UK pension funds, around £15.2bn is at risk of stranding by 2040.

"Yet BP and Shell are backing off from their 'green' promises, and other fossil fuel companies are still pushing ahead with projects."

A growing number of climate groups are campaigning for the introduction of a wealth tax.

The [Pay Up campaign](#) is calling on the government to bring in a series of wealth taxes as an alternative to spending cuts.

Climate groups say the revenue from the ultra-rich could fund investment, restore crumbling public services and help tackle the climate emergency. Opponents have raised concerns that such a move would result in the ultra-wealthy leaving the country.

However, experts say there is no evidence of a mass millionaire exodus from the UK, with the overall number of millionaires and billionaires having risen steadily over the past two decades.

At the same time, the government has little idea of how many billionaires pay tax.



Extinction Rebellion protesters 'die' during demonstration at bank



XR protesters 'die' during a demonstration at Barclays in Oxford (*Image: XR Oxford*)





Scientists for XR occupy the Bank of England

July 23, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

Press contacts: Shana 07546 166787 | XR UK press team press@extinctionrebellion.uk

Photos: <https://drive.proton.me/urls/WFVCDS5XJR#OEow1XVNSOdf>

Early on Wednesday 23rd of July, five scientists occupied the lobby of the Prudential Regulation Authority (PRA), part of the Bank of England.

Five scientists remained in the PRA's lobby from 8am until 9am, during the morning arrival of employees, demanding capital requirements on fossil fuels in the insurance and banking sectors. Three more offered flyers to staff inviting them

to an international network of financial regulators working for an end to fossil fuels expansion projects. [[Signal link](#)]

This protest took place during the second to last week of the PRA's public consultation on climate risk in insurance and banking, entitled 'Enhancing banks' and insurers' approaches to managing climate-related risks' [1]. The protestors argued that the PRA should be doing more to regulate these industries in a way that mitigates climate-related risks, by introducing capital requirements that would discourage providing financial and insurance support to the fossil fuel industry that is leading us ever deeper into climate catastrophe.

Capital requirements are the amount of liquid capital that must be held by a firm, reflective of the risk of their assets, in order to help protect the economy from collapse. Capital requirements on fossil fuels would deem these assets riskier and increase the mandatory amount to be held, thereby discouraging the holding of these assets.

The scientists taking part insist that climate and ecological breakdown must be central to discussions around mitigating economic breakdown – allowing insurance and banking sectors to continue to insure and loan to fossil fuel companies does not follow scientific consensus or economic logic. Signs were held with calls to action, “Climate tipping points = economic risk. Stop new fossil fuels, capital requirements now” and “Ecosystem collapse is financial collapse, capital requirements for fossil fuels now”.

Signs also quoted Günther Thallinger, Allianz SE board chairman from his March 2025 article 'Climate, Risk, Insurance: The Future of Capitalism' [2] stating “This is about saving the conditions under which markets, finance, and civilization itself can continue to operate. [...] There is only one path forward [...] burning less carbon or capturing it at the point of combustion.”

“Those that work in insurance and at the PRA, like us scientists, know how dire the situation is,” said Shana, Space Engineer and occupier of the lobby. *“To talk about ‘managing climate-risk’ in regard to banking and insurance operations whilst ignoring the fact that these same firms are enabling new oil and gas projects is baffling. They’re advising companies on how to manage a crisis that these same companies are actively contributing to – it’s like giving fire safety training to the person lighting the flames. Instead of just managing risk we need to actively be mitigating risk – something the PRA can do through capital requirements on fossil fuels for banks and insurers.”*

The PRA, in its latest paper on climate risks in the financial sector, admits that most banks and insurance companies are not properly analysing their climate related risks, and the industry requires work at a governance level to better understand climate risks including climate scenario analysis (eg. unprecedented, non linearity, tipping points) to

fully capture future risks [1]. A recent article in the Financial Times quotes senior Bank of England staff who resigned over the deprioritization of climate and nature risks [3].

Capital requirements on fossil fuels is not as radical an idea as it may seem – the European Insurance Authority (EIOPA) recommends capital requirements on fossil fuels “to accurately reflect the high risks of these assets” [4] and capital requirements are mentioned in the PRA consultation paper’s current iteration. However the PRA still states that no new capital requirements will be imposed on top of what is required now. This results in little financial incentive for banking and insurance firms to reduce their involvement in new oil and gas expansion projects, missing a vital opportunity to incentivise meaningful change in our financial sector.

[1] CP10/25 – Enhancing banks’ and insurers’ approaches to managing climate-related risks – Update to SS3/19, <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/prudential-regulation/publication/2025/april/enhancing-banks-and-insurers-approaches-to-managing-climate-related-risks-consultation-paper>

[2] ‘Climate, Risk, Insurance: The Future of Capitalism’ , <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/climate-risk-insurance-future-capitalism-g%C3%BCnther-thallinger-smw5f>

[3] Financial Times: Bank of England staff depart after downgrade of climate risk, <https://www.ft.com/content/c9919c02-8328-4fa0-af4d-a108770a9f73>

[4] EIOPA recommends a dedicated prudential treatment for insurers’ fossil fuel assets to cushion against transition risks, https://www.eiopa.europa.eu/eiopa-recommends-dedicated-prudential-treatment-insurers-fossil-fuel-assets-cushion-against-2024-11-07_en

About Extinction Rebellion

Extinction Rebellion (XR) is a decentralised, international and politically non-partisan movement using nonviolent direct action and civil disobedience to persuade governments to act justly on the Climate and Ecological Emergency.

[Donate](#) | Support our work

[What Emergency?](#) | Read about the true scale of the climate crisis

[Why Citizens’ Assemblies?](#) | Breaking the political deadlock

[XR UK Local Groups](#) | View a map of all local groups

[XR UK website](#) | Find out more about XR UK

[XR Global website](#) | Discover what’s going on in XR around the globe

Time has almost entirely run out to address the climate and ecological crisis which is upon us, including the sixth mass species extinction, global pollution, and increasingly rapid climate change. If urgent and radical action isn't taken, we're heading towards 4 ° C warming, leading to societal collapse and mass loss of life. The younger generation, racially marginalised communities and the Global South are on the frontline. No one will escape the devastating impacts.

Ten Greenpeace activists arrested after suspending themselves from bridge outside Edinburgh

The protesters dangled themselves 25m above the water line, stopping a tanker from delivering gas for 24 hours.

🕒 Saturday 26 July 2025 12:38, UK




Protesters suspended themselves from the Forth Road Bridge. Pic: Greenpeace

Ten Greenpeace activists have been arrested after suspending themselves from a bridge over a river to halt a tanker carrying fracked gas.

The Forth Road Bridge outside Edinburgh was closed on Friday due to the demonstration, with Police Scotland alerted shortly after 1pm.

The protesters ended up dangling around 25m above the water level at high tide.



The group said its activists had prevented the tanker from delivering gas. Pic: Greenpeace

Greenpeace announced it had ended the demonstration on Saturday morning, saying it had "achieved what we set out to do".

The group said its activists had prevented the Ineos tanker from delivering the gas for a full 24 hours, because the vessel could only travel to the Ineos petrochemical plant at nearby Grangemouth during high tides.

Its specially trained activists began climbing down their ropes on Saturday morning.

Greenpeace said all 10 descended safely and were voluntarily transported to Port Edgar in South Queensferry, where it said they were arrested by officers from Police Scotland on suspicion of culpable and reckless conduct.

Police Scotland confirmed five men aged between 35 and 40, as well as five women aged between 25 and 42, had been arrested.

It said further inquiries were ongoing and the Forth Road Bridge remained closed to traffic as of Saturday morning.

Read more:

[25% of young children now malnourished in Gaza, charity says](#)

[Trump issues warning to leaders as he arrives in Scotland](#)

Amy Cameron, programme director at Greenpeace UK, said: "By blocking Ineos, we've drawn global attention to the company's bottomless appetite for plastic production, false solutions and profit for its billionaire boss Jim Ratcliffe."

Describing the "plastic pollution problem" as "massive", she added: "Less than 10% of plastic is currently recycled globally, and this is set to rise to just 17% by 2060, while the amount of plastic we're producing is set to triple.

"The only solution is to address the problem at source which means securing a strong global plastics treaty that imposes legally-binding caps on plastic production."

Greenpeace insists its protest was safe and caused "minimal disruption".

It stressed the climbers had spent weeks training for the demonstration and pointed out the Forth Road Bridge carries low volumes of bus, cycle and pedestrian traffic.

Bank of England 'heist' as ministers face fresh anti-Rosebank oil field protests



Protesters outside the Bank of England. Photo: Fossil Free London

MINISTERS have faced a fresh protest against their possible renewal of permission for the Rosebank oil field, after the original decision was found to be unlawful in a landmark Supreme Court ruling last year.

Fossil Free London activists dressed as robbers emblazoned with the Norwegian flag staged a "heist" at the Bank of England on Monday evening to highlight the "daylight robbery" that approval of the application for exploitation of the oil field would entail.

Rosebank is the largest undeveloped oil field in the North Sea. If its development goes ahead, this would lead to the release of carbon emissions equal to those produced by all of the world's 28 low-income countries, the activists said.

Chanting "Rosebank Oil is a scam. Labour, do you give a damn?" the campaigners carried sacks labelled "UK taxpayer money" filled with fake cash from a makeshift vault and held placards reading "£1.5 billion for Norway, net loss for UK."

Fossil Free London director Robin Wells said: "It's plain and simple, Rosebank is daylight robbery."

“If allowed, Equinor, a Norwegian oil giant, will rob us blind, hoarding massive profits for themselves and leaving behind nothing but a trail of climate chaos and a net loss for us.

“The UK government needs to stop this carbon bomb and act in the interests of the general public — scrap Rosebank and invest in a just transition.”

In January, the Court of Session in Edinburgh found that a Supreme Court ruling that planning authorities should consider the full climate impact of burning oil from new wells should apply retrospectively to the former Tory government’s decision to approve the Rosebank and Jackdaw oil and gas fields.

The environmental assessments for these projects did not count the greenhouse gases that would be released when the fossil fuels produced by them were eventually burned.

The January ruling said that work on both fields could continue while the new information was gathered, but no oil and gas could be extracted unless fresh approval was granted.

Ministers later confirmed that they would consider the significance of a project’s environmental impact, “while taking into account and balancing relevant factors on a case-by-case basis, such as the potential economic impact and other implications of the project.”

No decisions are expected until the autumn.

The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero was contacted for comment.



Direct Action / 18 August 2025

Activists cut utilities to world's biggest fossil fuel investors declaring 'Summer of Sabotage'



M Shut the System activists cut the electricity to Barclays' Barclaycard's Northampton headquarters, August 18, 2025

ACTIVISTS sabotaged utilities infrastructure at the offices of major fossil fuel investors today, declaring the start of “disruption like never before” against fossil fuel finance.

Shut The System cut cables and superglued electrical service cabinets at JPMorganChase and Allianz in London, demanding they stop financing the climate emergency and genocide in Gaza.

At Barclaycard’s Northampton headquarters, activists cut the 5G communications mast serving the building.

The underground climate campaign said the action marked the launch of a period of sustained sabotage against financial institutions deemed “key culprits” in the climate crisis, running until the end of September.

It urged civilians to join a “Summer of Sabotage” by destroying the property and operating systems of institutions providing “critical support to deadly industries globally.”

JPMorgan is the world’s largest fossil fuel investor, while Barclays is the biggest in Europe, according to a June report by Reclaim Finance.

And Allianz is the sixth-largest fossil fuel insurer and insures Elbit Systems, an Israeli arms firm supplying the majority of weapons used in Gaza.

A Shut The System statement said: “We have been forced underground by draconian anti-protest laws.

“The British state has recently shown how much they are willing to suppress peaceful protest.

“History shows direct action and sabotage are highly effective so we cannot stop while the climate emergency wages on and we see the most hopeful path forward is to operate beyond the state’s reach.”

The group has pledged to escalate its actions in October if demands are ignored.

Earlier this year, it cut fibre optic cables at insurance firms in Leeds and Birmingham, disrupted internet access, and carried out nationwide graffiti

actions at Barclays branches during its annual general meeting.

JPMorgan, Allianz and Barclays were approached for comment.

Extinction Rebellion 'unearth the truth' at Welwyn Garden City protest

The Welwyn & Hatfield Times

26 Aug 2025 13:00

Copyright 2025 NewsQuest Media Group Limited All Rights Reserved

Welwyn Hatfield
TIMES

Author: Huw Richards

Print Edition: Welwyn Hatfield Times

Length: 391 words

Body

Extinction Rebellion claim to have "unearthed the truth" about a Welwyn Garden City insurance broker during a demonstration.

On Saturday, August 23, members of Hertfordshire Extinction Rebellion groups, dressed as oil workers and insurance executives, protested outside Howden Insurance in the town centre.

Extinction Rebellion members protest outside Howden, Welwyn Garden City. (Image: Derek Langley)

-The group called the protest due to its belief that Howden "supports the fossil fuel industry".

At the action on Saturday, an oil rig was set up outside the Howden branch, and members of the group dressed as oil workers allegedly "engaged" with Howden-s senior executives.

Phil from North Herts Extinction Rebellion said: "I hope people found our actions today both eye-opening and entertaining. Although there is widespread concern about the climate crisis among the public, the influence of the insurance companies on averting disaster may not be so well known.

"If a new oil or gas project can't get insurance they simply can't operate, so the insurance companies are in a uniquely powerful position.

"But companies like Howden are still actively supporting these industries, while at the same time home insurance premiums are doubling or even tripling to pay for the increased risks from extreme weather events like flooding and heatwaves. This is good business for them and a disaster for the rest of us."

(Image: Derek Langley)He added: "Many of us use Howden to insure our homes, cars, and even our pets. But they are secretly making millions by also acting as brokers for new oil, gas, and coal projects - despite dire warnings from scientists.

"We were asking Howden to do the right thing: pull the plug on insuring any new fossil fuel projects - this would send a powerful signal to the industry."

The demonstration was part of Extinction Rebellion's --Insure Our Survival" campaign, urges insurance companies to withdraw from insuring new fossil fuel operations which are believed to be worsening the climate crisis.

Insurance offices up and down the country have been targeted in a wave of nationwide actions, with activists demanding that key insurers stop backing destructive new fossil fuel projects and end their complicity in climate disaster and human rights abuses.

When contacted, Howden did not wish to comment.

(Image: Derek Langley)

Classification

Industry:

Insurance (92%), Insurance Overview (92%), Fossil Fuels (89%), Insurance Agencies & Brokerages (89%), Energy & Utilities (89%), Homeowners Insurance (78%), Property & Casualty Insurance (78%), Natural Gas Extraction (75%), Insurance Premiums (73%), Coal Industry (50%)

Subject:

Protests & Demonstrations (91%), Negative News (90%), Environmental Activism (90%), Negative Misc News (90%), Fossils (89%), Negative Environmental News (89%), Climate Change (89%), Severe Weather (88%), Environmental Accidents & Disasters (79%), Activism (78%), Negative Personal News (78%), Executives (77%), Floods & Flooding (73%), Heat Waves (68%), Weather (68%), Extreme Temperatures (68%), Human Rights Violations (63%), Human Rights (60%)

Climate protesters removed from Reform conference after heckling Nigel Farage

The protesters from Climate Resistance targeted the Reform leader to accuse him of working for super-rich donors.



A protester is removed from an address by Reform UK leader Nigel Farage during the party's annual conference (Jacob King/PA) (PA Wire)

Three climate protesters were carried out of the [Reform](#) UK party conference after shouting at [Nigel Farage](#) while he was on stage.

The protesters from Climate Resistance, a group calling for the government to tax the super-rich to fund public services and climate action, had planned to interrupt the Reform UK leader and [Clacton](#) MP during his keynote speech.

But he delivered it several hours earlier than originally planned after [Angela Rayner](#) resigned from the government.

They staged their protest as Mr Farage returned later to appear with special guest Preston Manning, the founder of Canada's now-defunct Reform party.

Climate Resistance targeted Mr Farage to accuse him of working for super-rich donors, such as property tycoon Nick Candy.

"You work for billionaires!" one shouted at Mr Farage.

Another said he was "paid by the super-rich to scapegoat migrants".

Mr Farage paused to say: "Off you go, mate...boring!"

One shouted "f*** the fascists" and "tax the rich" as security guards carried her out.

The audience chanted "out out out" and booed her.

Sam Simons, spokesperson for Climate Resistance, said: "Farage will go on national TV and say how he cares about the people in the UK, and then vote to keep us from getting our sick pay.

"This grifter will scapegoat anyone just so we don't talk about the oil barons and billionaire property tycoons who fund him.

"It's really about keeping everyone so divided and downtrodden that we won't even have time to think about taxing the super-rich."

Mr Simons added: "Meanwhile, the super-rich are fanning the flames of climate collapse with their lavish lifestyles, and exploiting people and the planet for profit.

"The top 10% in the UK hold more wealth than all the rest of us combined, and pollute far more than ordinary people.

"The majority of Britain wants a wealth tax. It's time to tax the super-rich and finally do what Reform never would: fund our schools, our hospitals, our climate and our futures."

■

Campaigners around the country fight to stop Rosebank



CAMPAIGNERS to stop Rosebank took to the streets across the country on Saturday, protesting outside the offices of oil giants and in Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer's backyard.

In Aberdeen, environmentalists joined forces with Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign (SPSC), protesting at the offices of Equinor and Ithaca to call for a ban on the development of the 300-million barrel field.

Speaking from the protest — one of almost 20 which took place around the country — Aberdeen SPSC activist, Kate Ramsden told the Star: "Rosebank isn't just an environmental disaster, Ithaca's involvement would generate hundreds of millions for Delek who are already literally fuelling the genocide in Gaza.

"Starmer needs to locate his conscience and stop Rosebank."

Four hundred miles away, campaign groups including Mothers Rise Up took that same message to the heart of Sir Keir's Holburn and St Pancras constituency.

Mothers Rise Up's Lorna Powell said: "Approving new fossil fuel projects like Rosebank in the context of an escalating, deadly climate crisis is simply unjustifiable."

The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero said its priority was to “deliver a fair, orderly and prosperous transition,” but could not comment on individual licences.



Two insurers named as targets in next Extinction Rebellion climate protest offensive

Two insurers are in the sights of Extinction Rebellion's next coordinated climate protest campaign

Insurers operating in the UK have been warned to expect a fresh wave of coordinated climate protests in September.

Activist group Extinction Rebellion (XR) has confirmed plans to target companies it says are enabling fossil fuel projects and arms trading.



Its campaign – dubbed *Insure Our Survival* – is set to run from 8 to 22 September 2025, with large-scale demonstrations confirmed for London on 8 and 9 September and further actions planned nationwide.

XR said the campaign would include coordinated actions in Europe, the Americas, Africa and Asia, with groups in the Global North working alongside those in the Global South to “amplify frontline voices” opposing fossil fuel and arms financing.

Targeted insurers

XR said the campaign will focus on international firms Axa and AIG, saying the call for action is an effort to draw attention to the broader insurance sector's role in underwriting high-carbon and defence projects.

The group claims fossil fuel and arms insurance represent just 2% to 3% of targeted firms' portfolios, arguing they could be removed without material financial harm.

Insurers have faced increasing scrutiny from climate campaigners in recent years, with several large players adopting restrictions on coal, oil and gas underwriting in response to public and shareholder pressure. However, XR maintains that such commitments remain inadequate to meet climate goals.

The September actions will form part of XR's ongoing global pressure campaign, which the group says will continue until targeted insurers commit to stopping fossil fuel and arms underwriting.



Protesters project 'toxic' images onto insurers' City offices

'Axa and AIG present themselves as protecting homes and families, yet continue to underwrite projects that accelerate climate breakdown and fuel conflict,' says spokesperson

Activists staged protests at the City of London offices of Axa and AIG yesterday (8 September 2025), blocking access to the buildings and calling on insurers to stop underwriting fossil fuel and defence-related risks.



The demonstration formed part of a two-week wave of coordinated global actions led by campaign group Insure Our Survival, which is planning protests across more than 30 cities worldwide between 8 and 22 September. Demonstrations are also [scheduled in London for today](#).

According to organisers, the London blockade began around 8am outside Axa's offices, with campaigners dressed in suits and gas masks carrying placards urging a boycott of Axa and AIG. Activists also threw fake blood-stained £50 notes and projected images onto buildings as part of the action.

The campaigners accused both insurers of profiting from fossil fuel expansion and from companies linked to armed conflict. They argued that such underwriting activities account

for less than 2% of global insurance profits, suggesting that insurers could exit the sectors without significant financial impact.

Lucy Porter, UK spokesperson for Insure Our Survival, said: "Axa and AIG present themselves as protecting homes and families, yet continue to underwrite projects that accelerate climate breakdown and fuel conflict."

Carbon boycott

Yesterday's London action followed a weekend of projection protests at Axa and AIG offices in London, Paris, Cologne, Johannesburg, Manchester, Glasgow, Auckland and Ipswich. Images of senior executives wearing gas masks were projected onto buildings, which campaigners said symbolised insurers' exposure to "toxic" industries.

Research cited by organisers alleged that Axa holds investments in fossil fuel firms linked to so-called "carbon bomb" projects, including coal, oil sands and shale operations. At the same time, AIG has been identified as one of the world's largest coal insurers with more than \$24bn (£17.73bn) invested in fossil fuel-related assets as of 2022.

Extinction Rebellion (XR) [previously occupied](#) AIG's office in London on October 30, 2024.

Speakers from climate and political groups, including Palestine-focused organisations, also scheduled addressed the demonstration throughout the day.

Insure Our Survival said it is also encouraging consumers and businesses to boycott other large insurers, including Allianz and Aviva.

Extinction Rebellion (XR) [previously protested at the Premiership rugby final](#) on June 14, 2025, to demand that the Rugby Football Union (RFU) end its sponsorship deal with Allianz.



Extinction Rebellion protesters stage 'die in' at Barclays Bank in Reading



Protesters from Extinction Rebellion performed a 'die-in' at Barclays Bank in Reading to link fossil fuel funding to climate change and global deaths.

Extinction Rebellion says: "Around the world, millions of people are dying as a result of heatwaves, wildfires, torrential rain, drought, flooding and landslides, all caused by changes in our climate brought about by the constant increase in greenhouse gas emissions.

"Barclays Bank is still funding fossil fuel projects which contribute to climate change, thus indirectly contributing to the deaths of humans and wildlife.

"Analyses from the World Weather Attribution organisation show that extreme weather is becoming more likely due to climate change.

"Heatwaves are the deadliest type of extreme weather globally, contributing to at least 500,00 deaths a year, including some in the UK. Researchers from the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) and Imperial College London, estimate that high heat killed 2,300 people across 12 major cities as temperatures soared across Europe this summer. They attributed 1,500 of the deaths to climate breakdown, which is heating the planet and making the worst extremes even hotter."

Dr Ben Clarke, researcher at the Centre for Environmental Policy at Imperial College London, said: "Heatwaves don't leave a trail of destruction like wildfires or storms. Their impacts are mostly invisible but quietly devastating – a change of just 2 or 3C can mean the difference between life and death for thousands of people.' He warned that countries need to speed up the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy.

Greece, Turkey and Cyprus suffered devastating wildfires. Greece experienced a heatwave above 45C, drought and strong winds. At least 17 lives were lost, including 10 firefighters and rescue workers.

An intense two-week heatwave in Norway, Finland and Sweden was hotter, with temperatures of 30C and more, resulting in many more hospital admissions.

A new study, published in the medical journal JAMA, links more than 400 additional deaths to the wildfires in Los Angeles earlier this year. The study comes as hundreds of wildfires burn across the US and Canada.

Climate change not only increases the risk of wildfires around the world but also makes them particularly explosive. Relatively small blazes rapidly "blow up" so suddenly and with such ferocity that they become difficult to control.

Climate change also intensified heavy monsoon rain in Pakistan, which suffered its worst floods on record, killing hundreds of people.

In late June 2025, several days of heavy rainfall swept across Colombia and Venezuela, causing widespread flooding, overflowing rivers, and numerous landslides, one of which killed 27 people.

Moscow suffered its worst flooding since 1879, with some parts experiencing far more than the monthly average.

These extreme weather events will only continue to become worse if governments do not do more to reduce emissions from greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide and methane-

Extinction Rebellion will pose as dead bodies (a 'die-in') to remind people of how they say that Barclays continues to fund projects that are contributing to over-heating planet Earth. Extinction Rebellion also says that they also hope to encourage visitors to the branch to move their accounts from Barclays to other banks with much 'greener' credentials.



Extinction Rebellion protestors spotted in Ipswich

Ipswich Star

15 Sep 2025 11:27

Copyright 2025 NewsQuest Media Group Limited All Rights Reserved



Author: Paris Maben-Hume

Print Edition: Ipswich Star

Length: 271 words

Body

Extinction Rebellion protestors were seen outside a block of offices in Ipswich.

Local activists for the environmental movement in the Suffolk town and nearby Colchester are taking part in a coordinated global campaign targeting insurance giants AXA and AIG.

The campaign started on September 8 and will run until September 22.

It is calling for a boycott of the insurance giants and their sub-brand and is urging people to switch providers.

READ MORE: School pledges 'rapid' change after being issued with government warning

The protestors held up banners outside the entrance to the office block (Image: Newsquest)

On Monday morning, Extinction Rebellion Ipswich was protesting outside the AXA building at Brooke Lawrence House in Civic Drive.

The group held up banners which read: "We are all vulnerable. Stop insuring fossil fuels."

Blue and white tape saying "climate crime scene" was put up on the entrance steps to the office block.

They also handed out flyers to passers-by and AXA staff.

READ MORE: Hundreds of staff at housing association have data leaked in payroll breach

Tina, from Extinction Rebellion Ipswich, said: "Ipswich is on a tidal river, so people are already living with the risk of flooding, and this will only get worse as the climate gets hotter.

"New homes have just been built along the riverside. How long will it be before these become uninsurable?

"Knowing that AXA is not only profiting from these crises but exacerbating them while claiming to protect us is outrageous.

"As we have a large AXA office here in Ipswich, I thought it was important to join this global campaign to highlight this issue locally."

Classification

Industry:

Insurance (90%), Insurance Overview (90%), Energy & Utilities (73%), Data Breaches (66%), Fossil Fuels (54%)

Subject:

Negative Misc News (93%), Environmental Activism (92%), Protests & Demonstrations (91%), Negative News (90%), Activism (90%), Community Activism (90%), Environmentalism (78%), Environment & Natural Resources (78%), Negative Personal News (78%), Government & Public Administration (71%), Negative Technology News (68%), Rivers (66%), Data Breaches (66%), Crime, Law Enforcement & Corrections (53%)

Load Date: 15 Sep 2025 11:27



[About](#) [Privacy Policy](#) [Trust Center](#) [Processing Notice](#)

[Terms & Conditions](#) [Cookies](#)



Copyright © 2025 LexisNexis®

Wash It Off: Private jet sprayers found guilty



Two young people who spray-painted two private jets at Stansted Airport in June 2024 were found guilty of criminal damage at Chelmsford Crown Court today. They took action with Just Stop Oil to demand the UK government negotiate a treaty to phase out oil and gas by 2030. [1]

Jennifer Kowalski, 29, from Dumbarton, and Cole Macdonald, 23, from Brighton, had cut through the wire perimeter fence and sprayed paint from a fire extinguisher onto two private jets parked at Stansted Airport, just hours after Taylor Swift's plane had landed. [2]

After the 4 day trial the jury returned a unanimous verdict of guilty. Sentencing will be on the 27th of October.

During the trial, the prosecution argued that extensive professional cleaning was required for the two planes after the action. The total cost of cleaning was assessed to be around £12,000.

The defendants told the jury they did not set out to cause damage. They explained that they had deliberately avoided spraying the engines and cockpits and believed the diluted

paint would wash off easily. They argued that they lacked the necessary criminal intent: they neither intended to cause damage nor realised that damage was a likely consequence of their actions.

In her defence Jennifer Kowalski explained that the action had been designed to target Taylor Swift's plane because of her personal interest in the famous singer and the immense influence that she carries. She said:

"She's one of the most famous people in the world; she's talked about everywhere, she's the only singer ever to be named Time Magazine Person of the Year; she earned 2 billion dollars last year; reporters devote their lives to covering her; if we devoted that much energy to tackling climate change we could change things."

"I thought a lot about what she might say – if we could get her attention – if she saw this it might get a reaction from her, from a place of care from a fan, instead of from a place of apathy – she's famous for saying how much she loves her fans, and yet her fans are dying because of climate change."

At trial, Judge Mill ruled that the damage was too serious for the rights to free expression and assembly under Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights to apply. As a result, the jury was not asked to consider whether a restriction on the defendants rights to protest was proportionate response in the light of the alleged damage, and that defence was blocked from the trial.

Following the verdict Cole MacDonald said:

"We were released from remand the day before the general election that elected a left wing government and that under that government the country has slipped into fascism and has become continually more corrupt."

Jennifer Kowalski said:

"I broke into Stansted airport to spray paint Taylor Swift's private jet because this is a dangerous time – the era of global boiling. This era will not end when it's time for a new album – it's the era to end all others."

"When I look out people's windows, I see entire settlements swept off the map and thousands killed by climate disasters. On this reckless path 1 billion people will be displaced by 2050. When you strip people of their basic rights and cram them into perilous conditions violence inevitably ensues."

"But it's not too late to be brand new. I just think you are what you love. And I'll fight for the music and people I love. Won't you?"

While two young people face an uncertain penalty for taking action targeting private jet use, it is estimated that 80% of the world's population has never taken a flight. Just 1% of people cause 50% of global aviation emissions and private jet users are responsible for up to 14 times as much carbon emissions compared with a commercial flight. A single flight in a private jet can easily emit as much carbon dioxide as the average annual carbon footprint for an EU citizen – 8.2 tonnes. Private aviation contributed at least 15.6 Mt CO₂ in direct emissions in 2023, or about 3.6 t CO₂ per flight. Almost half of all flights (47.4%) are

shorter than 500 km. Private aviation is concentrated in the USA, where 68.7% of the aircraft are registered. [3] [4] [5][6]

Scotland / 22 September 2025

Insurance giant accused of 'keeping killers safe' at Glasgow protest



M Protesters outside AXA offices. Photo: Extinction Rebellion Scotland

Stop Rosebank



Any day now, the UK government will face a major climate test. Equinor is expected to reapply to develop Rosebank: the biggest undeveloped oil field in the UK.

We use cookies on our website to give you the most relevant experience by remembering your preferences and repeat visits. By clicking "Accept All", you consent to the use of ALL the cookies. However, you may visit "Cookie Settings" to provide a controlled consent. [Our Privacy Policy](#)

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accept All](#)

Activists disrupt BP panel over hurricane-fuelling profits



[Pic: Fossil Free London]

ACTIVISTS have disrupted a panel event featuring senior BP executive Stewart Macfarlane, as the oil giant announced quarterly profits of \$2.2 billion (£1.7bn), surpassing analysts' forecasts.

Campaigners from Fossil Free London interrupted the discussion on Tuesday evening, chanting: "As Hurricane Melissa tears down lives, do your profits help you sleep at night?" before being escorted out of the event hosted by the Association of International Energy Negotiators at Simmons & Simmons LLP's London office.

The protest came just days after Hurricane Melissa devastated Jamaica, with scientists warning that the climate crisis intensified the storm's impact.

BP has faced mounting criticism after scaling back its climate commitments.

Earlier this year, the company increased its annual investment in oil and gas to \$10bn (£8.2bn) while cutting more than \$5bn (£4.1bn) from its low-carbon spending plans.

A Global Witness analysis found that the rollback could cause around 72,000 additional heat-related deaths worldwide by the end of the century.

Fossil Free London director Robin Wells said the BP profits show that the company's "green mask has slipped to reveal the oily mouth behind," accusing the firm of fuelling global destruction while "CEOs and shareholders wine and dine in luxury."



Campaigners disrupt Oil Executive awards dinner in London

To highlight damage caused by the oil and gas industry, campaigners from Fossil Free London interrupted the World Energy Council Assembly's dinner at the Hilton in Mayfair on 3 December.

[Oil and gas](#) executives had gathered to present and receive industry "achievement awards". Award nominees and attendees [included](#) Shell, BP, and Ithaca Energy.

Campaigners chanted "no awards for climate criminals", as they were dragged out of the building by security.

The protest comes after [devastating flooding](#) has killed at least 1,250 people across much of southeast Asia in recent days. Human-caused [climate breakdown](#) has [increased](#) the intensity of such extreme weather events.

Oil damages

A report recently found that oil and gas giants are [responsible](#) for €25 trillion in climate damages. Now, survivors of Super Typhoon Odette in the Philippines are [suing](#) Shell for damages, in a legal first for holding big oil accountable for its role in climate destruction.

Robin Wells, Director of Fossil Free London said:

Whilst executives drink champagne in tuxedos, the world floods outside. They pat themselves on the back for the 'deal of the year', whilst their projects sign death warrants for communities in the Global South and future generations everywhere.

How can it be that business as usual awards the fossil fuel corporations that depend on the systematic destruction of our life support systems? The science is clear: every new oil field is an act of violence. We crashed their party to remind them that history will not give them an award; it will put them on trial.

Featured image via the Canary





Arrest made as climate activists stage protest in Southampton

Story by Ross Marshall • 5mo • 1 min read



The protesters took to Threefield Lane in Southampton (Image: NQ)

A woman has been arrested during a climate protest in Southampton today.

Campaign group, Cut The Ties To Fossil Fuels, have taken to Threefield Lane in Southampton to stage a demonstration today.

The group were seen holding signs and banners, reading 'cut ties to carbon pollution' and it is understood that police arrested one of the protesters at the scene.

Hampshire police have been approached for more information on the arrest.

A police spokesperson said: "We were called at 12:41pm today (Wednesday 10 December), to reports of a protest at a business on Threefield Lane in Southampton.

"Officers are in attendance.

"Policing these events requires us to balance the rights of those lawfully protesting, and the rights of others to go about their lives without being subject to unacceptable disruption, whilst keeping the public safe.

"Our priority with protests is always public safety."

Activists stage Extinction Rebellion protest against private jet expansion in London



Extinction Rebellion campaigners gather outside the Macquarie Group headquarters to protest the proposed expansion of Farnborough Airport. Two activists, dressed in airplane costumes, occupy the entrance canopy while unfurling a banner that calls for a ban on private jets and urges the investment firm to sever its connections to fossil fuels. The demonstration highlights the environmental impact of business aviation, as the Australian-based global financial services group faces criticism over its majority ownership of the airport and its plans to increase annual flight limits. (Photo by Joao Daniel Pereira/Sipa USA)

■

Cut ties to Big Oil to stop energy crisis sparked by Trump's war on Iran – protest footage

Outside the US Embassy in London on 1 April, two activists were tied by fuel hoses to a life-sized petrol pump in response to Donald Trump's war on Iran.

The protest criticised the increase in oil company profits in the wake of the war's destruction and trade disruption. The pump carried the label: "Oil Profit\$\$\$ for Oil Bosses".

Campaigners from Fossil Free London held signs saying "Stop Trump Tying us Into Fossil Fuels", "Break Free from Climate Crisis" and "Break Free from Big Oil".

[Thousands have died](#) to date across the region following US and Israeli attacks on Iran. Trump has recently stated his intention to "[take the oil in Iran](#)" following major attacks on [fossil fuel](#) infrastructure.

Meanwhile, oil dependency is increasing the cost of living once again for families in the UK as petrol prices rise. Whilst [fossil fuel companies stand to make a windfall of billions](#) on the back of the price shock.

One of Reform's major donors, Jeremy Hoskings, has seen his fossil fuel and energy hedge fund investments [rise by more than \\$25m](#) since the war began in Iran.

This comes as Trump and Reform are using the oil price spike to call for our government to approve [new UK oil and gas projects](#), like the [controversial Rosebank oil field](#). Despite the fact that drilling in the North Sea would not make the UK more energy secure. If production began, [Rosebank's oil would still go for export](#) – like 80% of all UK oil.

Robin Wells, director of Fossil Free London said:

Right now we are seeing the horrors of Trump's war on Iran in the faces of dead schoolgirls and facing skyrocketing energy costs at home. And Big Oil cashes out big, with bumper profits.

We're protesting today to say that for as long as the UK stays tied up in fossil fuels, we'll see more oil wars, more extreme weather deaths and more instability.

The UK needs to cut ties with Trump and Big Oil. We need to break free from this knot of violence.

That starts with scrapping new UK oil and gas and rejecting Rosebank. Until then, being tied into Big Oil's big disaster leaves us paying the price.

Featured image via Fossil Free London



FØSSIL FREE LONDON

PHOTOCALL: Body bags piled outside Equinor as Q1 profit spike expected from Iran war

When: 8.15am, Tuesday 5th May

Where: Equinor Offices, W2 6BD

Details: Activists from Fossil Free London will pile several life-sized body bags outside the offices of Rosebank co-owner Equinor, as one campaigner dressed as an oil executive stands on top of them.

The protest comes as the UK Government's decision on whether to approve or reject the Rosebank oil field approaches.

Equinor's quarterly profits are **also expected to jump** when announced on Wednesday 6th May, amidst the US-Iran war.

Photos can be used in coverage of Equinor's quarterly profit announcement.


(We will also stage a stunt ahead of Shell's Q1 profit results on Wednesday the 6th at 8:15 a.m. outside Shell's HQ, we will send a separate photocall tomorrow.)

For further information, to find us on the day, or to organise an interview please contact campaigner@fossilfreelondon.org, or 020 3886 2590.

Notes:

1. For further information, please contact Rosie, 020 3886 2590, campaigner@fossilfreelondon.org.
2. Fossil Free London is a grassroots climate group that protests Big Oil and campaigns for a London beyond fossil fuels.
Instagram: [@fossilfreelondon](https://www.instagram.com/fossilfreelondon) Twitter: [@fossilfreeldn](https://twitter.com/fossilfreeldn).
3. Photos from other Fossil Free London actions are available [here](#) and can be used in your journalism at any time without prior permission. Please credit Fossil Free London.

Protesters take aim at Aviva as shareholder meetings face disruption



The tie-up will create a significant force in the motor insurance sector (Alamy/PA)

Aviva's York offices were disrupted by protesters targeting the insurer's activities in the latest twist in a turbulent season for shareholder meetings.

It comes after NatWest's annual general meeting (AGM) was halted by activists accusing the bank of backtracking on climate commitments.

Campaign group Boycott Bloody Insurance claimed to be behind 12 people with shares in [Aviva](#) disrupting its [AGM](#) on Wednesday.

Several protesters shouting and chanting outside a boardroom were escorted or carried out of the building, delaying the start of the meeting.

The group claims Aviva underwrites or invests in companies profiting from immigration detention and surveillance, fossil fuel giants and weapons firms.

Andrew Taylor, a campaigner at Boycott Bloody Insurance said: "Aviva likes to present itself as an ethical business, but when you look at the companies it supports, that turns out to be a sham."

Aviva declined to comment on the protests.

Meanwhile, following a shareholder vote at the AGM, some 8.4% of votes were cast against the motion to approve Aviva's climate-related financial disclosures for 2025, while 5.5% of votes were against approving the pay policy for directors.

Aviva's chief executive Amanda Blanc took home a pay packet of £9.76 million last year.

The disruption comes a week after [NatWest](#) was forced to stop its AGM for about half-an-hour amid disruption during its chairman's opening speech.

[Protesters](#) were singing and making statements about NatWest's climate policies, while shareholder activists called on the banking group to address claims it had "reduced the ambition of its fossil fuel policy and climate targets".

Rick Haythornthwaite, NatWest's chairman, defended its policies and said the financing of oil and gas comprises 0.6% of the group's total lending.

Meanwhile, Barclays is expected to be targeted at its AGM in London on Thursday, with activist groups including the Palestine Solidarity Campaign and Campaign Against Arms Trade organising a protest outside the meeting.

■

Fossil Free London pours fake blood outside Shell offices as it 'makes a killing' from the Iran war



Fossil Free London campaigners protest outside Shell's London headquarters against its giant profits from the Iran war [Pic: Fossil Free London]

FOSSIL Free London activists covered themselves in fake blood as they sat outside Shell's London headquarters wrapped in a fuel pump today.

They erected a banner that read "BLOOD MONEY: No new oil & gas" amid expectations the fossil fuel giant will announce bumper quarterly profits today thanks to the Iran war.

Fossil Free London spokesperson Robin Wells said: "In these past few years, as our world becomes more unstable and the realities of climate breakdown set in, it's never been clearer: Big Oil profits from, and locks in, mass death.

"And we're feeling this so rawly right now. As we see thousands slaughtered in Iran and weep alongside those mothers who will never hold their children again, Shell is making a killing."

More than 2,000 people have been killed by the US and Israel's war in Iran, which has sent oil prices soaring due to a blockade on the Strait of Hormuz.

Barclays shareholder meeting targeted by Palestine and climate activists

Disruption broke out at the beginning of the shareholder meeting in Westminster on Thursday.



Protesters outside the Barclays AGM in Westminster (Rebecca Speare-Cole/PA) (PA Wire)

Barclays faced a chaotic annual shareholder meeting as Palestine and climate activists repeatedly confronted the lender's board over its ties to Israel and fossil fuel financing.

The UK's biggest bank has come under fire in recent years for its links to Israeli government bonds and defence firms producing equipment used in attacks in the Gaza Strip, as well as companies driving large amounts of planet-heating emissions.

Disruption broke out at the beginning of the shareholder meeting in Westminster on Thursday, with groups of people being pulled out by security.

Chairman Nigel Higgins' opening remarks were repeatedly interrupted as protesters stood up holding Palestinian flags and shouting comments such as "Free, free Palestine" and "Everyone here is profiting from genocide".

Mr Higgins responded that the board had “heard your point” and would take questions on the topic during the meeting’s Q&A section.

A few minutes later, climate protesters rose from their seats and started singing: “Stop, in the name of love, before you break this Earth.”

One shouted: “This bank is financing the climate and nature crisis that we have to stop. Softly-softly, slowly-slowly is not good enough. You are endangering life on Earth.”

As the meeting moved to shareholder questions, the board was repeatedly quizzed about its recent fossil fuel financing.

Shareholders accused executives of failing to act with enough urgency over the climate crisis and criticised the board for leaving a key industry climate group, the Net Zero Banking Alliance.

A representative from [ShareAction](#), which campaigns for responsible investment, called on the board to affirm that it will stick to its climate goals in light of its continued lending to oil and gas firms.

Mr Higgins said Barclays has “no intention of backtracking on its commitments” and remains on track to meet climate targets that it says are aligned with the UN Paris climate agreement to limit the worst impacts of global warming.

“I know this sometimes frustrates people who would like to see us move further, but we have got a big emphasis on consistency, not chopping, changing, going backwards, sideways,” he said.

On its oil and gas lending, Mr Higgins said the bank hit “quite demanding” targets for reducing financed emissions in the energy field and power sector early, although he also acknowledged that progress is “not going to be linear”.

In light of growing global energy demand and price shocks driven by the US-Israeli conflict with Iran, he said: “We feel we have to balance the planet with energy security, energy affordability and also ramping up our transition and sustainable financing activities.”

The board was also challenged about Barclays’ ties to the Israeli government after a UN report last year identified the bank as one of several firms implicated in profiting from a “genocidal economy” in Gaza.

Mr Higgins said the bank does not understand the “report”.

“We’ve read it and we don’t agree with the characterisation of the financial sector in it,” he said.

On its dealings with foreign governments, the chairman said the bank “tries to follow the policies set out by the British Government”, which continues to support Israel’s right to defend itself.

“These are deeply political and complicated questions and at one level, certainly, we take a steer from where our country’s Government is,” he said.

He added: "We do provide finance to a number of international defence companies who provide arms for the defence of this country, for the defence of Ukraine, and that is what the bank does."

Asked if the bank will commit to supporting the sovereignty of the Palestinian people in any future dealings with Israel and its associated companies, Mr Higgins said: "The thing we all wish and pray for is peace in the region and reconciliation and an end to the appalling human cost on all sides of whichever frontiers you're looking at."

"And all of the discussions around our policy, we shouldn't lose sight of that fact – that is by far and away the most important thing to wish for."

"But I'm afraid I'm not going to go into our financing policies on specific clients."

One shareholder shouted: "That's not going to happen, Mr Chairman, unless commercial companies and banks stop financing Israel."

City firms continue to face protests over their impact on people and planet, with NatWest's [AGM](#) halted last week by activists accusing the bank of backtracking on climate commitments.

Wednesday also saw the London offices of insurance giant Aviva targeted by activists claiming the company underwrites or invests in companies profiting from immigration detention and surveillance, fossil fuel giants and weapons firms.

■

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW10

This is the exhibit marked "AJW10" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.





About us

Just Stop Oil was a nonviolent civil resistance group in the UK. In 2022 we started taking action to demand the UK Government stop licensing all new oil, gas and coal projects. We have won on this.

Civil resistance works.

Just Stop Oil ended its street campaign in 2025, whilst we continue to support our action takers through the courts and in prison.



Two Just Stop Oil supporters found guilty for Heathrow paint spraying following retrial

Court & Prison, Press / May 14, 2026

Two Just Stop Oil Supporters who sprayed Heathrow departure boards with orange paint during the Oil Kills, international uprising to end fossil fuels in July 2024 have been found guilty in a retrial after the jury in an earlier trial failed to reach a majority decision. [1]

Phoebe Plummer and Jane Touil were appearing before Her Honour Judge Duncan at Isleworth Crown Court for the second time accused of criminal damage over £5,000 for their action on 30 July 2024 to demand a fossil fuel treaty to end oil and gas by 2030. [2] [3]

Following the verdict Jane Touil said:

“Since I took action, global fossil fuel use and emissions have continued to rise. More than ever, we need a global fossil fuel treaty to help governments rapidly phase out fossil fuels.”

“What we do at this moment in history matters. But there is a difference between laws and morality. The courts apply the law made by powerful people. Morals come from within. It is our morals that give us our conscience. I have always tried to live according to my conscience.”

Phoebe Plummer said:

“The climate crisis is the greatest injustice that humanity has ever faced. We should all consider what to do at this time. No individual caused this crisis and no one is solely responsible for stopping it. But we can choose what we do to alleviate suffering. I feel compelled to act to be a responsible citizen, a loving aunt and a good person. It compels me to hope for a better future and one where my nephew grows up. I didn’t think the action would change government policy. But non violent civil resistance is a necessary part of tackling the climate crisis and I’m grateful and proud to have been part of that. “

Phoebe was remanded for 58 days and Jane for 14 days following the 2024 action in which the pair used fire extinguishers to spray diluted water-based paint in Terminal 5 including at the departure boards. The Crown alleged that the action caused £8,000 worth of damages and that three of the display screens needed to be replaced. [4]

At trial, Judge Duncan ruled out several legal defences for the action including those of ‘reasonable excuse’ under Articles 10 and 11 of the ECHR, ‘necessity’ and ‘self defence’ on the grounds that the threat from climate change was not proximate enough and the actions too far removed from the threat. The defendants were allowed to argue belief in consent : that they honestly believed the owners of Terminal 5 would have consented to the damage if they knew of its circumstances. However, evidence of the relevant circumstances was to be limited to the fact that it was a climate protest with all evidence about the scale and urgency of the climate crisis ruled ‘irrelevant and therefore inadmissible’.

In giving evidence, Jane Touil said:

“I genuinely and sincerely believed that if the shareholders [of Heathrow] had a full understanding of the situation we are in they would have given their consent to our action.

“Most people believe there is something that is wrong with climate but not many people have access to the full situation because the fossil fuel industry has used their immense wealth to ensure that governments do not act and it is not reported in the mainstream media.

“So I don’t know if shareholders have a full understanding, but I know that if they did, they would be doing all in their power to stop fossil fuels because there will be no business as usual, no functioning society,

In her evidence Phoebe Plummer said:

"I want to make it very clear that this was not a protest against Heathrow, or anyone flying through Heathrow that day. It's true that the aviation industry is especially harmful to the climate in terms of emissions, though it is a small number of frequent fliers and private jet users who cause the vast majority of this harm, not families who save up for a holiday once a year.

"But this wasn't about getting people to stop flying...I made this individual change to live in line with my values, but honestly I know that it's pretty inconsequential. Even if we all woke up tomorrow and stopped flying and went vegan, it would be like mopping up a spill from an overflowing bath whilst leaving the tap on. All individual changes are like this when we are facing a systemic issue. If fossil fuels are extracted from the ground, then they will all be burnt, even if it's not on a flight that you're on. We need systemic change, that has always been Just Stop Oil's demand."

"My intention was not to cause damage. My intention was to take part in an act of nonviolent civil resistance, raising a serious alarm bell to the catastrophic future in store for us if we persist in our addiction to fossil fuels."

In 2024 Just Stop Oil successfully won its original demand of 'no new oil and gas' and on March 27th 2025 announced an end to the campaign of action. However, our supporters will continue to tell the truth in court, to speak out for our political prisoners and to help build what comes next.

ENDS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW11

This is the exhibit marked "AJW11" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



!! NEW PROJECT ALERT !!

The rich are killing us. To stop them and fix our broken country we need to...



**Take back
POWER**

[Join us at: takebackpower.net](https://takebackpower.net)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -


PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW12

This is the exhibit marked "AJW12" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



A photograph of a person with their hand on their head, looking distressed, in a room with many beds. The room appears to be a temporary shelter or a camp, with rows of beds covered in white sheets. The lighting is dim and the overall atmosphere is one of hardship.

Just Stop Oil launched in 2022, demanding the UK Government stop licensing all new oil, gas and coal projects. In 2024 the UK government met our original demand. **Civil resistance works.**

But revolutionary change is needed now more than ever. Corrupt politicians are serving the interests of billionaires. Ordinary people are struggling to survive, and the media is shifting blame from their mates on mega yachts to the people in small boats. Meanwhile, the world is getting hotter and hotter. Nothing short of a political and economic revolution is going to get us out of this mess.

It's time to **Take Back Power.**

SIGN UP TO OUR NEXT CAMPAIGN

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants

- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW13

This is the exhibit marked "AJW13" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Follow



just.stopoil and defendourjuries



973

92


47

48



just.stopoil SLOW MARCHERS FOUND NOT GUILTY BY A JURY... more

17 April





17 April



just.stopoil




341
 19
 6
 8

just.stopoil BREAKING: JANE IS FREE!

Jane Touil, 60, has just been released from prison... more

7 April





takeback.power and 4 others



15 arrested last night at Wesminster Quaker meeting house



During a
nonviolence training.



907

37

113


153



takeback.power Imagine being so deep in the pockets of CEOs and billionaires that you'd go to a Quaker Meeting House and arrest everyone at a nonviolence training.

@metpolice_uk really demonstrating the state's fear of peaceful resistance.

6 March






Follow



rogerhallamcs21 and 3 others
Wales, UK



298



18



28




31



rogerhallamcs21 With these numbers it's clear that revolution is inevitable. Sign up for it at rev21.earth.

3 March





🤍 69 💬 3 ↻ 2 🗑️ 3




takeback.power Another Just Stop Oil jury trial has just been adjourned to 2027.

Fact 1. All Section 7 jury trials bar one for nonviolent civil resistance have been adjourned in the 2 years since the Public Order Act came into law.

Fact 2. Lammy is planning to try and rush through scrapping jury trials.

There is no justice in our "Justice" Secretary.

23 February





Posts Replies Highlights Videos Photos



Just Stop Oil @JustSt... · 17/04/2026

SLOW MARCHERS FOUND NOT GUILTY BY A JURY

Hey @SuellaBraverman, turns out juries don't like when you invent anti-protest laws designed to imprison people for 12 months just for marching.

Six Just Stop Oil supporters were a [Show more](#)



42 568 1K 25K



Posts

Replies

Highlights

Videos

Photos



Just Stop Oil @JustSt... · 07/04/2026



BREAKING: JANE IS FREE!

Jane Touil, 60, has just been released from prison after serving 4 months of a 20 month sentence for climbing a gantry over the M25 in 2022 to demand an end to new oil and gas. She is partially sighted.

She will serve the rest of her sente [Show more](#)



21 ↑ 105 ❤️ 294 🗣️ 5.5K 📌 ↑





Posts Replies Highlights Videos Photos




Just Stop Oil @JustSt... · 20/02/2026



BREAKING: NO PRISON FOR CAR DEALERSHIP SPRAYERS

In October 2022, Carmen and Emma sprayed orange paint over high end car dealerships including HR Owen, Jack Barclay and Ferrari Mayfair, demanding an end to new oil and gas licences [Show more](#)



13

10

24

4.1K





Just Stop Oil

17 Apr · 🌐



🚩 SLOW MARCHERS FOUND NOT GUILTY BY A JURY... See more



Southwark Crown Court today, two and a half years after slow marching on Waterloo Bridge to demand an end to new oil and gas licensing.

On 8th November 2023, Sheila Shatford, Julia Mercer, David Kilroy, Geraldine James, Rosalind Bird and Gregory Sculthorpe were among approximately 50 supporters who joined a slow march around the IMAX roundabout before heading north over Waterloo Bridge. They were arrested and charged with Section 7 of the Public Order Act 2023: interference with key national infrastructure: an offence which was used for the first time only two days beforehand, and which carries a maximum penalty of 12 months imprisonment, an unlimited fine, or both.

The six appeared before Judge Hiddleston at Southwark Crown Court this week in a trial which had been restarted after one of the original jury fell ill. The jury delivered their

During the five day trial, the Judge denied the defendants all legal defences including reasonable excuse and necessity, and ruled that agreed facts on climate were "irrelevant". The defendants were, however, given around 20 minutes each to talk about their motivations for taking action.

The jury were asked to consider whether the defendants had caused a significant delay to other road users, and if so whether that was their intention or they were reckless as to whether that would have been the result.

The police produced a compilation of video evidence showing the march which demonstrated some traffic buildup, but no evidence of a normal traffic flow at that location. Laura Stockdale, acting for Greg Sculthorpe, questioned whether the jury could be sure that this buildup was more than would normally occur on a weekday in central London.

She also suggested that the delays would have been less if the police had let the march continue to the other end of the Bridge and if they had not themselves closed the Southbound carriageway. DI Keven Pender for the Metropolitan Police responded that they could not be sure what the marchers were planning to do.

The defendants each emphasised their desire to draw attention to the climate crisis and the care and careful planning that was involved in undertaking a march. All denied that there was any intention to cause anything more than minor slowing of traffic.

In her defence evidence, Sheila Shatford spoke movingly of what inspired her to take action, including a childhood teacher whose family had been affected by the Aberfan disaster in which 116 children were killed. She said: "Only later did I understand that the slag heap belonged to the National Coal Board, and that warnings were given before the disaster, but none listened."


She went on to recount how she had learned about the climate emergency and said: "I realised that it's always the poorest and most vulnerable that are most affected and have the smallest voice. I read and found out the climate emergency was real - there is overwhelming evidence that it's happening now, and very soon we won't be able to stop it."

The 2023 Public Order Act was introduced specifically to target climate protest, and named groups such as Extinction Rebellion, Just Stop Oil and Insulate Britain as the reason for its introduction. Although hundreds of Just Stop Oil supporters have been charged with the Section 7 offence and are awaiting trial, as a result of the backlog in courts, this was only the second case to be heard since May 2024.

The first person to be convicted of the offence was Stephen Gingle who was jailed for 6 months after pleading guilty in December 2023.



61 comments 75 shares



All

Photos

Reels

More ▾



Just Stop Oil

20 Feb · 🌐



🔴 BREAKING: NO PRISON FOR CAR DEALERSHIP SPRAYERS... See more

NO PRISON



FOR CAR DEALERSHIP

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW14

This is the exhibit marked "AJW14" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Taking back power or taking the mickey?

The activists 'liberating' food from big stores

A new UK civil resistance group has called for 'mass shoplifting' to focus attention on inequality, but recent stunts have led to arrests



Eve Middleton was sitting on a picnic blanket in a park, sharing out vegan biscuits with six fellow activists, when she saw a squad of police bearing down on them. About 30 officers, she said, surrounded the seven young people, and one officer told them: "Don't run or you'll be cuffed."

Another officer focused on gathering evidence. "Whose Oreos are these?" they asked, seizing the biscuits.

"It was pretty farcical, but it's still frightening when you see that amount of officers running towards you. It's pretty scary," said student Bridie Leggatt, another of the seven.

The seven activists had gathered for a "nonviolence training event" – meeting in the park to enjoy the sunny weather.

Leggatt, 22, and Middleton, 25, were among 13 people arrested last weekend in Salford and London as part of a national police crackdown on a new civil resistance group called [Take Back Power](#).

A further 15 arrests had been made in March when police raided a "nonviolence training" event, this time at the Grade II-listed Quaker House in Westminster.

They were all held on suspicion of conspiracy to commit theft, police said, linked to Take Back Power's campaign of "mass shoplifting" in supermarkets across Britain in a protest against inequality.

On TikTok, the group's videos show activists of all ages "liberating" rice, pasta, beans, nappies, stock cubes and tinned fruit from supermarkets including Cornwall, London and Manchester.

They pile the goods into cardboard boxes branded with the message: "These things are going to those who need them." The items are then distributed at local food banks – if they manage to get past security.

Even by today's standards of shoplifting, when supermarket thefts have reached [record highs](#), the mass looting is quite brazen.

Steph Parker, an assistant chief constable at [Greater Manchester](#) police, said forces would take "robust action to disrupt this type of organised criminality and it will not be tolerated".

Middleton and her six comrades were held in custody for 24 hours before being released on Monday. For Middleton, like many of the activists, this is not her first encounter with the law.

Many of those involved with the group are seasoned activists – despite being in their early 20s – having taking part in actions with Extinction Rebellion, Just Stop Oil, Animal Rising and other groups in recent years. Neither Middleton or Leggatt wanted to say how many times they had been arrested as they feared a telling off from their parents.

Take Back Power announced itself in December when activists [threw custard and apple crumble](#) at a case containing the crown jewels at the Tower of London.



Eight people were charged with criminal damage over the stunts, with four due to appear before Westminster magistrates court on Monday. The group said a total of 50 people had been arrested since December, with the majority detained while taking part in "nonviolence training" events.

On its website, activists are invited to join upcoming action in London "targeting the luxury lifestyle of the super-rich" by "occupying where they play and shop".

A spokesperson for Take Back Power, who would only give his name as James due to the risk of arrest, said the group planned further headline-grabbing stunts this year with the aim of focusing attention on Britain's deepening inequality.

James said the organisation, which wants to see higher taxes levied on the rich and a legally binding citizens' assembly, had no leader "as such". It has raised more than £65,000

in donations in the past four months, according to a fundraising page.

Another of those arrested last weekend, who would only give his name as Mark, said mass shoplifting would have “no real effect” on supermarkets who make billions of pounds in profit.

“Supermarkets are profiting off other people’s misery and we can’t put up with that,” said Middleton, pointing out that Tesco’s chief executive, Ken Murphy, was paid £9.2m last year, about 400 times that of the shop’s typical worker.

What about the effect on low-paid staff? Will they not risk losing their jobs if mass shoplifting has an effect on company profits?

“It shouldn’t be staff that get cut,” said Mark, 44, who works in education. “What should get cut are the obscene profits and salaries of the chief executives.”

The vegan picnic raided by police last weekend was in Salford’s Peel Park – named after Sir Robert Peel, the founder of modern law enforcement whose philosophy of “policing by consent” is a guiding principle of forces today, recognising that those in uniform operate on the basis of public trust rather than fear or force.



Yet the arrests of activists at a training event – rather than for a specific act – appears to run counter to that principle, said Middleton.

Parliament’s joint committee on human rights has condemned legislative changes in recent years that [it said \(pdf\)](#) have had “a chilling effect” on the right to protest in England and Wales.

Middleton said the arrests on suspicion of being involved in a conspiracy was part of a wider “repression” of civil resistance in Britain.

“Other groups were able to take part in training without everyone getting arrested,” she said. “For doing not as much, the risk of prison is a lot higher.”

James, the Take Back Power spokesperson, said the group planned to build up its action with the aim of pushing inequality to the top of the agenda by the next general election, which has to be held by August 2029.

Middleton believes the police crackdown is a sign that the authorities are scared.

“They can see that Take Back Power does speak to a lot of this country’s people [who are] fed up with inequality. They are scared of what it could become.”

■

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW15

This is the exhibit marked "AJW15" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Four taken into custody as Take Back Power 'crumble and custard' the Crown Jewels



Two supporters of Take Back Power have smothered dessert over the crown jewels. Take Back Power is a new nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a permanent citizen's assembly- a House of the People, which has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain. [1]

At around 09:50 this morning, two Take Back Power supporters covered the glass containing the crown jewels in custard and apple crumble. They then held a sign which read 'DEMOCRACY HAS CRUMBLLED- TAX THE RICH'. By around 10:30, the two action takers and two others had been taken into custody by police.

Today's action comes as all donations to Take Back Power will be doubled until midnight on Sunday the 7th December! You can donate and have your donation doubled [here](#). [2]

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

"Since 2011, the poorest 10% of households have paid a combined tax rate of 44% on their income and wealth gains, while the richest paid 22%. Our political class, be it this government, Reform or Tory, serve the super-rich; they do not care about working people. That's why we must demand real democracy, with ordinary people at the heart of decision making, through a citizen-led assembly that has the power to tax the rich." [3]

One of those taking action today is Miriam Cranch, 21, a retail worker from Leeds, who said:

"Britain is broken because the super rich are pocketing billions, whilst working people struggle to get by."

"This wealth inequality is leading us towards civil unrest, and it doesn't have to be this way. Billionaires should not pay a lower tax rate on wealth they generate doing nothing, than those of us working jobs. It's time ordinary people get a say on how to tax wealth with a permanent House of the People."

Also taking action today is Zahra Ali, 19, a student from London, who said:

"Our country is crumbling before our eyes! We have homeless people dying on the very streets that King Charles passed on his way to the coronation, whilst there are more empty homes than unhoused people in this country."

"It's time the ultra rich pay their fair share. We demand a permanent House of the People. It's time to take back power, tax the rich and fix Britain! Join us at takebackpower.net."

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen's assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at TakeBackPower.net.

ENDS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW16

This is the exhibit marked "AJW16" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Wed, Oct 22, 2020, 8:00 pm
8:00 pm

Welcome Event

London, E1
5QJ

[Register](#)



Follow us on social media.

—

Take Back Power is a nonviolent civil resistance group in the UK. We aim to put the 99% in charge through citizen's assemblies. We are ordinary people from all walks of life who believe that in order to fix Britain, we have to tax the rich. And we don't think the rich should get a veto. We want the people to decide how we tax the rich through a legally-binding citizen's assembly — a House of the People. **It's time for the 99% to have 99% of a say!**

—

Contact us

General: info@takebackpower.net

Press: press@takebackpower.net

Fundraising: giving@takebackpower.net

Get the newsletter

First name *

Email *

Postcode

Country

I agree to the [privacy policy](#) *

Register

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW17

This is the exhibit marked "AJW17" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



What is Take Back Power and what does it want?



– What is Take Back Power?

Take Back Power is a nonviolent civil resistance group in the UK. We aim to put the 99% in charge through citizen's assemblies. We are ordinary people from all walks of life who believe that in order to fix Britain, taxing the rich is an essential first step, and we want ordinary people to decide how.

+ What is Take Back Power's demand?

+ What is the House of the People?

+ What would the House of the People do?

+ Has an institution like this existed before?

+ Don't the super-rich already pay too much tax?

+ How rich are we talking about here?

+ How bad is inequality in the UK?

+ What sort of tax would you like to see?

+ Even if you tax the rich it won't be enough to fix Britain will it?

+ How would you spend the money raised?

+ Why does Take Back Power engage in disruptive direct action?

+ How is Take Back Power funded?

+ How can I get involved?

What is Take Back Power and what does it want?



+ What is Take Back Power?
+ What is Take Back Power's demand?
+ What is the House of the People?
+ What would the House of the People do?
+ Has an institution like this existed before?
+ Don't the super-rich already pay too much tax?
+ How rich are we talking about here?
+ How bad is inequality in the UK?
+ What sort of tax would you like to see?
+ Even if you tax the rich it won't be enough to fix Britain will it?
+ How would you spend the money raised?
- Why does Take Back Power engage in disruptive direct action?
Nobody likes disruption, least of all the people disrupting, however history shows us that disruption is a necessary part of social change. Disruptive direct action brought us livable working conditions, the weekend, universal suffrage, and civil rights for marginalised communities. More recently, it saw the demand of Just Stop Oil become government policy. The evidence is clear that though people may not like the messenger, or the method of delivery, they hear the message. Ultimately this leads to political pressure and eventual social change. You can read more about how this works here .

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW18

This is the exhibit marked "AJW18" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.





[.https://takebackpower.net](https://takebackpower.net)

‘Inequality is shit’ — Take Back Power deliver crappy Christmas for the Ritz

[December 3, 2025\(https://takebackpower.net/2025/12/03/\)](https://takebackpower.net/2025/12/03/)



Three supporters of Take Back Power have delivered a pile of shit to the Ritz. Take Back Power is a new nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a permanent citizen’s assembly- a House of the People, which has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain. [1]

At around 12:05 today, three Take Back Power supporters deposited a pile of manure below the Christmas tree at the iconic luxury hotel. The three were quickly removed from the lobby and then held signs outside the entrance which read: ‘INEQUALITY IS SHIT’ & ‘TAX THE RICH’.

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“The super-rich have more than doubled their wealth since the pandemic, while this Christmas, a third of UK children suffer and grow up in poverty. It’s time ordinary people – those most affected by inequality, get a say in deciding how to tax wealth through the means of a legally binding citizen’s assembly- a House of the People.” [2][3]

One of those taking action today, Ellen Redwood-Brown, 23, an NHS worker, said:

“The billionaires, corporations, and corrupt politicians running Britain don’t care about us. While working in the NHS I’ve seen people dying because they couldn’t get appointments whilst doctors are working 15 hour shifts.”

“The UK has 156 billionaires. We could take away 75% of that wealth to fix Britain and we’d still have 156 billionaires. We must let ordinary people decide how to tax the rich.” [4]



Also taking action today is Tom Barber, 65, a former doctor, journalist and community worker from Nottingham, who said:

“Power is concentrated in the hands of a small group of obscenely wealthy and ruthless individuals. They are hell-bent on enriching themselves, forcing the gap between the haves and the have-nots ever wider.”

“Everyday people must Take Back Power, compelling our government to create a permanent citizens’ assembly- a House of the People. Only then can we start making decisions for everyone’s benefit- taxing the rich, creating a fairer society and restoring our faith in our democracy.”

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net \(https://takebackpower.net\)](https://takebackpower.net).



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Four taken into custody as Take Back Power ‘crumble and custard’ the Crown Jewels

December 6, 2025(<https://takebackpower.net/2025/12/06/>)



Two supporters of Take Back Power have smothered dessert over the crown jewels. Take Back Power is a new nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a permanent citizen’s assembly- a House of the People, which has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain. [1]

At around 09:50 this morning, two Take Back Power supporters covered the glass containing the crown jewels in custard and apple crumble. They then held a sign which read ‘DEMOCRACY HAS CRUMBLLED- TAX THE RICH’. By around 10:30, the two action takers and two others had been taken into custody by police.

Today's action comes as all donations to Take Back Power will be doubled until midnight on Sunday the 7th December! You can donate and have your donation doubled [here](https://charity.org/project/take-back-power?utm_source=tbpn&utm_medium=website&utm_content=tbphome&utm_term=doubletop) (https://charity.org/project/take-back-power?utm_source=tbpn&utm_medium=website&utm_content=tbphome&utm_term=doubletop) (<https://takebackpower.net>)

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“Since 2011, the poorest 10% of households have paid a combined tax rate of 44% on their income and wealth gains, while the richest paid 22%. Our political class, be it this government, Reform or Tory, serve the super-rich; they do not care about working people. That’s why we must demand real democracy, with ordinary people at the heart of decision making, through a citizen-led assembly that has the power to tax the rich.” [3]

One of those taking action today is Miriam Cranch, 21, a retail worker from Leeds, who said:

“Britain is broken because the super rich are pocketing billions, whilst working people struggle to get by.”

“This wealth inequality is leading us towards civil unrest, and it doesn’t have to be this way. Billionaires should not pay a lower tax rate on wealth they generate doing nothing, than those of us working jobs. It’s time ordinary people get a say on how to tax wealth with a permanent House of the People.”

Also taking action today is Zahra Ali, 19, a student from London, who said:

“Our country is crumbling before our eyes! We have homeless people dying on the very streets that King Charles passed on his way to the coronation, whilst there are more empty homes than unhoused people in this country.”

“It’s time the ultra rich pay their fair share. We demand a permanent House of the People. It’s time to take back power, tax the rich and fix Britain! Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net) (<https://takebackpower.net>).

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Take Back Power supporters call on Starmer to cut the corruption and resign by ‘locking-on’ at Parliament

February 6, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/02/06/>)



Two young people have called on Keir Starmer to cut out corruption and resign by ‘locking-on’ outside Parliament. They are supporters of Take Back Power, a nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a ‘House of the People’- a permanent citizen-led assembly with the power to tax extreme wealth. [1]

At 9am this morning, two young people carrying a giant Keir Starmer papier mache head locked themselves in front of Carriage Gate, blocking access to Parliament. They could be seen holding placards which read “Cut the Corruption”. By around 10am police arrived at the scene and had cut through the papier mache head.

A spokesperson for Take Back Power said:

“We’re calling on Keir Starmer to resign. While Lord Mandelson is gone, the system that protected and empowered him remains. It’s time to cut out the corruption at the heart of our democracy. While corporations and the super rich are splashing their cash to buy access to ministers and seats in the House of Lords, ordinary people are struggling to afford basic necessities.”

“We need a radical overhaul so that democracy works for all of us, not just the privileged few. We have politicians in the pockets of billionaire pedophiles, they don’t work for us. We need ordinary people in charge through a House of the People.”

One of those taking action today is Alice Jones, 20, a student from Manchester, who said:

“It is absurd that we live in a country where 156 billionaires hoard wealth, splashing out on private jets, whilst ordinary people have to choose between heating their homes, or feeding their children; all while our country quickly descends into fascism.”

“The politicians in our country are failing us. Ordinary people are being left to survive with the scraps: a crumbling NHS, extortionate food prices, and ever rising bills. The UK needs a permanent House of the People. It’s time to take back power, tax the rich and fix Britain! Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”



(Left image credit to Jamie Lowe. Right image and main image credit to Will Colebourne.)

Also taking action is Bridie Leggatt, 22, who is also a student from Manchester, who said:

“Spiralling wealth inequality is leading us to societal collapse. Our country is the sixth richest nation and yet it is home to 4 million children living in poverty. Our political system doesn’t function fairly. We need ordinary people in the decision making seats deciding how to fix this; not corrupt politicians in the pockets of the super rich.”

“There IS a solution to inequality, but our government simply won’t do what’s necessary. We cannot let political parties use scapegoated minorities to distract us from what is needed: a tax on the super rich.”



(Image credit to Will Colebourne.)

Today’s action comes just days after the MET police began criminal investigations into Peter Mandelson, Starmer’s former ambassador to the US, over allegations that he passed market-sensitive information to the pedophile financier Jeffrey Epstein.

New allegations from recently released Epstein files also allege that Peter Mandelson’s husband accepted money from Jeffrey Epstein after his prison sentence over child sexual offences. [2]

But the corruption doesn’t end there, recent research by the Guardian showed that almost a third (266 out of 800) members of the House of Lords have given donations to political parties, some 115 of them before they were given peerages. [3]

Recent media reports have revealed that Labour government ministers have met with the arms industry, banks and big oil hundreds of times, while half the cabinet have taken cash from pro-Israel lobbyists. The Party even offered sponsorship deals for £55,000 to allow businesses to host lunches for ministers at the Labour conference. [4][5][6]

Meanwhile, inequality is spiralling out of control. Student nurses say they are sleeping in their cars, going to food banks and relying on lecturers to buy them food, while nearly half of Brits would struggle to pay for basic necessities if they lost their jobs. Given this, it is not surprising that faith in political institutions has collapsed, with 87 per cent of Britons across all parties having either not very much trust in politicians or none at all. [7][8][9]

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net):
(<https://takebackpower.net>)
(<https://takebackpower.net>)

ENDS



[.https://takebackpower.net](https://takebackpower.net)

Police arrest 15 Take Back Power supporters at a nonviolence training event

March 5, 2026[\(https://takebackpower.net/2026/03/05/\)](https://takebackpower.net/2026/03/05/)



15 Take Back Power supporters were arrested during a nonviolence training this evening being held in the Westminster Quaker Meeting House. Take Back Power is a nonviolent campaign demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a 'House of the People.' [1]

At around 18:35 a number of police officers forced entry into the Westminster Quakers meeting house. They proceeded to arrest 15 people on suspicion of conspiracy to commit theft. Two of those arrested were acting as legal observers. During the raid an ambulance had to be called as one person

suffered a panic attack after being arrested. Those arrested were sent to Brixton and Walworth police stations where one person was subsequently bailed. 14 remain in custody. [2]

(<https://takebackpower.net>)

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“The police arrested fifteen ordinary people in a place of worship for discussing nonviolent civil disobedience. This draconian overreach shows what the state is willing to do to protect corporate profits and billionaires, while ordinary people struggle to put food on the table.

The state is scared of civil disobedience because it works. But when the super-rich have captured our politics, nonviolent civil disobedience is the only choice we have to take back our power. Now more than ever, we need everyone to join us: sign up at takebackpower.net.”

In their statement, the MET police referenced last year’s unprecedented raid on Westminster Quakers and the arrests of Youth Demand supporters meeting about the genocide in Gaza, which drew widespread condemnation from faith groups. One of the people arrested this evening had also been previously arrested during last year’s raid on Westminster Quakers. [3]

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Take Back Power supporters redistribute food from supermarkets to those most in need

March 14, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/03/14/>)



Take Back Power supporters have been redistributing food from supermarkets to local foodbanks across the country this morning. Take Back Power is a nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a 'House of the People'- a permanent citizen-led assembly with the power to tax extreme wealth. [1]

From around 8:30 this morning, teams across four UK cities- Manchester, London, Exeter and Truro, entered supermarkets and began putting food and necessities into boxes emblazoned with 'These things are going to those that need them'. The Take Back Power supporters left the shops without paying for the produce and then redistributed these items to local food-bank drop off points.

In Exeter, a team of five supporters took five boxes of produce from Morrison's supermarket in Prince Charles Road, however were stopped by security who took away two of five boxes. The remaining three boxes were successfully

benefit parasitic billionaires instead of the masses. It's time for ordinary people to be put at the heart of decision making, through a House of the People with powers to tax the rich and fix Britain.”


(<https://takebackpower.net>)



(Credit for image to The Canary)

Also taking action is Ruth Cook, 74, a company director from Somerset, who said:

“I’m taking this action and risking arrest because we have a terrible situation in this country. Families are struggling and children are going hungry, while the profits some companies make are obscene. The answer is to tax the super-rich. I’m taking this food and delivering it to a food bank collection point because we need to do something about this. We need to tax the super rich and give ordinary people a say in how our taxes are spent. Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”



Today's action comes in the wake of the raid of a Quakers meeting house and the arrest of 15 people during a nonviolence training last week. One other was arrested at their home on Thursday and the houses of seven supporters have been raided by police in connection with these actions so far. (<https://takebackpower.net>)

This occurs as the UK remains in crisis. Last year, 14 million people in the UK faced the prospect of going hungry due to a lack of money. Whilst in 2024, 6.5 million people turned to food banks. [2]

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen's assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net \(https://takebackpower.net\)](https://takebackpower.net).

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Seven arrested at Nonviolence training event as Take Back Power supporters homes raided

April 19, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/04/19/>)



Seven people have been arrested at a nonviolence training event held in London. The training was held by Take Back Power, a nonviolent campaign demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a 'House of the People.' [1]

At around 12:30 yesterday, dozens of officers raided Millman Street Community Centre in London. Officers arrived in three vans, arresting six people under suspicion of 'conspiracy to commit theft.' One of those arrested was an undercover Daily Mail journalist.

At around 15:20 on Saturday the home of Take Back Power supporter was also raided. The supporter wasn't home and on learning there was a warrant for their arrest they handed themselves in. The police subsequently raided their home for a second time at around 2am this morning.

This weekend's raids occur as Take Back Power supporters joined a counter demonstration in Manchester yesterday, opposing Britain First, a far-right demonstration which was marching in the city. Groups opposing fascist demonstrators were kettled, beaten with truncheons and pepper-sprayed by police.

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“Once again the police are raiding homes and community centres, arresting people for simply learning about nonviolence. Meanwhile, police protect fascists marching in Manchester and kettle and beat counter-protestors instead. Such is the state of civil liberties in the UK in 2026. The government and police care more about protecting the interests of corporations and billionaires than protecting the people of this country. We’ve got to make politics work for ordinary people. We need a House of the People with powers to tax the billionaires destroying this country. If you want to help us make it happen sign up at takebackpower.net (https://takebackpower.net).”



On Saturday, police also attended and shut down a nonviolence training being held in Falmouth, no arrests were made, however the event was cancelled.

Today’s raids continue the escalating repression being imposed on nonviolent campaigns. Police have so far shut down four nonviolence trainings held by Take Back Power, in some instances raiding places of worship.

These raids echo the widely unpopular and unprecedented raid in 2025 on Westminster Quakers where Youth Demand supporters were meeting to discuss the genocide in Gaza, which drew widespread condemnation from faith groups.

[2]

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

“Nigel for Sale”- Take Back Power takes action at Sotheby’s

April 27, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/04/27/>)



Two Take Back Power supporters have taken action at Sotheby’s auction house. Take Back Power is a nonviolent campaign demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a ‘House of the People.’ [1]

At around 11:15 this morning, two Take Back Power supporters covered a painting at Sotheby’s Orientalist art pre-auction exhibition, with a picture of Nigel Farage’s face. The image read “*Nigel for sale: £100,000- bought by Sotheby’s*”. The painting covered is King Wilhelm I’s Arabian Stallion ‘Tursi’ by Friedrich Nerly, which is expected to sell for between £80,000- £120,000.

By around 11:35 the action takers had been removed from the building by security, however police didn’t arrive on the scene. At around mid-day, the action takers attempted to hand themselves in at Charing Cross police station. Thus far, no arrests have been made.

Sotheby's describes itself as the 'world's premier destination for art and luxury'. Best known for its fine art auctions, it also has a luxury real estate company — Sotheby's realty which has donated £100,000 to Reform. [2]

(<https://takebackpower.net>)

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“Reform claims to be on the side of working people. If that were true, why would the ‘world’s premier destination for art and luxury’, be giving them a donation of £100,000 in exchange for yet more tax breaks on the super rich if they get into power?”

“Reform is another party of the same corrupt corporations and super-rich who are destroying our country, putting the burden of fixing Britain onto working people. In order to fix Britain we need a mass redistribution of wealth and power away from the 1%, back to working people. Help us fix Britain at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”



One of those taking action today is Elvis, a delivery driver from Bolton, who said:

“I’m taking action with Take Back Power in order to highlight corruption and inequality in the UK. Sotheby’s have donated 100,000 to Reform plc, in exchange for more tax breaks for the super wealthy if they get elected.”

“Meanwhile millions of families still struggle to put food on the table every single day. We can make a change if we all come together and build a system that’s fairer and more representative of the British people. To find out more go to takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”

Also taking action today is Jimmy, 74, a retired NGO worker, from London who said:

“There was a time when the super-rich would be taxed at a much higher rate than ordinary working people, and we had a functioning health system and affordable housing. Nowadays corporations and billionaires pay next to no tax through using loopholes and offshore accounts.”

*“Reform wants to give even more tax breaks to the super wealthy who are already breaking Britain. We need ordinary people at the heart of deciding how to tax extreme wealth to begin fixing Britain. This is why we are calling for a permanent citizen’s assembly, with the power to tax extreme wealth- a **House of the People**.”*
(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Reform is backed primarily by the super-rich and corporations. This includes donations from crypto-billionaire Christopher Harborne, Claudia Harmsworth, wife of the owner of the Daily Mail- Lord Rothermere, and London’s leading luxury interior designers- Interior Architecture Landscape. [2]

We need to Take Back our Power from the super-rich, which is why Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net) (<https://takebackpower.net>).

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Take Back Power ‘take over’ the playgrounds of the super-rich

April 30, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/04/30/>)



Take Back Power supporters have been ‘taking over’ the playgrounds of the super-rich this morning. Take Back Power is a nonviolent campaign, demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a ‘House of the People.’ [1]

At around 10 this morning, 22 Take Back Power supporters occupied a Ferrari dealership in Berkeley Square, they could be heard chanting “WE DEMAND EQUALITY!” and “THE BILLIONAIRES HAVE GOT TO GO!”. By around 10:30 the group left the store.

At around 11:30, the group reconvened at Burlington Arcade- the world’s first modern shopping mall, which positions itself as an ‘elegant and exclusive upmarket shopping venue’. The group could be seen holding signs which read “HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE” and “4 MILLION KIDS IN POVERTY”, which were quickly seized by door staff.

By around 12:20, the group had moved on to the food hall at the luxury department store, Harrod's. Security was much more reactive, dragging Take Back Power supporters from the building.

(<https://takebackpower.net>)
A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“This country is in crisis and everyone knows it! The people to blame are the corporations and super-rich who are extracting every last penny from working people, and then using their ownership of the media to distract people into blaming the poor and migrants. Nothing short of a massive transfer of wealth and power away from the 1% and back to working people can hope to fix Britain. Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”



One of those taking action today is Robert Pembroke, 43, a builder and dad from Devon, who said:

“It’s time ordinary people take back our power from the super-rich. Inequality is spiralling out of control, 50 families in the UK hold more wealth than 50% of the country. Around the world, it’s even worse with eight men holding more wealth than 50% of the world’s population!”

*“It is obscene to allow this, people are dying. We need ordinary people, taking part in a permanent citizens’ assembly- a **House of the People** deciding how to tackle this. To find out more go to takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”*



Also taking action today is Ana Heyatawin, 63, a grandmother from Somerset, who said:



“Inequality, which is being imposed on ordinary people by big business, billionaires and the politicians who work for them, is killing people right now. More than a third of people in the UK now don’t earn enough to buy life’s essentials.”

*“We need ordinary people at the heart of deciding how to tax extreme wealth to begin fixing this mess. This is why we are calling for a permanent citizen’s assembly, with the power to tax extreme wealth- a **House of the People.**”*

It’s time working people take back our power from the super-rich. This is why Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent **House of the People**— a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net) (<https://takebackpower.net>).

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Take Back Power supporters redistribute essential items whilst occupying high-end stores and hotels

May 1, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/05/01/>)



Take Back Power supporters have been occupying the playgrounds of the wealthy this morning, and have liberated items from a superstore to redistribute them back to the communities that need them. Take Back Power is a nonviolent campaign, demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a **'House of the People.'** [1]

At around 9 this morning, three Take Back Power supporters entered the Tesco Extra on Acre Lane in Brixton, and took essential items from the shelves and left without paying. The action takers then donated the items at a local food-bank

drop-off point. At around 10am, all three attempted to hand themselves in at Brixton Police Station. So far none have been arrested.

At 11:45, around a further 18 Take Back Power supporters occupied the luxury department store Liberty, on Regent Street in London. They could be seen holding signs which read '3 MILLION HOUSEHOLDS SKIPPING MEALS' and 'TAX THE SUPER-RICH NOW.'

At around 1pm, this group then reconvened, disrupting access to the luxury hotel, Claridges. The group could be heard chanting "WE DEMAND EQUALITY!" and 'HOW DO WE TAX THE SUPER RICH?- A HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE!' as security attempted to move the supporters away from the door.

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

*"Take Back Power is calling for an emergency '**House of the People**' to deal with the cost of living crisis. When politicians are too busy lining their pockets to fix our problems, we need the people most impacted to have a seat at the table. A **House of the People** selected by democratic lottery, like a jury, is a no-brainer solution to cut out the corruption and decide how to redistribute wealth."*



One of those taking action redistributing food today is Moshe Dixon, 25, from Dundee said:

"My mother came from poverty and fought tooth and nail to give me a better future. Like so many mothers she was promised that hard work would be rewarded, yet we are living in a country where so many families can't make ends meet despite working multiple jobs."

"6.5 million people had to turn to foodbanks in 2024. Meanwhile the CEO of Tesco is taking home 430 times the pay of the average Tesco employee, and the rich are paying a smaller share of tax than working people. We need an assembly of ordinary people coming together to decide how to tax extreme wealth in order to fix our broken country. Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>)."



Also taking action today occupying high-end stores and hotels, is Hannah McDonald, 20, a student from Liverpool, who said:

“Fourteen million people last year were faced with the prospect of going hungry, in this, the 6th richest nation on earth! Now we have a cost of living tsunami on the way and the government is nowhere to be seen.”

*“This is broken Britain. We need a **House of the People**— an assembly with real power, where ordinary mums, nurses, posties & cleaners, get a real say in how to take back our power from the super rich, and redistribute that wealth and power back to working people.”*

Today’s actions come as the UK braces for food shortages and soaring prices as a result of the war in Iran, as rising fuel, fertiliser and commodity prices begin to feed into business costs. [2]

It’s time we take on the super-rich who are profiteering from a world in crisis. This is why Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish an emergency **House of the People**— a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net \(https://takebackpower.net\)](https://takebackpower.net).

ENDS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

(1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
(2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
(4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
(5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
(6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants

- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW19

This is the exhibit marked "AJW19" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Look what you made me do.



Two young people received suspended sentences today for spray-painting two private jets at Stansted Airport in June 2024 to demand the UK government negotiate a treaty to phase out oil and gas by 2030. [1]

They were found guilty of criminal damage at Chelmsford Crown Court in September. Jennifer Kowalski, 29, from Dumbarton received a 5 month custodial sentence suspended for 12 months, Cole Macdonald, 23, from Brighton was handed a six week custodial sentence suspended for 8 months plus 20 days rehabilitative activity. The two had cut through the wire perimeter fence at Stansted and sprayed paint from a fire extinguisher onto two private jets parked at Stansted Airport, just hours after Taylor Swift's plane had landed. [2]

At trial, the prosecution claimed the planes required extensive professional cleaning costing about £12,000. Judge Mill ruled the damage too serious for the defendants to rely on their rights to free expression and assembly under Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The jury was therefore not allowed to consider whether restricting those rights was a proportionate response to the alleged damage. [3]

After their arrest both were held for 11 days on remand, until released on bail. Cole then spent 39 weeks on curfewed tag (this equals a four month custodial sentence) While tagged Cole was arrested five times for breach of bail, approximately once every two months. Once she was being held in police custody, another time she was in hospital seeking treatment for back pain after informing the monitoring service. None of the five arrests resulted in breaching bail being proven.

Before sentencing Jennifer Kowalski, 29, a former sustainability manager from Dumbarton, said:

"Whilst Taylor and her fans have been celebrating her eras, we have entered a new one – the era of global boiling. This is an era that will not end with a rebrand; it will end all others. As a former Swiftie, I know what Taylor stands to lose, because there is no folklore without human culture, no music on a dead planet."

"The court system can take our freedom, our autonomy, our dignity, and deny us basic rights. But they can never take my convictions, to fight for a future for us all. Whatever happens in a court room, that is who I am today, and they can never change that."

A Just Stop Oil spokesperson said

This trial, the saga of mismanaged draconian bail conditions and the sentences demonstrates, again, the establishment will protect the wealthy and privileged while punishing those seeking to protect us and defend our freedoms and natural justice.

In just seven months of 2022, Taylor Swift's private jet logged 170 flights – 15.9 full days in the air, averaging 80 minutes and 139 miles per trip. Yard, the sustainability marketing firm that compiled the data, estimated her total carbon emissions at 8,293.54 tonnes of CO₂, more than 1,100 times that of an ordinary person over an entire year. [4]

A study published in Nature and reported by National Geographic found that private aviation generated at least 15.6 million tonnes of CO₂ in 2023, with an average of 3.6 tonnes emitted per flight. Almost half of all private-jet journeys were under 500 kilometres,

and around one in five covered less than 200 kilometres, distances that could often be travelled by rail or road. The researchers noted that some aircraft models can emit more carbon in a single hour than an average person produces in an entire year. [5] [6]

The music industry, and even artists of Taylor Swift's stature, are not shielded from the accelerating climate collapse. In November 2023, 23-year-old Ana Clara Benevides collapsed and later died from heat exhaustion while attending Swift's concert in Rio de Janeiro during a record-breaking heatwave that pushed temperatures above 40°C. [7]

In recent months, the musician Steve Miller cancelled his entire North American tour citing the growing threat of extreme weather, describing the decision as unavoidable in light of intensifying heat, floods and wildfires. Artists and organisers are already facing rising costs, cancellations and safety risks as performances are disrupted by record temperatures and severe storms. Extreme weather, driven by fossil fuel combustion, is already endangering lives and reshaping the conditions in which global entertainment operates. [8]

ENDS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW20

This is the exhibit marked "AJW20" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



FØSSIL FREE LONDON



Fossil Free London is a climate justice organisation dedicated to disrupting the fossil fuel industry here in our city.

Through direct action, strategic campaigning, and movement building, we challenge the social licence of elites and corporate polluters. We advocate for a rapid and just transition towards a sustainable and equitable society.

In London? **[Sign up to a welcome talk.](#)**

Or join our **[mailing list](#)** and follow us on social media.



[Powered by WordPress.com.](#)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW21

This is the exhibit marked "AJW21" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



! NEW PROJECT ALERT !

The rich are killing us. To stop them and fix our broken country we need to...



Take back POWER

Join us at: takebackpower.net

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

- (1) BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LIVERPOOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (3) PEEL L&P INVESTMENTS (NORTH) LIMITED
- (4) BRISTOL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (5) SOUTH WEST AIRPORTS LIMITED
- (6) BRISTOL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Claimants


- v -

PERSONS UNKNOWN
AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED
IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW22

This is the exhibit marked "AJW22" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.





Two Just Stop Oil supporters found guilty for Heathrow paint spraying following retrial



by The Canary — 14 May 2026 in News, UK Reading Time: 4 mins read

202 10 AA 0

Home > UK > News

Share on Facebook

Share on Twitter



Share on Bluesky



Share via WhatsApp



Share via Telegram




Share on Threads

Two [Just Stop Oil supporters](#) who [sprayed Heathrow departure boards with orange paint](#) during the Oil Kills international uprising to end fossil fuels in July 2024 have been found guilty in a retrial after the jury in an earlier trial failed to reach a majority decision.

Phoebe Plummer and Jane Touil were appearing before Judge Duncan at Isleworth Crown Court for the second time on a charge of criminal damage over £5,000 for [their action on 30 July 2024 to demand a fossil fuel treaty to end oil and gas by 2030](#).


The jury took four-and-a-half hours to reach a majority verdict of 10-2. Following the verdict, Touil said:



Since I took action, global fossil fuel use and emissions have continued to rise. More than ever, we need a global fossil fuel treaty to help governments rapidly phase out fossil fuels.

What we do at this moment in history matters. But there is a difference between laws and morality. The courts apply the law made by powerful people. Morals come from within. It is our morals that give us our conscience. I have always tried to live according to my conscience.

Plummer said:



The climate crisis is the greatest injustice that humanity has ever faced. We should all consider what to do at this time. No individual caused this crisis and no one is solely responsible for stopping it. But we can choose what we do to alleviate suffering.

I feel compelled to act to be a responsible citizen, a loving aunt and a good person. It compels me to hope for a better future and one where my nephew grows up.

I didn't think the action would change government policy. But non violent civil resistance is a necessary part of tackling the climate crisis and I'm grateful and proud to have been part of that.

Plummer was remanded for 58 days and Touil for 14 days following the 2024 action in which the pair used fire extinguishers to spray diluted water-based paint in Heathrow Terminal 5 including at the departure boards. The Crown alleged that the action caused £8,000 worth of damages and that three of the display screens needed to be replaced.

Judge ruled out various defences for Heathrow action

At trial, Judge Duncan ruled out several legal defences for the action including those of 'reasonable excuse' under Articles 10 and 11 of the ECHR, 'necessity' and 'self defence' on the grounds that the threat from climate change was not proximate enough and the actions too far removed from the threat.

The defendants were allowed to argue belief in consent: that they honestly believed the owners of Heathrow would have consented to the damage if they knew of its circumstances. However, evidence of the relevant circumstances was to be limited to the fact that it was a climate protest with all evidence about the scale and urgency of the climate crisis ruled 'irrelevant and therefore inadmissible'.

Discover more

[Coatings & Adhesives](#)

[Art & Craft Supplies](#)

[House Painting & Finishing](#)

[Newspapers](#)

[Politics](#)

[Science news features](#)

[Journalism training resources](#)

In giving evidence, Touil said:

I genuinely and sincerely believed that if the shareholders [of Heathrow] had a full understanding of the situation we are in they would have given their consent to our action.

Most people believe there is something that is wrong with climate but not many people have access to the full situation because the fossil fuel industry has used their immense wealth to ensure that governments do not act and it is not reported in the mainstream media.

So I don't know if shareholders have a full understanding, but I know that if they did, they would be doing all in their power to stop fossil fuels because there will be no business as usual, no functioning society, half the population could be wiped out along with 50% of global GDP. I think shareholders want to protect their investment but they also want a future for their kids.

In her evidence Plummer said:

I want to make it very clear that this was not a protest against Heathrow, or anyone flying through Heathrow that day. It's true that the aviation industry is especially harmful to the climate in terms of emissions, though it is a small number of frequent fliers and private jet users who cause the vast majority of this harm, not families who save up for a holiday once a year.

But this wasn't about getting people to stop flying. I made this individual change to live in line with my values, but honestly I know that it's pretty inconsequential. Even if we all woke up tomorrow and stopped flying and went vegan, it would be like mopping up a spill from an overflowing bath whilst leaving the tap on.

All individual changes are like this when we are facing a systemic issue. If fossil fuels are extracted from the ground, then they will all be burnt, even if it's not on a flight that you're on. We need

systemic change, that has always been Just Stop Oil's demand.

My intention was not to cause damage. My intention was to take part in an act of nonviolent civil resistance, raising a serious alarm bell to the catastrophic future in store for us if we persist in our addiction to fossil fuels.

Featured image via Just Stop Oil

Tags: [climate crisis](#) [fossil fuels](#) [Just Stop Oil](#) [protest](#)

Share 158

Tweet 99

 Share

 Send

 Share

 Share

Previous Post

[How medical misogyny stole my life for 20 years](#)

Next Post

[Israeli troops murder 16yo for objecting to settlers stealing his dad's sheep](#)

Leave a Reply

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

Comment *

Name *

Email *

Website

POST COMMENT



News > UK > Crime

Just Stop Oil activists who sprayed Stonehenge with orange powder cleared of criminal damage


They cited human rights law in their defence

Rod Minchin

Friday 31 October 2025 17:12 GMT




Prosecutors release videos played in trial of Just Stop Oil activists accused of damaging Stonehenge



BREAKING NEWS

For free real time breaking news alerts sent straight to your inbox sign up to our breaking news emails

I would like to be emailed about offers, events and updates from The Independent. Read our [Privacy notice](#)



Three **Just Stop Oil activists** who took part in a protest in which **Stonehenge** was sprayed with orange powder have been found not guilty of criminal damage and causing a public nuisance.

It follows a trial at **Salisbury Crown Court** where they cited **human rights law** in their defence.

Then-Oxford University student Niamh Lynch, 23, and Rajan Naidu, 74, had been accused of using two colour blasters filled with cornflour, talc and an orange dye to spray the monument.

Salisbury Crown Court was told the pair – along with a third activist, Luke Watson, 36 – targeted Stonehenge as part of an ongoing fossil fuel protest by the Just Stop Oil group the day before the 2024 summer solstice.

About 15,000 people were due to gather and celebrate at the monument.

Naidu and Lynch had crossed the boundary ropes and trespassed into the area around the monument before launching the attack.



Just Stop Oil protesters sit down after an orange substance was sprayed on Stonehenge (PA Media)

Watson had bought the equipment used in the attack and had driven his co-accused to Stonehenge that morning.

Prosecutors alleged the protest had been “carefully planned” and was filmed by other Just Stop Oil supporters with footage released publicly afterwards.

Simon Jones, prosecuting, said: “Putting it simply, we say they were all in it together.

“The prosecution say that this is an act of blatant and clear vandalism. The intention is undoubtedly to make a statement.”


After the attack, Naidu and Lynch, who were both wearing white Just Stop Oil T-shirts, sat down in silence in front of the stones until they were arrested.

The court heard the stones were promptly cleaned. The costs of removing the powder totalled £620.

Mr Jones added: “Stonehenge is arguably the best recognised and architecturally sophisticated prehistoric stone circle in the world, built around 5,000 years ago.

“The site in Wiltshire is visited by members of the public from all over the world, providing both an education and spiritual experience.

“The stones are a protected ancient monument.”





Judge Paul Dugdale told the jury in his legal directions they had to assess where the “balance lies” in the case and whether a conviction would be a “proportionate interference” with the defendants’ rights.

RECOMMENDED

- [Footage shows moment Just Stop Oil protesters spray orange paint on Stonehenge, court hears](#)
- [Just Stop Oil to end disruptive protests with final demonstration date announced](#)
- [Two deny charges over Just Stop Oil protest at Stonehenge](#)
- [Two people charged by police after orange paint was thrown at Stonehenge in Just Stop Oil protest](#)

“In any society there will be those whose opinions we agree with and those whose opinions we disagree,” he said.

“The essence of a free society and freedom of speech is that everyone’s entitled to express their opinion even when we disagree with what they say.

“If individuals disagree with what our government is doing on certain matters, they are entitled to protest about the government’s actions or inactions.

“All of this is the essence of our free society. It’s how our society has developed over the centuries, and the reality is we are very fortunate to live in a free society.

“There are times when protecting the right to freedom of speech and freedom to protest can mean that activity that would otherwise be unlawful would be regarded as lawful by the court to protect those rights.”

The jury found Naidu, of Gosford Street, Birmingham; Lynch, of Norfolk Road, Turvey, Bedford; and Watson, of The Street, Manuden, Essex, each not guilty of the two charges after deliberating for six hours.

More about: [Stonehenge](#) [Just Stop Oil](#) [Salisbury Crown Court](#) [Human rights law](#) [Activists](#)

Promoted Links

by Taboola

Aldi Shoppers Say This £15 Cloth Beats £2,000 Bodyshop Repairs


TOP.US.ORG

Read More

London Bodyshop Owner Reveals The £15 Cloth He Was Selling As £2,000 Repairs

TOP.US.ORG

Read More





Three Just Stop Oil supporters walk free after trial for M25 gantry action

Court & Prison, Press / September 11, 2025

Three Just Stop Oil supporters were found not guilty of public nuisance at Guildford Crown Court today, after peacefully climbing gantries on the M25 in 2022, to demand an end to new fossil fuel projects.[1]

Sam Holland, Rachel Payne and Isabel Rock took action on the M25 on 9th November 2022. They were

We use cookies on our website to give you the most relevant experience by remembering your preferences and repeat visits. By clicking "Accept All", you consent to the use of ALL the cookies. However, you may visit "Cookie Settings" to provide a controlled consent.

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accept All](#)

During the trial the prosecution emphasised that this was a planned and coordinated action that resulted in significant delays to the travelling public, that all three defendants were trespassing in a place that was forbidden to the public and that they had taken considerable risks with public safety. Giving evidence National Highways Ltd claimed that traffic was delayed by between 4 and 5 hours and that between 9,000 and 30,000 vehicles were impacted. None of the defendants denied the indictment, but they argued that they had a reasonable excuse for their actions.

Sam Holland argued that he had wanted to prevent harm. He had read academic papers which pointed to catastrophic consequences for humanity from burning fossil fuels, including food system collapse.

Rachel Payne explained that she took action because she was fearful for her children and grandchildren about government inaction on the climate crisis. She highlighted the government breaking its 2015 climate agreements by offering new fossil fuel licences.

Isabel Rock said that she felt a duty to look after people younger than herself and that the climate crisis is going to touch every single part of their lives. Taking action was something she weighed up very seriously and that as a self employed person, she knew how hard it was for people to earn money and to get by. However she felt that if they could see some of these agreed facts about the seriousness of the climate crisis, she hoped they would understand.

The Judge, Recorder L Harris, ruled that it was for the jury to decide whether or not the supporters had a reasonable excuse for their actions.

In their closing speeches, all the defendants were able to refer to the agreed facts in the case, which included several key facts relating to the climate crisis.

In his closing speech, Sam Holland said:

"We brought evidence on the largest evil committed in human history: the continued drilling and burning of oil and gas in full knowledge that large parts of humanity will be killed. The prosecution has said that these are beliefs. They are not beliefs. This is not a cause. This is not another 'issue'. This is billions of deaths. Not according to me, according to the world's leading scientists. These are the facts. If we hit 3C of warming by 2050, there could be four billion human deaths. Half of the world's current population.

"What was the UK government doing? It was issuing over 100 new licences for companies to explore and drill oil and gas in the North Sea. In the knowledge of everything I've just said, which is public knowledge and has been known for decades, the government was still wanting to drill. Unimaginable evil. We all talked about how we had extensively tried other methods for making change. Signing petitions, emailing MPs, going on conventional marches... So we had to turn to disruptive action."

We use cookies on our website to give you the most relevant experience by remembering your preferences and repeat visits. By clicking "Accept All", you consent to the use of ALL the cookies. However, you may visit "Cookie Settings" to provide a controlled consent.

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accept All](#)

