



Neutral Citation Number: [2020] EWCA Civ 9

Case No: A3/2019/2391; A3/2019/2395

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL (CIVIL DIVISION)**  
**ON APPEAL FROM THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE**  
**BUSINESS AND PROPERTY COURTS OF ENGLAND AND WALES**  
**PROPERTY, TRUSTS AND PROBATE LIST (ChD)**  
**MANCHESTER DISTRICT REGISTRY**  
**HHJ Pelling QC (sitting as a Judge of the High Court)**  
**E30MA313**

Royal Courts of Justice  
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 23/01/2020

**Before:**

**LORD JUSTICE UNDERHILL**  
**(Vice-President of the Court of Appeal, Civil Division)**  
**LORD JUSTICE DAVID RICHARDS**  
and  
**LORD JUSTICE LEGGATT**

-----  
**Between:**

**CUADRILLA BOWLAND LIMITED & ORS**

**Claimants/  
Respondents**

**- and -**

**(1) PERSONS UNKNOWN ENTERING OR  
REMAINING WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE  
CLAIMANT(S) ON LAND AT LITTLE PLUMPTON AS  
MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE  
CLAIM FORM AND SHOWN EDGED RED ON THE  
PLAN ANNEXED TO THE CLAIM FORM**

**(2) PERSONS UNKNOWN INTERFERING WITH THE  
PASSAGE BY THE CLAIMANTS AND THEIR  
AGENTS, SERVANTS, CONTRACTORS, SUB-  
CONTRACTORS, GROUP COMPANIES, LICENSEES,  
INVITEES OR EMPLOYEES WITH OR WITHOUT  
VEHICLES, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT TO,  
FROM, OVER AND ACROSS THE PUBLIC  
HIGHWAY KNOWN AS PRESTON NEW ROAD**

**(3) PERSONS UNKNOWN COMMITTING THE ACTS  
SPECIFIED AT PARAGRAPH 7 OF THE ORDER  
& ORS**

**Defendants**

**- and -**

**KATRINA LAWRIE  
LEE WALSH  
CHRISTOPHER WILSON**

**Appellants/  
Respondents  
to Committal  
Applications**

-----  
-----

**Kirsty Brimelow QC, Adam Wagner and Richard Bridgen** (instructed by **Robert Lizar Solicitors**) for the **Appellants**  
**Tom Roscoe** (instructed by **Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP**) for the **Respondents**

Hearing dates: 10-11 December 2019

-----

**Approved Judgment**

## **Lord Justice Leggatt:**

### **Introduction**

1. On 3 September 2019 His Honour Judge Pelling QC, sitting as a judge of the High Court, made an order committing the three appellants to prison for contempt of court. Their contempt consisted in deliberately disobeying an earlier court order, which I will refer to as “the Injunction”, made on 11 July 2018 with the aim of preventing trespass on the claimants’ land, unlawful interference with the claimants’ rights of passage to and from their land and unlawful interference with the supply chain of the first claimant (“Cuadrilla”). As punishment for two deliberate breaches of the Injunction, the judge committed one of the appellants, Katrina Lawrie, to prison for two months plus four weeks. The other appellants, Lee Walsh and Christopher Wilson, were both committed to prison for four weeks. In each case execution of the committal order was suspended on condition that the appellant obeys the Injunction for a period of two years.
2. The appellants have exercised their rights of appeal against the committal order. They appeal on the grounds (1) that the relevant terms of the Injunction were insufficiently clear and certain to be enforceable by committal because those terms made the question whether conduct was prohibited depend on the intention of the person concerned; and (2) that imposing the sanction of imprisonment (albeit suspended) was inappropriate and unduly harsh in the circumstances of this case. Relevant circumstances include the facts that the Injunction was granted, not against the appellants as named individuals, but against “persons unknown” who committed specified acts, and that the acts done by the appellants in breach of the Injunction were part of a campaign of protest involving ‘direct action’ designed to disrupt Cuadrilla’s activities. This context is one in which the appellants’ rights to freedom of expression and assembly are engaged.

### **Background**

3. Cuadrilla and the other claimants own an area of land off the Preston New Road (A583), near Blackpool in Lancashire, on which Cuadrilla has engaged in the hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking”, of rock deep underground for the purpose of extracting shale gas. It is not in dispute that all Cuadrilla’s activities have been carried out in accordance with the law. Equally, there is no dispute that Cuadrilla’s activities are controversial and that a significant number of people, including the appellants, have sincere and strongly held views that fracking ought not to take place because of its impact on the environment. It is also common ground that the appellants, like everyone else, have the right to express their views and to protest against an activity to which they object subject only to such restrictions as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society for (amongst other legitimate aims) the prevention of disorder or crime or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. The right of protest is protected both by the common law of England and Wales and by articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (the “Human Rights Convention”) which is incorporated into UK law by the Human Rights Act 1998.
4. Protests on and near Cuadrilla’s site started in 2014, well before any drilling or preparatory work had commenced, when part of the site was occupied by a group of protestors. On 21 August 2014 Cuadrilla issued proceedings to recover possession of

the land and for an injunction to prohibit further trespassing. Such an injunction was granted until 6 October 2016.

5. Protests intensified after work in preparation for exploratory drilling at the site started in January 2017. The evidence adduced by the claimants when they applied for a further injunction in May 2018 showed that, since January 2017, Cuadrilla and its employees, contractors and suppliers had been subjected to numerous ‘direct action’ protests, designed to obstruct works on the site. The actions taken by some protestors included ‘locking on’ – that is, chaining oneself to an object or another person – at the entrance to the site in order to prevent vehicles from entering or leaving it; ‘slow walking’ – that is, walking on the highway as slowly as possible in front of vehicles attempting to enter or leave the site; and climbing onto vehicles to prevent them from moving.
6. The overall scale of such protest activity is indicated by the fact that, between January 2017 and May 2018, the police had made over 350 arrests in connection with protests against Cuadrilla’s operations, including 160 arrests for obstructing the highway, and substantial police resources had to be deployed in order to deal with the actions of protestors, with around 100 officers directly involved each day and at a total policing cost of some £7 million.
7. In July 2017 a group calling themselves “Reclaim the Power” organised a “month of action” targeting Cuadrilla. Of the many actions taken by protestors during that month to attempt to disrupt transport to and from the Preston New Road site, one particularly disruptive incident involved criminal offences and led to sentences which were the subject of an appeal to the Criminal Division of the Court of Appeal: see *R v Roberts* [2018] EWCA Crim 2739; [2019] 1 WLR 2577. That incident began on the morning of 25 July 2017, when two protestors managed to climb on top of lorries approaching the site along the Preston New Road, forcing the lorries to stop to avoid putting the safety of the two men at risk. Two more men later climbed on top of the lorries. Each of the protestors stayed there for two or three days and the last one did not come down until 29 July 2017. For all this time the lorries were therefore unable to move, with the result that one carriageway of the road remained blocked. Substantial disruption was caused to local residents and other members of the public.
8. Further particularly serious disruption occurred on 31 July 2017. The events of that day were described in a letter from Assistant Chief Constable Terry Woods put in evidence by Cuadrilla, as follows:

“The last day of the RTP [Reclaim the Power] rolling resistance month of action saw a final lock-in involving a supposedly one tonne weight concrete barrel lock-on in the rear of a van with a prominent RTP activist attached to it via an arm tube. This action, coupled with an already tense atmosphere amongst the RTP activists, anti-fracking activists and local protestors, resulted in confrontation with police and they arrested two protestors. During the evening the protestors then became aware of a convoy *en route* to the drill site resulting in four protestors deploying in two pairs with arm tube lock-ons and blocking the A583. Further confrontation and aggression towards police ensued, with one of the locked-on protestors also assaulting a police officer. A security staff van was then mobbed by

protestors and damaged, with a further protestor being arrested from that incident. Protestors also blockaded three vans of police protest liaison officers outside the Maple Farm Camp. The vehicle of a drill site staff member's partner dropping them off was then confronted by protestors, with a number of protestors climbing on the roof of the vehicle as it attempted to reverse away. The A583 was finally reopened to traffic at around 21:00 once police had removed all the protestors locked on, resulting in four arrests ...”

9. At the hearing of the application for an injunction on 31 May and 1 June 2018, evidence was also adduced that the “Reclaim the Power” protest group was planning and promoting a further campaign of sustained direct action targeting Cuadrilla from 11 June to 1 July 2018. The group had openly stated their intention to organise a mass blockade of the Preston New Road dubbed “Block around the Clock” with the aim of completely preventing access to and egress from Cuadrilla’s site for four days from 27 June to 1 July 2018.

### **The Injunction**

10. It was against this background that HHJ Pelling QC granted an interim injunction on 1 June 2018 to restrain four named individuals and “persons unknown” from trespassing on the claimants’ land, unlawfully interfering with the claimants’ rights of passage to and from their land and unlawfully interfering with Cuadrilla’s supply chain. This injunction was granted until 11 July 2018. On that date it was replaced by a further order in similar terms, to continue until 1 June 2020 (unless varied or discharged in the meantime). This is the Injunction that was in force when the appellants did the acts which led to their committal for contempt of court.
11. As with the order initially made on 1 June 2018, the Injunction had three limbs, each designed to prevent a different type of wrong (tort) being done to the claimants.

#### *Paragraph 2: trespass*

12. The first type of wrong, prohibited by paragraph 2 of the Injunction, was trespassing on the claimants’ land situated off the Preston New Road. The land was identified by reference to the title numbers under which it is registered at the Land Registry and was denoted in the order as “the PNR Land”.

#### *Paragraph 4: nuisance*

13. The second type of wrong which the Injunction sought to prevent was unlawful interference with the claimants’ freedom to come and go to and from their land. An owner of land adjoining a public highway has a right of access to the highway and a person who interferes with this right commits the tort of private nuisance. In addition, it is a public nuisance to obstruct or hinder free passage along a public highway and an owner of land specially affected by such a nuisance can sue in respect of it, if the obstruction of the highway causes them inconvenience, delay or other damage which is substantial and appreciably greater in degree than any suffered by the general public: see *Clerk & Lindsell on Torts* (22<sup>nd</sup> Edn, 2018) para 20-181.

14. These rights protected by the law of nuisance underpinned paragraph 4 of the Injunction, which applied to the second defendant. The second defendant to the proceedings is described as:

“Persons unknown interfering with the passage by the claimants and their agents, servants, contractors, sub-contractors, group companies, licensees, invitees or employees with or without vehicles, materials and equipment to, from, over and across the public highway known as Preston New Road.”

Paragraph 4 of the Injunction prohibited persons falling within this description from carrying out the following acts on any part of “the PNR Access Route”:

- “4.1 blocking any part of the bell-mouth at the Site Entrance with persons or things when done with a view to slowing down or stopping the traffic;
- 4.2 blocking or obstructing the highway by slow walking in front of vehicles with the object of slowing them down;
- 4.3 climbing onto any part of any vehicle or attaching themselves or anything or any object to any vehicle at any part of the Site Entrance;

in each case with the intention of causing inconvenience or delay to the claimants and/or their agents, servants, contractors, sub-contractors, group companies, licensees, invitees or employees.”

An exception was made in paragraph 5 for a weekly walk or march from Maple Farm on the Preston New Road to the Site Entrance followed by a meeting or assembly for up to 15 minutes at the bell-mouth of the Site Entrance.

15. The “PNR Access Route” was defined in paragraph 3 to mean:

“The whole of the Preston New Road (A583) between the junction with Peel Hill to the northwest and 50 metres to the east of the vehicular entrance to the PNR Site (“the Site Entrance” - as marked on the plan annexed to this Order as Annex 2) ...”

*Paragraph 7: unlawful means conspiracy*

16. The third type of wrong which the Injunction was designed to prevent was unlawful interference with Cuadrilla’s supply chain. This was the subject of paragraph 7 of the Injunction, which prohibited persons unknown from “committing any of the following offences or unlawful acts by or with the agreement or understanding of any other person”:

“... ”

- 7.2 obstructing the free passage along a public highway, or the access to or from a public highway, by:

- (i) blocking the highway or access thereto with persons or things when done with a view to slowing down or stopping vehicular or pedestrian traffic, and with the intention of causing inconvenience and delay;
- (ii) slow walking in front of vehicles with the object of slowing them down, and with the intention of causing inconvenience and delay;
- (iii) climbing onto or attaching themselves to vehicles;

...

in each case with an intention of damaging [Cuadrilla] by obstructing, impeding or interfering with the lawful activities undertaken by it or its group companies, or contractors, sub-contractors, suppliers or service providers engaged by [Cuadrilla], in connection with [Cuadrilla's] searching or boring for or getting any mineral oil or relative hydrocarbon and natural gas existing in its natural condition in strata at the PNR Site or on the PNR Land.”

17. The tort underpinning this limb of the Injunction was that of conspiracy to injure by unlawful means.
18. Conspiracy is one of a group of “economic torts” which are an exception to the general rule that there is no duty in tort to avoid causing economic loss to another person unless the loss is parasitic upon some injury to person or damage to property. As explained by Lord Sumption and Lord Lloyd-Jones in *JSC BTA Bank v Ablyazov (No 14)* [2018] UKSC 19; [2018] 2 WLR 1125, para 7, the modern law of conspiracy developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a basis for imposing civil liability on the organisers of strikes and other industrial action. In the form of the tort relevant for present purposes, the matters which the claimant must prove to establish liability are: (i) an unlawful act by the defendant, (ii) done with the intention of injuring the claimant, (iii) pursuant to an agreement (whether express or tacit) with one or more other persons, and (iv) which actually does injure the claimant.

### **The breaches of the Injunction**

19. As required by the terms of the Injunction, extensive steps were taken to publicise it and bring it to the notice of protestors. These steps included: (i) fixing sealed copies of the Injunction in transparent envelopes to posts, gates, fences and hedges and positioning signs at no fewer than 20 conspicuous locations around the PNR Land including at the Site Entrance and at either side of the public highway in each direction from the Site Entrance advertising the existence of the Injunction; (ii) leaving a sealed copy of the Injunction at protest camps; (iii) advertising and making copies of the Injunction available online; and (iv) sending a press release and copies of the Injunction to 16 specified news outlets.
20. Despite this publicity, a number of incidents occurred in the period July to September 2018 which led Cuadrilla on 11 October 2018 to issue a committal application.

*The incident on 24 July 2018*

21. The first main incident occurred on 24 July 2018 and involved all three appellants. The facts alleged, which were not seriously disputed by the appellants, were that at around 7am on the morning of that day they (and three other individuals) lay down in pairs on the road across the Site Entrance. Each person was attached to the other person in the pair by an ‘arm tube’ device. This was done in such a way as to prevent any vehicle from entering or leaving the site. The protestors remained in place for some six and a half hours until around 1.30pm, when they were cut out of the arm tube devices and removed by the police.

*The incident on 3 August 2018*

22. The second main incident occurred on 3 August 2018 and involved Ms Lawrie alone. It took place on the “PNR Access Route” (as defined in paragraph 3 of the Injunction) about 1200 metres to the west of the Site Entrance. At about 12.55pm Ms Lawrie, along with three other people, attempted to stop a tanker lorry which was on its way to the site in order to collect rainwater. In doing so she stood in the path of the lorry, raising her arms above her head. To avoid hitting her, the lorry had to veer across the centre line of the carriageway into the opposite lane. These facts were proved by video evidence from a camera on the dashboard of the lorry cab.

*The other breaches of the Injunction*

23. There were three more minor incidents:
  - (1) On 1 August 2018 Ms Lawrie trespassed on the PNR Land for approximately two minutes.
  - (2) Also on 1 August 2018, Mr Walsh sat down on the road in front of the Site Entrance until he was forcibly removed by police officers.
  - (3) On 22 September 2018, as a sewage tanker was attempting to enter the site, Ms Lawrie ran into its path, forcing it to stop. She then lay on the ground in front of the lorry before being helped to her feet by security staff and persuaded to move.

**The findings of contempt of court**

24. Although two other individuals were also named as respondents, the committal application was pursued only against the three current appellants. The application was heard in two stages. The first stage was a hearing over four days from 25 to 28 June 2019 to decide whether the appellants were guilty of contempt of court.

*The legal test for contempt*

25. It was common ground at that hearing that a person is guilty of contempt of court by disobeying a court order that prohibits particular conduct only if it is proved to the criminal standard of proof (that is, beyond reasonable doubt) that the person: (i) having received notice of the order did an act prohibited by it; (ii) intended to do the act; and (iii) had knowledge of all the facts which would make doing the act a breach of the order: see *FW Farnsworth Ltd v Lacy* [2013] EWHC 3487 (Ch), para 20. It would not



necessarily follow from proof of these facts that the person had knowingly disobeyed the order; but the judge took the sensible approach that, unless this further fact was established, it would not be appropriate to impose any penalty for the breach.

26. For reasons given in a judgment delivered on 28 June 2018, the judge found all the relevant factual allegations proved to the requisite criminal standard of proof. There is no appeal against any of his factual findings.

*Knowledge of the Injunction*

27. The main factual dispute at the hearing concerned the appellants' knowledge of the Injunction at the time when the incidents occurred. Although they gave evidence to the effect that they did not know of its terms, the judge rejected that evidence as inherently incredible and untruthful.
28. The judge explained in detail his reasons for reaching that conclusion. In the case of Ms Lawrie, the relevant evidence included her own admissions that there was a lot of discussion about the Injunction around the time that it was granted and that she was concerned about its effect on lawful protesting. As the judge observed, that evidence only made sense on the basis that she was aware of its terms. There were also photographs showing Ms Lawrie placing decorations on the fence around the site "in such close proximity to the notices summarising the effect of the [Injunction] as to make it virtually impossible for her not to have read the information in the notice unless she was deliberately choosing not to do so". In the case of Mr Walsh, the relevant evidence included social media posts that he had shared with others that referred to or summarised the main effects of the Injunction. The third appellant, Mr Wilson, accepted that he was aware of the Injunction and that it affected protests at the site entrance. There was also video evidence of Cuadrilla's security guards seeking to draw the Injunction to the attention of the appellants by providing them with copies of it, which they refused to take.

*The intentions proved*

29. In relation to the first main incident on 24 July 2018, in which each of the appellants lay in the road across the Site Entrance attached to another person by an arm tube device, they all gave evidence that in taking this action they intended to protest. The judge accepted this but thought it obvious from what they did, and was satisfied beyond reasonable doubt, that they also intended to stop vehicles from entering or leaving the site and thereby cause inconvenience and delay to Cuadrilla. Having found on this basis that the appellants were in breach of paragraph 4 of the Injunction, he considered it unnecessary to decide whether they were also in breach of paragraph 7.
30. In relation to the second main incident which occurred on 3 August 2018, Ms Lawrie admitted that she together with others was attempting to stop the lorry. The judge found it proved beyond reasonable doubt that she was acting with the agreement or understanding of others present and with the intention of slowing down or stopping the vehicle, causing inconvenience and delay, and thereby damaging Cuadrilla by interfering with the activities undertaken at the site. He accordingly found that she was in breach of paragraph 7 of the Injunction.

31. The judge also found that the three more minor incidents (referred to at paragraph 23 above) all involved intentional breaches of the Injunction, but he did not consider that it was in the public interest to impose any sanction for those breaches.

### **The committal order**

32. The second stage of the committal application was a hearing held on 2 and 3 September 2019 to decide what sanctions to impose for the two principal breaches of the Injunction found proved at the earlier hearing. The judge had already made it clear that he would not impose immediate terms of imprisonment, so that the available penalties were (a) no order (except in relation to costs), (b) a fine or (c) a suspended term of imprisonment.
33. The judge was satisfied that, in relation to both incidents, the custody threshold was passed such that it was necessary to make orders for committal to prison, although their effect should be suspended. In reaching that conclusion and in fixing the length of the suspended prison terms, the judge had regard to his finding that the breaches were intentional and to the need not only to punish the appellants for their intentional disobedience of the court's order, but also to deter future breaches of the order (whether by them or others).
34. The judge recognised that the breaches were committed as part of a protest but was not persuaded that this should result in lesser penalties. The judge also had regard, by analogy, to the Sentencing Council guideline on sentencing for breach of a criminal behaviour order. This guideline identifies three levels of culpability, where level A represents a very serious or persistent breach, level B a deliberate breach falling between levels A and C, and level C a minor breach or one just short of reasonable excuse. Harm – which includes not only any harm actually caused but any risk of harm posed by the breach – is also divided into three categories. Category 1 applies where the breach causes very serious harm or distress or “demonstrates a continuing risk of serious criminal and/or anti-social behaviour”. Category 3 applies where the breach causes little or no harm or distress or “demonstrates a continuing risk of minor criminal and/or anti-social behaviour”. Category 2 applies to cases falling between categories 1 and 3.
35. In the case of the first incident involving all three appellants, where the Site Entrance was blocked by a ‘lock-on’ for several hours, the judge assessed the level of culpability as falling at the lower end of level B and the harm caused together with the continuing risk of breach demonstrated as falling at the lower end of category 2. The guideline indicates that the starting point in sentencing for breach of a criminal behaviour order in category 2B is 12 weeks’ custody, with a category range between a medium level community order and one year’s custody. A community order is not an available sanction for contempt of court. In the circumstances the judge concluded that the appropriate penalty was a short suspended term of imprisonment, which he fixed at four weeks.
36. In relation to the second main incident, involving Ms Lawrie alone, the judge assessed the level of culpability as at the top end of level B within the guideline and the degree of harm that was at risk of being caused as in the top half of category 2. In making that assessment, he said:

“The risk I have identified was a serious one, involving the risk of death or injury to Ms Lawrie; to the driver of the vehicle she was attempting to stop by standing in front of it in the highway; and those driving on the other side of the road into which the lorry was forced by reason of the presence of Ms Lawrie in the road. Those risks were worsened by the fact that the incident occurred during a period of heavy rain ...”

The judge also found that the breach was aggravated by “the failure of Ms Lawrie to acknowledge the danger posed by her conduct, or to apologise for it, or to offer any assurance that it will not happen again”.

37. The sanction imposed for this contempt of court was committal to prison for two months. As with the penalties imposed in relation to the first incident, execution of the order was suspended on condition that the Injunction is obeyed for a period of two years.

### **Variation of the Injunction**

38. In the same judgment given on 3 September 2019 in which he decided what sanctions to impose, HHJ Pelling QC also dealt with an application by the appellants to vary the Injunction, in particular by removing paragraphs 4 and 7. In making that application, the appellants relied on the decision of this court in *Ineos Upstream Ltd v Persons Unknown* [2019] EWCA Civ 515; [2019] 4 WLR 100, which I will discuss shortly. For the moment I note that, while the judge on 3 September 2019 made some variations to the wording of the Injunction, he rejected the appellants’ contention that the original wording was impermissibly wide or uncertain. Furthermore, none of the variations made on 3 September 2019 would, had they been incorporated in the original wording of the Injunction, have rendered the appellants’ conduct not a breach.
39. The appellants applied for permission to appeal against the decision not to vary the Injunction by removing paragraphs 4 and 7. However, on 2 November 2019 the Government announced a moratorium on fracking with immediate effect. In the light of the moratorium, the claimants themselves applied on 19 November 2019 to remove paragraphs 4 and 7 of the Injunction for the future on the ground that they no longer require this protection, as Cuadrilla has ceased fracking operations on the site and will not be able to resume such operations unless and until the moratorium is lifted. On 25 November 2019 the judge granted the claimants’ application. In these circumstances the appellants withdrew their appeal against the judge’s previous refusal to vary the Injunction in that way, as the relief which they were seeking had been granted (albeit for different reasons from those which they were advancing).

### **The right to protest**

40. Before I come to the grounds of the appeal against the committal order, I need to say something more about the two contextual features of this case which I mentioned at the start of this judgment. The first is the legal relevance of the fact, properly emphasised by counsel for the appellants, that the appellants’ breaches of the Injunction were a form of non-violent protest against activities to which they strongly object.

41. The right to engage in public protest is an important aspect of the fundamental rights to freedom of expression and freedom of peaceful assembly which are protected by articles 10 and 11 of the Human Rights Convention. Those rights, and hence the right to protest, are not absolute; but any restriction on their exercise will be a breach of articles 10 and 11 unless the restriction (a) is prescribed by law, (b) pursues one (or more) of the legitimate aims stated in articles 10(2) and 11(2) of the Convention and (c) is “necessary in a democratic society” for the achievement of that aim. Applying the last part of this test requires the court to assess the proportionality of the interference with the aim pursued.
42. Exercise of the right to protest – for example, holding a demonstration in a public place – often results in some disruption to ordinary life and inconvenience to other citizens. That by itself does not justify restricting the exercise of the right. As Laws LJ said in *Tabernacle v Secretary of State for Defence* [2009] EWCA Civ 23, para 43:

“Rights worth having are unruly things. Demonstrations and protests are liable to be a nuisance. They are liable to be inconvenient and tiresome, or at least perceived as such by others who are out of sympathy with them.”

Such side-effects of demonstrations and protests are a form of inconvenience which the state and other members of society are required to tolerate.

43. The distinction between protests which cause disruption as an inevitable side-effect and protests which are deliberately intended to cause disruption, for example by impeding activities of which the protestors disapprove, is an important one, and I will come back to it later. But at this stage I note that even forms of protest which are deliberately intended to cause disruption fall within the scope of articles 10 and 11. Restrictions on such protests may much more readily be justified, however, under articles 10(2) and 11(2) as “necessary in a democratic society” for the achievement of legitimate aims.
44. The clear and constant jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights on this point was reiterated in the judgment of the Grand Chamber in *Kudrevičius v Lithuania* (2016) 62 EHRR 34. That case concerned a demonstration by a group of farmers complaining about a fall in prices of agricultural products and seeking increases in state subsidies for the agricultural sector. As part of their protest, some farmers including the applicants used their tractors to block three main roads for approximately 48 hours causing major disruption to traffic. The applicants were convicted in the Lithuanian courts of public order offences and received suspended sentences of 60 days imprisonment. They complained to the European Court that their criminal convictions and sentences violated articles 10 and 11 of the Convention. In examining their complaints, the Grand Chamber first considered whether the case fell within the scope of article 11 and concluded that it did. The court noted (at para 97) that, on the facts of the case, “the disruption of traffic cannot be described as a side-effect of a meeting held in a public place, but rather as the result of intentional action by the farmers, who wished to attract attention to the problems in the agricultural sector and to push the government to accept their demands”. The judgment continues:

“In the Court’s view, although not an uncommon occurrence in the context of the exercise of freedom of assembly in modern societies, physical conduct purposely obstructing traffic and the

ordinary course of life in order to seriously disrupt the activities carried out by others is not at the core of that freedom as protected by article 11 of the Convention.”

Despite this, the court did not consider that the applicants’ conduct was “of such a nature and degree as to remove their participation in the demonstration from the scope of protection of ... article 11” (see para 98).

45. In the present case the claimants accept that the conduct of the appellants which constituted contempt of court likewise fell within the scope of articles 10 and 11 of the Human Rights Convention, even though disruption of Cuadrilla’s activities was not merely a side-effect but an intended aim of the appellants’ conduct. It follows that both the Injunction prohibiting this conduct and the sanctions imposed for disobeying the Injunction were restrictions on the appellants’ exercise of their rights under articles 10(1) and 11(1) which could only be justified if those restrictions satisfied the requirements of articles 10(2) and 11(2) of the Convention.

### **The *Ineos* case**

46. A second significant feature of this case is that the Injunction was granted not against the current appellants as named individuals but against “persons unknown”. Injunctions of this kind were considered in *Ineos Upstream Ltd v Persons Unknown* [2019] EWCA Civ 515; [2019] 4 WLR 100, which forms an essential part of the backdrop to the issues raised on this appeal.
47. Like the present case, the *Ineos* case concerned an injunction granted on the application of a company engaged or planning to engage in ‘fracking’ to restrain unlawful interference with its activities by protestors whom it was unable to name. In the *Ineos* case, however, the court was not concerned, as it is here, with breaches of such an injunction. The appeal involved a challenge to the making of an injunction against persons unknown before any allegedly unlawful interference with the claimants’ activities had yet occurred. This context is important in understanding the decision.
48. The main question raised on the appeal was whether it was appropriate in principle to grant an injunction against “persons unknown”. That question was decided in favour of the claimant companies. The court held that there is no conceptual or legal prohibition on suing persons unknown who are not currently in existence but will come into existence if and when they commit a threatened tort. Nor is there any such prohibition on granting a ‘*quia timet*’ injunction to restrain such persons from committing a tort which has not yet been committed. Nonetheless, Longmore LJ (with whose judgment David Richards LJ and I agreed) warned that a court should be inherently cautious about granting such injunctions against unknown persons since the reach of such an injunction is necessarily difficult to assess in advance (see para 31).
49. Longmore LJ stated the requirements necessary for the grant of an injunction of this nature “tentatively” (at para 34) in the following way:
  - “(1) there must be a sufficiently real and imminent risk of a tort being committed to justify *quia timet* relief; (2) it is impossible to name the persons who are likely to commit the tort unless restrained; (3) it is possible to give effective notice of the

injunction and for the method of such notice to be set out in the order; (4) the terms of the injunction must correspond to the threatened tort and not be so wide that they prohibit lawful conduct; (5) the terms of the injunction must be sufficiently clear and precise as to enable persons potentially affected to know what they must not do; and (6) the injunction should have clear geographical and temporal limits.”

50. In the light of precedents which were not cited in the *Ineos* case but which have been drawn to our attention on the present appeal, I would enter a caveat in relation to the fourth of these requirements. While it is undoubtedly desirable that the terms of an injunction should correspond to the threatened tort and not be so wide that they prohibit lawful conduct, this cannot be regarded as an absolute rule. The decisions of the Court of Appeal in *Hubbard v Pitt* [1976] QB 142 and *Burris v Azadani* [1995] 1 WLR 1372 demonstrate that, although the court must be careful not to impose an injunction in wider terms than are necessary to do justice, the court is entitled to restrain conduct that is not in itself tortious or otherwise unlawful if it is satisfied that such a restriction is necessary in order to afford effective protection to the rights of the claimant in the particular case. In both those cases the injunction was granted against a named person or persons. What, if any, difference it makes in this regard that the injunction is sought against unknown persons is a question which does not need to be decided on the present appeal but which may, as I understand, arise on a pending appeal from the decision of Nicklin J in *Canada Goose UK Retail Ltd v Persons Unknown* [2019] EWHC 2459 (QB); and in these circumstances I express no opinion on the point.
51. In the *Ineos* case the judge had proceeded on the basis that the evidence adduced by the claimants of protests against other companies engaged in fracking (including Cuadrilla) would, if accepted at trial, be sufficient to show a real and imminent threat of trespass on the claimants’ land, interference with the claimants’ rights of passage to and from their land and interference with their supply chain. On that basis he granted an injunction in similar – although in some respects wider and more vaguely worded – terms to the Injunction granted in the present case. The Court of Appeal allowed an appeal brought by two individuals who objected to the order made on the ground that the judge’s approach – which simply accepted the claimants’ evidence at face value – did not adequately justify granting a *quia timet* injunction which might affect the exercise of the right to freedom of expression, as it did not satisfy the requirement in section 12(3) of the Human Rights Act 1998 that the applicant is “likely” to establish at trial that such an injunction should be granted. The Court of Appeal also held that the parts of the injunction seeking to restrain future acts which would amount to an actionable nuisance or a conspiracy to cause loss by unlawful means should be discharged in any event, as the relevant terms were too widely drafted and lacked the necessary degree of certainty. I will come back to one aspect of the reasoning on that point when discussing the first ground of appeal.

### **This appeal**

52. I turn now to the issues raised on this appeal. The appellants’ notice puts forward three grounds. However, Ms Brimelow QC, who now represents the appellants, did not pursue one of them. This challenged the judge’s finding that Ms Lawrie was in contempt of court by trespassing on the “PNR Land” on 1 August 2018 in breach of paragraph 2 of the Injunction. As Ms Brimelow accepted, a challenge to that finding,

even if successful, would provide no reason for disturbing the committal order, as the judge considered that there was no public interest in taking any further action in relation to the three minor incidents, of which the trespass incident was one, and made no order in respect of them. The order under appeal was based only on the ‘lock-on’ at the Site Entrance by all three appellants on 24 July 2018 and Ms Lawrie’s action in standing in the path of a lorry on 3 August 2018. Nothing turns, therefore, on whether or not Ms Lawrie trespassed on the “PNR Land” on 1 August 2018.

53. The two grounds of appeal pursued are that, in relation to the two incidents on which the order for committal was based:
- (1) the judge erred in committing the appellants under paragraphs 4 and 7 of the Injunction, as these paragraphs were insufficiently clear and certain because they included references to intention;
  - (2) alternatively, the judge erred by imposing an inappropriate sanction (consisting of suspended orders for imprisonment) which was too harsh.

**(1) Was the Injunction unclear?**

54. It is a well-established principle that an injunction must be expressed in terms which are clear and certain so as to make plain what is permitted and what is prohibited: see e.g. *Attorney General v Punch Ltd* [2002] UKHL 50; [2003] 1 AC 1046, para 35. This is just as, if not even more, essential where the injunction is addressed to “persons unknown” rather than named defendants. As Longmore LJ said in the *Ineos* case, para 34, in stating the fifth of the requirements quoted at paragraph 49 above: “the terms of the injunction must be sufficiently clear and precise as to enable persons potentially affected to know what they must not do”.
55. A similar need for clarity and precision “to a degree that is reasonable in the circumstances” forms part of the requirement in articles 10(2) and 11(2) of the Human Rights Convention that any interference with the rights to freedom of expression and assembly must be “prescribed by law”: see *The Sunday Times v United Kingdom* (1979) 2 EHRR 245, para 49; *Kudrevičius v Lithuania* (2016) 62 EHRR 34, para 109.

*The references to intention in the Injunction*

56. As mentioned, the aspect of paragraphs 4 and 7 of the Injunction which the appellants contend made those terms insufficiently clear and certain to support findings of contempt was the fact that they included references to the defendant’s intention. Paragraph 4.1, of which all three appellants were found to be in breach by their ‘lock on’ at the Site Entrance on 24 July 2018, prohibited “blocking any part of the bell mouth at the Site Entrance with persons or things when done with a view to slowing down or stopping the traffic” and “with the intention of causing inconvenience or delay to the claimants”. Establishing a breach of this term therefore required proof of two intentions. Paragraph 7.2(1), of which Ms Lawrie was found to have been in breach when she stood in front of a lorry on 3 August 2018, required proof of three intentions: namely, those of “slowing down or stopping vehicular or pedestrian traffic”, “causing inconvenience and delay”, and “damaging [Cuadrilla] by obstructing, impeding or interfering with the lawful activities undertaken by it or its group companies, or

contractors ...” It was also necessary to prove that the act was done with the agreement or understanding of another person.

*Types of unclarity*

57. There are at least three different ways in which the terms of an injunction may be unclear. One is that a term may be ambiguous, in that the words used have more than one meaning. Another is that a term may be vague in so far as there are borderline cases to which it is inherently uncertain whether the term applies. Except where quantitative measurements can be used, some degree of imprecision is inevitable. But the wording of an injunction is unacceptably vague to the extent that there is no way of telling with confidence what will count as falling within its scope and what will not. Evaluative language is often open to this objection. For example, a prohibition against “unreasonably” obstructing the highway is vague because there is room for differences of opinion about what is an unreasonable obstruction and no determinate or incontestable standard by which to decide whether particular conduct constitutes a breach. Language which does not involve a value judgment may also be unduly vague. An example would be an injunction which prohibited particular conduct within a “short” distance of a location (such as the Site Entrance in this case). Without a more precise definition, there is no way of ascertaining what distance does or does not count as “short”.
58. A third way in which the terms of an injunction may lack clarity is that the language used may be too convoluted, technical or otherwise opaque to be readily understandable by the person(s) to whom the injunction is addressed. Where legal knowledge is needed to understand the effect of a term, its clarity will depend on whether the addressee of the injunction can be expected to obtain legal advice. Such an expectation may be reasonable where an injunction is granted in the course of litigation in which each party is legally represented. By contrast, in a case of the present kind where an injunction is granted against “persons unknown”, it is unreasonable to impose on members of the public the cost of consulting a lawyer in order to find out what the injunction does and does not prohibit them from doing.
59. All these kinds of clarity (or lack of it) are relevant at the stage of deciding whether to grant an injunction and, if so, in what terms. They are also relevant where an application is made to enforce compliance or punish breach of an injunction by seeking an order for committal. In principle, people should not be at risk of being penalised for breach of a court order if they act in a way which the order does not clearly prohibit. Hence a person should not be held to be in contempt of court if it is unclear whether their conduct is covered by the terms of the order. That is so whether the term in question is unclear because it is ambiguous, vague or inaccessible.
60. It is important to note that whether a term of an order is unclear in any of these ways is dependent on context. Words which are clear enough in one factual situation may be unclear in another. This can be illustrated by reference to the ground of appeal which was abandoned. The argument advanced was that paragraph 2 of the Injunction was insufficiently clear to form the basis of a finding of contempt of court because the “PNR Land” was described by reference to a Land Registry map and such maps are, so it was said, only accurate to around one metre. Assuming (which was in issue) that there is this margin of error, the objection that the relevant term of the Injunction was insufficiently clear would have been compelling in the absence of proof that Ms Lawrie



crossed the boundary of the land as it was marked on the map by more than a metre. As it was, however, the judge was satisfied from video evidence that Ms Lawrie entered on the land by much more than a metre. The alleged vagueness in the term of the Injunction was therefore immaterial.

*The concept of intention*

61. Of these three types of unclarity, it is the third that is said to be material in the present case. For the appellants, Ms Brimelow QC argued that references to intention in an injunction addressed to “persons unknown” made the terms insufficiently clear because intention is a legal concept which is difficult for a member of the public to understand. In the judgment given on 28 June 2019 in which he made findings of contempt of court, the judge referred to the maxim that a person “is presumed to intend the natural and probable consequences of his acts”, citing a passage from the speech of Lord Bridge in *R v Maloney* [1985] AC 905, 928-9. Ms Brimelow submitted that a person with no legal knowledge or training would not understand that, even if they do not have in mind a particular consequence of their action, they will be held to intend any natural and probable consequence of it. Such a person might reasonably consider that their intention was, for example, to prevent fracking, or to protect the environment, or to protest, rather than, say, to cause inconvenience and delay to Cuadrilla, even if such inconvenience and delay was a natural or probable consequence of what they did.
62. I do not accept that the references in the terms of the Injunction to intention had any special legal meaning or were difficult for a member of the public to understand. In criminal law there has not for more than 50 years been any rule of law that persons are presumed to intend the natural and probable consequences of their acts. That notion was given its quietus by section 8 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967, which provides:

“A court or jury, in determining whether a person has committed an offence —

  - (a) shall not be bound in law to infer that he intended or foresaw a result of his actions by reason only of its being a natural and probable consequence of those actions; but
  - (b) shall decide whether he did intend or foresee that result by reference to all the evidence, drawing such inferences from the evidence as appear proper in the circumstances.”
63. This was the point that Lord Bridge was making in the *Maloney* case in the passage to which HHJ Pelling QC referred. The House of Lords made it clear in that case that juries should no longer, save in rare cases, be given legal directions as to what is meant by intention. Lord Bridge described it (at 926) as the “golden rule” that, when directing a jury on intent, a judge should avoid any elaboration or paraphrase of what is meant by intent and should leave it to the jury’s good sense to decide whether the person accused acted with the intention required to be guilty of a crime. Just as no elaboration of the concept of intention is required for juries, so equally its meaning does not need to be explained to members of the public to whom a court order is addressed. It is not a technical term nor one that, when used in an injunction prohibiting acts done with a specific intention, is to be understood in any special or unusual sense. It is an ordinary

English word to be given its ordinary meaning and with which anyone who read the Injunction would be perfectly familiar.

64. That is not to say that proof of an intention is always straightforward. Often it causes no difficulty. A person's immediate intention may be obvious from their actions. Thus, when the appellants and three others lay across the Site Entrance on 24 July 2018 in pairs linked by arm tube devices, it was obvious that they were intending to stop vehicles from entering or leaving the site. Had that not been their intention, they would not have positioned themselves where they did. Similarly, when in the incident on 3 August 2018 Ms Lawrie stood in the road in front of a lorry, waving her arms, there could be no doubt that her intention was to cause the vehicle to stop. To determine whether less direct consequences or potential consequences of a person's actions are intended may require further knowledge of, or inference as to, their plans or goals. In so far as there is evidential uncertainty, however, a person alleged to be in contempt of court by disobeying an injunction is protected by the requirement that the relevant facts must be proved to the criminal standard of proof. Hence where the injunction prohibits an act done with a particular intention, if there is any reasonable doubt about whether the defendant acted with that intention, contempt of court will not be established.
65. I accordingly cannot accept that there is anything objectionable in principle about including a requirement of intention in an injunction. Nor do I accept that there is anything in such a requirement which is inherently unclear or which requires any legal training or knowledge to comprehend.

*Dicta in the Ineos case*

66. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that the appellants' argument gains some traction from a statement in the judgment of Longmore LJ in the *Ineos* case. One of the terms of the injunction granted by the judge at first instance in that case, like paragraph 7 of the Injunction in this case, was designed to protect the claimants from financial damage caused by an unlawful means conspiracy. In the *Ineos* case the term in question prohibited persons unknown from "combining together to commit the act or offence of obstructing free passage along a public highway (or access to or from a public highway) by ... slow walking in front of the vehicles with the object of slowing them down and with the intention of causing inconvenience and delay or ... otherwise unreasonably and/or without lawful authority or excuse obstructing the highway with the intention of causing inconvenience and delay, all with the intention of damaging the claimants." The wording of this prohibition was held to be insufficiently clear, both because it contained language which was too vague ("slow walking" and "unreasonably and/or without lawful authority or excuse obstructing the highway") and because, as Longmore LJ put it, "an ordinary person exercising legitimate rights of protest is most unlikely to have any clear idea of what would constitute lawful authority or excuse": see *Ineos Upstream Ltd v Persons Unknown* [2019] EWCA Civ 515; [2019] 4 WLR 100, para 40.
67. In addition to making these points, however, Longmore LJ also agreed with a submission that one of the "problems with a *quia timet* order in this form" was that "it is of the essence of the tort [of conspiracy] that it must cause damage". He commented:

"While that cannot of itself be an objection to the grant of *quia timet* relief, the requirement that it cause damage can only be

incorporated into the order by reference to the defendants' intention which, as Sir Andrew Morritt said in *Hampshire Waste*, depends on the subjective intention of the individual which is not necessarily known to the outside world (and in particular to the claimants) and is susceptible to change and, for that reason, should not be incorporated into the order."

68. Although this was not an essential part of the court's reasoning, I agreed with the judgment of Longmore LJ in the *Ineos* case and therefore share responsibility for these observations. However, while I continue to agree with the other reasons given for finding the form of order made by the judge in the *Ineos* case unclear as well as too widely drawn, with the benefit of the further scrutiny that the point has received on this appeal I now consider the concern expressed about the reference to the defendants' intention to have been misplaced.
69. It is not in fact correct, as suggested in the passage quoted above, that the requirement of the tort of conspiracy to show damage can only be incorporated into a *quia timet* injunction by reference to the defendants' intention. It is perfectly possible to frame a prohibition which applies only to future conduct that actually causes damage. It is, however, correct that, in order to make the terms of the injunction correspond to the tort and avoid prohibiting conduct that is lawful, it is necessary to include a requirement that the defendants' conduct was intended to cause damage to the claimant. As already discussed, there is nothing ambiguous, vague or difficult to understand about such a requirement. The only potential difficulty created by its inclusion is one of proof.

*The Hampshire Waste case*

70. The case of *Hampshire Waste Services Ltd v Intending Trespassers upon Chineham Incinerator Site* [2003] EWHC 1739 (Ch); [2004] Env LR 9, to which Longmore LJ referred, involved an application by companies which owned and operated waste incineration sites for an injunction to restrain persons from trespassing on their sites in connection with a planned day of protest by environmental protestors described as "Global Day of Action Against Incinerators". On similar occasions in the past protestors had invaded sites owned by the claimants and caused substantial irrecoverable costs.
71. The injunction was sought against defendants described in the draft order as "Persons intending to trespass and/or trespassing" on six specified sites "in connection with the 'Global Day of Action Against Incinerators' (or similarly described event) on or around 14 July 2003". Sir Andrew Morritt V-C considered that the case for granting an injunction to prevent the threatened trespass to the claimants' property was clearly made out and that, in circumstances where the claimants were unable to name any of the protestors who might be involved, it was appropriate to grant the injunction against persons unknown. He raised two points, however, about the proposed description of the defendants (see para 9). The two points were that:

"it seems to me to be wrong that the description of the defendant should involve a legal conclusion such as is implicit in the use of the word 'trespass'. Similarly, it seems to me to be undesirable to use a description such as 'intending to trespass' because that depends on the subjective intention of the individual

which is not necessarily known to the outside world and in particular the claimants, and is susceptible of change.”

To address these points, the Vice-Chancellor amended the opening words of the proposed description of the defendants to refer to: “Persons entering or remaining without the consent of the claimants” on the specified sites.

72. I take the Vice-Chancellor’s objection to the use of the word “trespass” to have been that trespass is a legal concept and that the class of persons affected by the injunction ought to be identified in language which does not use a legal term of art. His objection to the reference to intention was different. It was not that intention is a legal concept which might not be clear to persons notified of the injunction. It was that “the outside world and in particular the claimants” would not necessarily know whether a person did or did not have the relevant intention and also that this state of affairs was susceptible of change.
73. Although the Vice-Chancellor did not spell this out, what was particularly unsatisfactory, as it seems to me, about the proposed description was that it would have made the question whether a person was a defendant to the proceedings dependent not on anything which that person had done (with or without a specific intention) but solely on their state of mind at any given time (which might change). Thus, a person who had formed an intention of joining a protest which would involve entering on the claimants’ land would fall within the scope of the injunction even if he or she had done nothing which interfered with the claimants’ legal rights or which was even preparatory or gave rise to a risk of such interference. It is easy to see why the Vice-Chancellor regarded this as undesirable.
74. I do not consider that the same objection applies to a term of an injunction which prohibits doing specified acts with a specified intention. Limiting the scope of a prohibition by reference to the intention required to make the act wrongful avoids restraining conduct that is lawful. In so far as it creates difficulty of proof, that is a difficulty for the claimant and not for a person accused of breaching the injunction – for whom the need to prove the specified intention provides an additional protection. Accordingly, although the inclusion of multiple references to intention – as in paragraph 7 of the Injunction in this case – risks introducing an undesirable degree of complexity, I would reject the suggestion that there is any reason in principle why references to intention should not be incorporated into an order or that the inclusion of such references in the terms of the Injunction in the present case provided a reason not to enforce it by committal.

### **The width of the Injunction**

75. I mentioned earlier that the appellants withdrew their appeal against the judge’s decision on 3 September 2019 to refuse their application to vary the Injunction, when the relief which they were seeking was granted for different reasons following the Government’s moratorium on fracking. The arguments which the appellants would have made on that appeal, however, did not disappear from the picture.
76. It is no defence to an application for the committal of a defendant who has disobeyed a court order for the defendant to say that the order is not one that ought to have been made. As a matter of principle, a court order takes effect when it is made and remains

binding unless and until it is revoked by the court that made it or on an appeal; and for as long as the order is in effect, it is a contempt of court to disobey the order whether or not the court was right to make it in the first place: see e.g. *M v Home Office* [1992] QB 270, 298-299; *Burris v Azadani* [1995] 1 WLR 1372, 1381. In the present case, therefore, it is not open to the appellants to argue that they were not guilty of contempt of court because the Injunction should not have been granted or should not have been granted in terms which prohibited the acts which they chose to commit in defiance of the court's order.

77. If it were shown that the court was wrong to grant an injunction which prohibited the appellants' conduct, that would nonetheless be relevant to the question whether it was appropriate to punish the appellants' contempt of court by ordering their committal to prison. Although no such argument was raised in the appellants' grounds of appeal against the committal order, in the course of her oral submissions Ms Brimelow QC suggested that this was the case. She did so, as I understood it, by reference to the grounds on which the appellants had sought permission to appeal against the judge's refusal to remove paragraphs 4 and 7 of the Injunction (before that appeal was withdrawn). Although there was no formal application to rely on those grounds for the purpose of the appeal against the committal order, it would be unreasonable not to permit this.
78. The grounds on which the appellants argued that paragraphs 4 and 7 should not have been included in the Injunction were essentially the same, however, as the grounds on which they argued that those terms could not properly form the basis of findings of contempt of court – namely, that the terms were insufficiently clear and certain because of their references to intention. For the reasons already given, I do not consider this to be a valid objection.
79. I would add that it has not been argued – and I see no reason to think – that on the facts of this case paragraph 4 of the Injunction, as it stood when the breaches occurred, was too widely drawn. Although a similarly worded term was criticised by this court in the *Ineos* case, there was in that case, as I have emphasised, no previous history of interference with the claimants' rights. The injunction sought was therefore what might be called a 'pure' *quia timet* injunction, in that it was not aimed at preventing repetition of wrongful acts which had caused harm to the claimants but at preventing such acts in circumstances where none had yet taken place. The significance which the court attached to this can be seen from para 42 of the judgment of Longmore LJ, where he said:

“[Counsel] for the claimants submitted that the court should grant advance relief of this kind in appropriate cases in order to save time and much energy later devoted to legal proceedings after the events have happened. But it is only when events have happened which can in retrospect be seen to have been illegal that, in my view, wide ranging injunctions of the kind granted against the third and fifth defendants should be granted. The citizen's right of protest is not to be diminished by advance fear of committal except in the clearest of cases, of which trespass is perhaps the best example.”

80. In the present case, by contrast, there was a well documented history of obstruction and attempts to obstruct access to and egress from Cuadrilla's site by blocking the Site Entrance and by obstructing the highway or otherwise interfering with traffic on the part of the Preston New Road defined in paragraph 3 of the Injunction as the "PNR Access Route". That history of conduct which clearly infringed the claimants' rights of free passage provided a solid basis for the prohibition in paragraph 4.
81. Paragraph 7 is a different matter. The only breach of paragraph 7 in issue on this appeal, however, is Ms Lawrie's conduct on 3 August 2018 in standing in the road in an attempt to stop a lorry which was approaching the Site Entrance and with the intention of causing inconvenience and delay to Cuadrilla. Cuadrilla had no need to rely on the tort of unlawful means conspiracy in seeking to restrain such conduct. It clearly amounted to an actionable public nuisance. As such, the prohibition in paragraph 4 could have been framed so as to prohibit such conduct. Indeed, one of the variations made to the Injunction on 3 September 2019 was an amendment to paragraph 4 to prohibit:

"Standing, sitting, walking or lying in front of any vehicle on the carriageway with the effect of interfering with the vehicular passage along the PNR Access Route by the claimants and/or their agents, servants, contractors, sub-contractors, group companies, licensees, invitees or employees;"

This squarely covered conduct of the kind which occurred on 3 August 2018.

82. The word "effect" was included in the variations made on 3 September 2019 to avoid referring to intention. In my view, reference to intention should not have been removed because there is nothing unclear in such a requirement and I see no sufficient justification for framing the prohibition more widely so as to catch unintended effects. But what matters for present purposes is that the terms of the Injunction were not criticised – and it seems to me could not reasonably be criticised – as too wide in so far as they prohibited the conduct of Ms Lawrie on 3 August 2018, as they did both before and after the variations were made.
83. I am therefore satisfied that, when considering the sanctions imposed on the appellants, it cannot be said in mitigation that the acts which formed the basis of the committal order were not acts which ought to have been prohibited by the Injunction.

**(2) Were the sanctions too harsh?**

84. The second ground of appeal pursued by the appellants is that – on the footing that the relevant restrictions placed on their conduct by the Injunction were legally justified – the judge was nevertheless wrong to punish their breaches of the Injunction by ordering their committal to prison (albeit that execution of the order was suspended).

*The standard of review on appeal*

85. In deciding what sanction to impose for a contempt of court, a judge has to assess and weigh a number of different factors. The law recognises that a decision of this nature involves an exercise of judgment which is best made by the judge who deals with the case at first instance and with which an appeal court should be slow to interfere. It will generally do so only if the judge: (i) made an error of principle; (ii) took into account

immaterial factors or failed to take into account material factors; or (iii) reached a decision which was outside the range of decisions reasonably open to the judge. It follows that there is limited scope for challenging on an appeal a sanction imposed for contempt of court as being excessive (or unduly lenient). If, however, the appeal court is satisfied that the decision of the lower court was wrong on one of the above grounds, it will reverse the decision and either substitute its own decision or remit the case to the judge for further consideration of sanction. See *Liverpool Victoria Insurance Co Ltd v Zafar* [2019] EWCA 392 (Civ), paras 44-46; *McKendrick v Financial Conduct Authority* [2019] EWCA Civ 524; [2019] 4 WLR 65, paras 37-38.

86. The appellants' case that the judge's decision was wrong is put in two ways. First, it is argued that the judge made an error of principle and/or failed to take into account a material factor in treating as irrelevant the fact that, when they disobeyed the Injunction, the appellants were exercising rights of protest which are protected by the common law and by articles 10 and 11 of the Human Rights Convention. Secondly, it is argued that, in having regard (as the judge did) to the guideline issued by the Sentencing Council which applies to sentencing in criminal cases for breach of a criminal behaviour order, the judge misapplied that guideline and, in consequence, reached a decision that was unduly harsh.

#### *Sentencing protestors*

87. The fact that acts of deliberate disobedience to the law were committed as part of a peaceful protest will seldom provide a defence to a criminal charge. But it is well established that it is a relevant factor in assessing culpability for the purpose of sentencing in a criminal case. On behalf of the appellants, Ms Brimelow QC emphasised the following observations of Lord Hoffmann in *R v Jones (Margaret)* [2006] UKHL 16; [2007] 1 AC 136, para 89:

“My Lords, civil disobedience on conscientious grounds has a long and honourable history in this country. People who break the law to affirm their belief in the injustice of a law or government action are sometimes vindicated by history. The suffragettes are an example which comes immediately to mind. It is the mark of a civilised community that it can accommodate protests and demonstrations of this kind. But there are conventions which are generally accepted by the law-breakers on one side and the law-enforcers on the other. The protesters behave with a sense of proportion and do not cause excessive damage or inconvenience. And they vouch the sincerity of their beliefs by accepting the penalties imposed by the law. The police and prosecutors, on the other hand, behave with restraint and the magistrates impose sentences which take the conscientious motives of the protesters into account.”

88. This passage was quoted with approval by Lord Burnett of Maldon CJ, giving the judgment of the Court of Appeal Criminal Division in *R v Roberts* [2018] EWCA Crim 2739; [2019] 1 WLR 2577, the case mentioned earlier that arose from ‘direct action’ protests at Cuadrilla’s site in July 2017 by four men who climbed on top of lorries. Three of the protestors were sentenced to immediate terms of imprisonment, but on appeal those sentences were replaced by orders for their conditional discharge, having

regard to the fact that they had already spent three weeks in prison before their appeals were heard. The Court of Appeal indicated that the appropriate sentence would otherwise have been a community sentence with a punitive element involving work (or perhaps a curfew). The Lord Chief Justice (at para 34) summarised the proper approach to sentencing in cases of this kind as being that:

“the conscientious motives of protestors will be taken into account when they are sentenced for their offences but that there is in essence a bargain or mutual understanding operating in such cases. A sense of proportion on the part of the offenders in avoiding excessive damage or inconvenience is matched by a relatively benign approach to sentencing. When sentencing an offender, the value of the right to freedom of expression finds its voice in the approach to sentencing.”

89. Ms Brimelow submitted that this approach to sentencing should have been, but was not, followed in the present case when deciding what sanction to impose for the breaches of the Injunction committed by the appellants.

*Were custodial sentences wrong in principle?*

90. At one point in her oral submissions Ms Brimelow sought to argue that, where a deliberate breach of a court order is committed in the course of a peaceful protest, it is wrong in principle to punish the breach by imprisonment, even if the sanction is suspended on condition that there is no further breach within a specified period. This mirrored a submission which she made when representing the protestors in the *Roberts* case. The submission was rejected in the *Roberts* case (at para 43) and I would likewise reject it as contrary to both principle and authority.
91. There is no principle which justifies treating the conscientious motives of a protestor as a licence to flout court orders with impunity from imprisonment, whatever the nature or extent of the harm intended or caused provided only that no violence is used. Court orders would become toothless if such an approach were adopted – particularly in relation to those for whom a financial penalty holds no deterrent because it cannot be enforced as they do not have funds from which to pay it. Unsurprisingly, no case law was cited in which such an approach has been endorsed. Not only, as mentioned, was it rejected in the *Roberts* case in the context of sentencing for criminal offences, but it is also inconsistent with the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights.
92. Thus, in *Kudrevičius v Lithuania* (2016) 62 EHRR 34, mentioned earlier, the Grand Chamber of the European Court saw nothing disproportionate in the decision to impose on the applicants a 60 day custodial sentence suspended for one year (along with some restrictions on their freedom of movement) – a sentence which the court described as “lenient” (see para 178). The Grand Chamber also referred with approval to earlier cases in which sentences of imprisonment imposed on demonstrators who intentionally caused disruption had been held not to violate articles 10 and 11 of the Human Rights Convention. For example, in *Barraco v France* (application no 31684/05) 5 March 2009, the applicant had taken part in a protest which involved blocking traffic on a motorway for several hours. The European Court held that his conviction and sentence to a suspended term of three months’ imprisonment (together with a fine of €1,500) did not violate article 11.



93. Another case cited by the Grand Chamber in *Kudrevičius* that is particularly in point because it involved defiance of court orders is *Steel v United Kingdom* (1999) 28 EHRR 603. In that case the first applicant took part in a protest against a grouse shoot in which she intentionally obstructed a member of the shoot by walking in front of him as he lifted his shotgun to take aim, thus preventing him from firing. She was convicted of a public order offence, fined and ordered to be bound over to keep the peace for 12 months. Having refused to be bound over, the applicant was committed to prison for 28 days. The second applicant took part in a protest against the building of a motorway extension in which she stood under the bucket of a JCB digger in order to impede construction work. She was likewise convicted of a public order offence, fined and ordered to be bound over. She also refused to be bound over and was committed to prison for seven days. The European Court held that in each of these cases the measures taken against the protestors interfered with their rights under article 10 of the Convention but that in each case the measures were proportionate to the legitimate aims of preventing disorder, protecting the rights of others and also (in relation to their committal to prison for refusing to agree to be bound over) maintaining the authority of the judiciary.
94. The common feature of these cases, as the court observed in the *Kudrevičius* case, is that the disruption caused was not a side-effect of a protest held in a public place but was an intended aim of the protest. As foreshadowed earlier, this is an important distinction. It was recently underlined by a Divisional Court (Singh LJ and Farbey J) in *Director of Public Prosecutions v Ziegler* [2019] EWHC 71 (Admin); [2019] 2 WLR 1451, a case – like the *Kudrevičius* case – involving deliberate obstruction of a highway. After quoting the statement that intentional disruption of activities of others is not “at the core” of the freedom protected by article 11 of the Convention (see paragraph 44 above), the Divisional Court identified one reason for this as being that the essence of the rights of peaceful assembly and freedom of expression is the opportunity to persuade others (see para 53 of the judgment). The court pointed out that persuasion is very different from attempting (through physical obstruction or similar conduct) to compel others to act in a way you desire.
95. Where, as in the present case, individuals not only resort to compulsion to hinder or try to stop lawful activities of others of which they disapprove, but do so in deliberate defiance of a court order, they have no reason to expect that their conscientious motives will insulate them from the sanction of imprisonment.
96. On the other hand, courts are frequently reluctant to make orders for the immediate imprisonment of protestors who engage in deliberately disruptive but non-violent forms of direct action protest for conscientious reasons. It is notable that in the *Kudrevičius* case and in the earlier cases there cited in which custodial sentences were held by the European Court to be a proportionate restriction on the rights of protestors, in all but one instance the sentence imposed was a suspended sentence. The exception was *Steel v United Kingdom*, but in that case too the protestors were not immediately sentenced to imprisonment: it was only when they refused to be bound over to keep the peace that they were sent to prison. A similar reluctance to make (or uphold) orders for immediate imprisonment is apparent in the domestic cases to which counsel for the appellants referred, including the *Roberts* case. As Lord Burnett CJ summed up the position in that case (at para 43):

“There are no bright lines, but particular caution attaches to immediate custodial sentences.”

There are good reasons for this, which stem from the nature of acts which may properly be characterised as acts of civil disobedience.

*Civil disobedience*

97. Civil disobedience may be defined as a public, non-violent, conscientious act contrary to law, done with the aim of bringing about a change in the law or policies of the government (or possibly, though this is controversial, of private organisations): see e.g. John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (1971) p.364. Where these conditions are met, such acts represent a form of political protest, both in the sense that they are guided by principles of justice or social good and in the sense that they are addressed to other members of the community or those who hold power within it. The public nature of the act – in contrast to the actions of other law-breakers who generally seek to avoid detection – is a demonstration of the protestor’s sincerity and willingness to accept the legal consequences of their actions. It is also essential to characterising the act as a form of political communication or address. Eschewing violence and showing some measure of moderation in the level of harm intended again signal that, although the means of protest adopted transgress the law, the protestor is engaged in a form of political action undertaken on moral grounds rather than in mere criminality.
98. It seems to me that there are at least three reasons for showing greater clemency in response to such acts of civil disobedience than in dealing with other disobedience of the law. First, by adhering to the conditions mentioned, a person who engages in acts of civil disobedience establishes a moral difference between herself and ordinary law-breakers which it is right to take into account in determining what punishment is deserved. Second, by reason of that difference and the fact that such a protestor is generally – apart from their protest activity – a law-abiding citizen, there is reason to expect that less severe punishment is necessary to deter such a person from further law-breaking. Third, part of the purpose of imposing sanctions, whether for a criminal offence or for intentional breach of an injunction, is to engage in a dialogue with the defendant so that he or she appreciates the reasons why in a democratic society it is the duty of responsible citizens to obey the law and respect the rights of others, even where the law or other people’s lawful activities are contrary to the protestor’s own moral convictions. Such a dialogue is more likely to be effective where authorities (including judicial authorities) show restraint in anticipation that the defendant will respond by desisting from further breaches. This is part of what I believe Lord Burnett CJ meant in the *Roberts* case at para 34 (quoted above) when he referred to “a bargain or mutual understanding operating in such cases”.
99. These considerations explain why, in a case where an act of civil disobedience constitutes a criminal offence or contempt of a court order which is so serious that it crosses the custody threshold, it will nonetheless very often be appropriate to suspend the operation of the sanction on condition there is no further breach during a specified period of time. Of course, if the defendant does not comply with that condition, he or she must expect that the order for imprisonment will be implemented.

*The judge's approach*

100. The judge had regard to the fact that the breaches of the Injunction committed by the appellants in this case were part of a protest but did not accept that this was relevant in deciding what sanction to impose. That was an error. As I have indicated, it is clear from the case law that, even where protest takes the form of intentional disruption of the lawful activities of others, as it did here, such protest still falls within the scope of articles 10 and 11 of the Human Rights Convention. Any restrictions imposed on such protestors are therefore lawful only if they satisfy the requirements set out in articles 10(2) and 11(2). That is so even where the protestors' actions involve disobeying a court order. Although – as the judge observed – the appellants' rights to freedom of expression and assembly had already been taken into account in deciding whether to make the order which they disobeyed, imposing a sanction for such disobedience involved a further and separate restriction of their rights which also required justification in accordance with articles 10(2) and 11(2) of the Human Rights Convention.
101. That said, the judge was in my opinion entitled to conclude – as he made it clear that he did – that the restrictions which he imposed on the liberty of the appellants by making suspended orders for their committal to prison were in any event justified by the need to protect the rights of the claimants and to maintain the court's authority. The latter aim is specifically identified in article 10(2) as a purpose capable of justifying restrictions on the exercise of freedom of expression. It is also, as it seems to me, essential for the legitimate purpose identified in both articles 10(2) and 11(2) of preventing disorder.

*Reference to the Sentencing Council guideline*

102. In deciding what sanctions were appropriate, the judge approached the decision, correctly, by considering both the culpability of the appellants and the harm caused, intended or likely to be caused by their breaches of the Injunction. I see no merit in the appellants' argument that, in making this assessment, he misapplied the Sentencing Council guideline on sentencing for breach of a criminal behaviour order. In *Venables v News Group Newspapers* [2019] EWCA Civ 534, para 26, this court thought it appropriate to have regard to that guideline in deciding what penalty to impose for contempt of court in breaching an injunction. As the court noted, however, the guideline does not apply to proceedings for committal. There is therefore no obligation on a judge to follow the guideline in such proceedings and I do not consider that, if a judge does not have regard to it, this can be said to be an error of law. The criminal sentencing guideline provides, at most, a useful comparison.
103. Caution is needed in any such comparison, however, as the maximum penalty for contempt of court is two years' imprisonment as opposed to five years for breach of a criminal behaviour order. It would be a mistake to assume that the starting points and category ranges indicated in the sentencing guideline should on that account be made the subject of a linear adjustment such that, for example, the starting point for a contempt of court that would fall in the most serious category in the guideline (category 1A) should only be of the order of 10 months' custody (which is roughly 40% of the guideline starting point of two years' custody). As the Court of Appeal observed in *McKendrick v Financial Conduct Authority* [2019] EWCA Civ 524; [2019] 4 WLR 65, para 40:

“[Counsel for the appellant] was correct to submit that the decision as to the length of sentence appropriate in a particular case must take into account that the maximum sentence is committal to prison for two years. However, because the maximum term is comparatively short, we do not think that the maximum can be reserved for the very worst sort of contempt which can be imagined. Rather, there will be a comparatively broad range of conduct which can fairly be regarded as falling within the most serious category and as therefore justifying a sentence at or near the maximum.”

104. A further material difference is that, in proceedings for contempt of court, a community order is not available as a lesser alternative to the sanction of imprisonment. There may therefore be cases where, although the sentencing guideline for breach offences might suggest that a community order would be an appropriate sentence, it is necessary to punish a contempt of court by an order for imprisonment because the contempt is so serious that neither of the only alternative sanctions of a fine and/or an order for costs could be justified.

*Sanction for the first incident*

105. In relation to the first incident on 24 July 2018 involving all three appellants, there is no basis for saying that the judge’s assessment of culpability and harm by reference to the sentencing guideline for breach offences, or his decision on sanction in the light of that assessment, was wrong on any of the grounds listed in paragraph 85 above. The judge was right to start from the position that a deliberate breach of a court order is itself a serious matter. He was entitled, as he also did, to treat the appellants’ culpability as aggravated by the element of planning involved in their use of lock-on devices and to take account of (i) the number of hours of disruption and delay caused by their conduct, (ii) evidence that the incident caused Cuadrilla additional (and irrecoverable) costs of around £1,000, and (iii) the fact that the incident only ended when police were deployed to cut through the arm lock devices and remove the appellants. It was also relevant that the appellants expressed no remorse and gave no indication that they would not commit further breaches of the Injunction. Nor were they entitled to any credit for admitting their contempt, as they declined to do so, thereby necessitating a trial at which evidence had to be called.
106. Had it not been for the fact that the appellants’ actions could be regarded as acts of civil disobedience in the sense I have described, short immediate custodial terms would in my view have been warranted. As it is, it cannot be said that the judge’s decision to impose suspended terms of imprisonment of four weeks was wrong in principle or outside the range of decisions reasonably open to him.

*Sanction for the second incident*

107. In relation to the second incident on 3 August 2018 involving Ms Lawrie alone, somewhat different considerations apply. Although Ms Lawrie’s action in standing in the path of a lorry to try to stop it was also found to be a deliberate breach of the court’s order, there was no evidence of planning and the incident was far shorter in duration lasting only a few seconds. In assessing the harm caused or risked by Ms Lawrie’s breach of the Injunction, the judge emphasised the danger of injury or death to which

her action had exposed Ms Lawrie herself, the driver of the lorry and other road-users. However, as David Richards LJ pointed out in the course of argument, in approaching the matter in this way the judge seems to have lost sight of the fact that the purpose of paragraph 7 of the Injunction, which he was punishing Ms Lawrie for disobeying, was not to protect the safety of road-users but was to protect Cuadrilla from suffering economic loss as a result of conspiracy to disrupt its supply chain by unlawful means. In assessing the seriousness of the breach, the judge should have focused on the extent to which the breach caused, or was intended to cause or risked causing, harm of the kind which the relevant term of the Injunction was intended to prevent. Had he done this, the judge would have been bound to conclude not only that no harm was actually caused but that the amount of economic loss intended or threatened by delaying a lorry on its way to collect rainwater from the site was slight.

108. The judge was, I consider, entitled to take into account as aggravating Ms Lawrie's culpability the nature of the unlawful means used and the fact that, on his findings, it amounted not merely to a public nuisance through obstruction of the highway but to an offence of causing danger to road-users contrary to section 22A of the Road Traffic Act 1988. To be guilty of an offence under that statutory provision, it is not necessary that the person concerned should have intended to cause, or realised that they were causing, danger to life or limb, and the judge made no such finding in relation to Ms Lawrie. It is sufficient that it would be obvious to a reasonable person that their action would be dangerous – a matter of which the judge was clearly satisfied on the evidence.
109. Ms Lawrie was not prosecuted, however, and the judge was not sentencing her for a criminal offence under the Road Traffic Act. In the circumstances, giving all due weight to the nature of the unlawful means used, the fact that this was Ms Lawrie's second deliberate breach of the Injunction and her complete lack of contrition, I do not consider that the term of imprisonment of two months which the judge imposed was justified. In my judgment, although the judge was right to conclude that the custody threshold was crossed, the appropriate penalty for this contempt of court was the same as that imposed for the earlier contempt committed by all three appellants – that is, a suspended term of imprisonment of four weeks.

### **Conclusion**

110. For these reasons, I would vary the committal order made by HHJ Pelling QC on 3 September 2019 by substituting for the period of imprisonment of two months in paragraph 2 of the order a period of four weeks. In all other respects I would dismiss the appeal.

### **Lord Justice David Richards:**

111. I agree.

### **Lord Justice Underhill:**

112. I agree with Leggatt LJ, for the reasons which he gives, that this appeal should be dismissed save in the one respect which he identifies. The courts attach great weight to the right of peaceful protest, even where this causes disruption to others; but it is also important for the rule of law that deliberate breaches of court orders attract a real

penalty, and I can see nothing wrong in principle in the judge's conclusion that the appellants' conduct here merited a custodial sentence, albeit suspended.