Neutral Citation Number: [2024] EWHC 1277 (KB)

Case No: QB-2022-BHM-000044

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
THE BIRMINGHAM DISTRICT REGISTRY

Date: 24th May 2024

Before :

MR JUSTICE RITCHIE

- -

Between :

HIGH SPEED TWO (HS2) LIMITED [1]
THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR TRANSPORT [2] — **Claimant**

- and –

(1) NOT USED — **Defendants**

(2) PERSONS UNKNOWN ENTERING OR REMAINING WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE CLAIMANTS ON, IN OR UNDER THE HS2 LAND WITH THE EFFECT OF DAMAGING AND/OR DELAYING AND/OR HINDERING THE CLAIMANTS, THEIR AGENTS, SERVANTS, CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS, GROUP COMPANIES, LICENSEES, INVITEES AND/OR EMPLOYEES

(3) PERSONS UNKNOWN OBSTRUCTING AND/OR INTERFERING WITH ACCESS TO AND/OR EGRESS FROM THE HS2 LAND IN CONNECTION WITH THE HS2 SCHEME WITH OR WITHOUT VEHICLES, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT, WITH THE EFFECT OF DAMAGING AND/OR DELAYING AND/OR HINDERING THE CLAIMANTS, THEIR AGENTS, SERVANTS, CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS, GROUP COMPANIES, LICENSEES, INVITEES AND/OR EMPLOYEES WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE CLAIMANTS

(4) PERSONS UNKNOWN CUTTING, DAMAGING, MOVING, CLIMBING ON OR OVER, DIGGING BENEATH OR REMOVING ANY ITEMS AFFIXED TO ANY TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT FENCING OR GATES ON OR AT THE PERIMETER OF THE HS2 LAND, OR DAMAGING, APPLYING ANY SUBSTANCE TO OR INTERFERING WITH ANY LOCK

OR ANY GATE AT THE PERIMETER OF THE HS2 LAND WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE CLAIMANTS

(5) MR ROSS MONAGHAN (AKA SQUIRREL / ASH TREE)

(6) MR JAMES ANDREW TAYLOR (AKA JIMMY KNAGGS / JAMES KNAGGS / RUN AWAY JIM)

(7-65) THE OTHER NAMED DEFENDANTS AS SET OUT IN ANNEX A HERETO

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Michael Fry & **Jonathan Welch** of Counsel (instructed by **DLA Piper Solicitors**) for the **Claimant**
Stephen Simblet KC (instructed by **Robert Lizar Solicitors**) for the **6th Defendant**

Hearing dates: 15th May 2024
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Approved Judgment

This judgment was handed down remotely at 10.30pm on Friday 24th May 2024 by circulation to the parties or their representatives by e-mail and by release to the National Archives.

.....

Mr Justice Ritchie:

The Parties

1. The first Claimant is constructing the high speed railway from London to Crewe and was then planning to construct onwards to Manchester and Leeds. The second Claimant is the Secretary of State for Transport.

2. There are two types of Defendant. Persons Unknown (PUs) and named Defendants. The 6th Defendant (D6) attended the hearing. Many of the other named Defendants have been removed as parties to the proceedings as the claim has progressed. Most have been removed because they provided undertakings in similar format to the prohibitory interim injunctions granted to the Claimants. Some have been found in contempt of the CPL (Cotter J.) injunction and imprisoned.

Bundles

3. For the hearing I was provided with hard copy and digital bundles, beautifully prepared as follows: core bundles: A and B; supplementary bundles: A, B1 and 2, C; authorities bundles: main and supplementary. I was also provided with a skeleton argument by the Claimants and by D6 and a "Written Reasons" from D6 to amend the draft Order proposed by the Claimants.

The hearing

4. This was a review hearing of a routewide interim injunction granted to prohibit unlawful interference by known Defendants and PUs with the work being carried out by the Claimants to build the HS2 railway from London to Manchester and Leeds on land in HS2 possession. To understand the project as it stood when the claim was issued, it may help to see a simple map of it provided in evidence by the Claimants, which I set out below. There are three parts. Phase 1 is from London to the West Midlands and is shown in blue. Phase 2A was from West Midlands to Crewe and is shown in purple. Phase 2B is in orange, which takes the Western line from Crewe to Manchester and the Eastern line from West Midlands to Leeds. I shall refer to these phases both by colour and by the phase numbers.

The chronology

5. The HS2 project was authorised by Parliament through Acts dated 2017 and 2021. There were supporters of this project and there were objectors to it. Some of the objectors decided to take what they called direct action. Some of those taking direct action chose to break criminal and/or civil law as part of their direct action. Their publicly stated purposes included: causing huge expense to the Claimants by unlawful direct action on HS2 land through incurring security costs to deal with the direct action; delaying the construction of HS2 and thereby increasing the costs; persuading

Government to cease to build each and all of the phases set out above and saving the environments affected by the project. All such increased costs have been funded by UK taxpayers. It is not the role of this Courts to make any comment on any of those matters. In relation to civil unlawfulness, the Courts deal with applications and claims made by parties.

6. On 19 February 2018 Baring J. (PT 2018 000098) made an interim injunction protecting the Claimants' HS2 Harvil Road site from unlawful actions by PUs and named Defendants. Those included D28, 33, 36, and 39 in the action before me. I do not know how the claim progressed. This was renewed on 18 September 2020 by David Holland QC sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge.

7. On 23 March 2022 (QB 2022 BHM 000016) Linden J. made an interim injunction protecting the Claimants' HS2's contractor's land leased at Swynnerton, which was being used by Balfour Beatty (the contractor), which is very near to Cash's Pit Land (CPL) which the protesters called Bluebell Woods Camp. The interim injunction was to remain in force until further order and expired after 12 months. D6 in the action before me was a Defendant and appeared at that hearing. Directions were given for the claim to be pleaded out and for evidence to be filed and protection was given to PUs by the right to vary or set aside the order. I do not know how that claim progressed.

8. On 10 February 2021 (CO/361/2021) Steyn J. made an interim injunction order protecting the Claimants' HS2 land at Euston Square, London." On 28.3.2022 (QB 2021 004465) Linden J. made an interim injunction order protecting the Claimants' HS2 land at Euston Square, London. This was against Larch Maxey; Daniel Hooper (one of the Defendants in the case before me); Isla Sandford; J Stephenson-Clarke and B Croarkin. I do not know how that claim progressed.

9. The claim before me started by the issuing of the Claim Form on 28.3.2022. The Claimants sought possession of land at CPL and sought an injunction prohibiting PUs and named Defendants from trespassing and interfering with the construction of the project. They sought delivery up of possession of CPL, declaratory relief relating to possession of CPL, an injunction and costs.

10. The Claimants issued an application for urgent interim injunctions relating to CPL and routewide at the same time. D6 was represented at the hearing. Cotter J. made: (1) an order for possession of CPL against D6 and all the other Defendants, and (2) an interim injunction order against PUs and certain named Defendants who were believed to be occupying CPL (D5-20, 22, 31 and 63). The numbers and remaining Defendants' names (many have since been released from the claim) are set out in the Annex to this judgment. The original interim injunction was to last until trial or further order and expired on 24.10.2022 in any event.

11. On 20.9.2022 Julian Knowles J. handed down judgment on the Claimants' application in this action for a routewide interim injunction covering all HS2 land. At the hearing the Claimants had sought a final injunction. Julian Knowles J. noted that he was dealing not just with PUs but also with named Defendants and some of them might wish to dispute the claims against them, and indeed D6 objected to there being a final injunction. Thus, Knowles J. refused to make a final injunction and dealt with the application as one for an interim injunction (see para. 9 of his judgment). Knowles J. dealt with a wealth of evidence but no witness was cross-examined. I refer to and incorporate the chronology of events set out in the judgment. At para. 24 he set out the bit by bit litigation put in evidence before him which had preceded the routewide injunction application. He set out the Claimants' rights to the HS2 land; the Claimants' action for trespass and nuisance; the Defendants' clearly publicised intention to continue direct action protests against the construction of HS2 across the whole of the HS2 land; D6's submissions in opposition (lawful protest, no right to possession, lack of real and imminent risk, inadequate definition of PUs, inadequate constraint terms in the draft order, discretionary relief should not be granted, disproportionate exercise of power, breach of Art. 10 and 11 of the ECHR, challenges to service methods and other complaints). Julian Knowles J. set out the legal principles relating to trespass and nuisance and then covered the law relating to interim injunctions at paras. 91-102. In summary, he considered such injunctions were to "hold the ring pending the final hearing"; the Court was to apply the just and convenient test; adequacy of damages was to be considered; where wrongs had already been committed by the Defendant/s the quia timet threshold was lower and the evidential inference was that such infringements would continue until trial unless restrained; the Claimants had to show more than a real issue to be tried, he followed the principle in *Ineos v PUs* [2019] 4 WLR 100, at paras. 44-48, that the Court must be satisfied that the Claimants will likely obtain an injunction (preventing trespass) at the final hearing; and, for precautionary relief (what we fear, or quia timet), whether there was a sufficiently real and imminent risk of torts being committed which would cause harm sufficient to justify the relief. Knowles J. then set out the *Canada Goose* structural requirements for PU injunctions and considered the Defendants' ECHR rights. He then applied the law and made findings. He found that the Claimants had sufficient title to the HS2 land to make the claims. He accepted the Claimants' evidence of trespass and damage at CPL by PUs and Defendants "to the requisite standard at this stage" (para. 159). He found significant violence and criminality. He found that there was a real and imminent risk of continuing unlawfulness (para. 168). He rejected D6's submission that he had to find a risk of actual damage occurring on HS2 land and that there was no such risk. Knowles J. took account of the many past unlawful acts and the clearly expressed intention of many protesters to continue direct action by unlawful means. He found, at para. 177, that a precautionary interim injunction was appropriate and that to fail to grant one would be a licence for guerrilla tactics. These findings were not made on the "real issue to be tried" basis, but instead on the "likely to obtain the relief sought at trial" basis (para. 217); damages would not be an adequate remedy and the balance of convenience strongly favoured protecting the Claimants' HS2 land until trial. A helpful schedule of

the Defendants' responses was appended to the judgment. Some Defendants had put in defences; others had emailed or put in responses, submissions or witness statements.

12. D6 appealed the judgment of Knowles J. but permission was refused on 9.12.2022 by Coulson LJ.

13. The routewide interim injunction made by Julian Knowles J. in September 2022 was extended by me in May 2023 for another year. In para. 16 of that order and Schedule D to that order I made provision for any Defendant to apply to bring the proceedings to a final trial. This provided PUs and all named Defendants with the right to end being a party to the proceedings by that route. It provided each with the right to force the Claimants to prove their allegations on the balance of probabilities at trial, under cross-examination and after disclosure of relevant evidence and documentation. No Defendant has done so. Provisions were made for review of the interim injunction by May this year.

14. The Cotter J. version of the CPL interim injunction was breached by various Defendants back in 2022, who stayed at CPL despite the prohibitions therein. Committal proceedings were commenced and heard by me in July and September 2022. Two protestors who had been occupying CPL in treehouses gave undertakings and walked free: D62, (Leanne Swateridge, aka Flowery Zebra) and D31, (Rory Hooper). Five Defendants who had occupied tunnels were sentenced to imprisonment for contempt of Court, two of the sentences were suspended: D18, (William Harewood, aka Satchel/Satchel Baggins); D33 (Elliot Cuciurean, aka Jellytot); D61 (David Buchan, aka David Holliday); D64 (Stefan Wright); D65 (Liam Walters). One of these (Wright) never attended and is still at large.

The applications

15. Pursuant to the order I made in May 2023 the Claimants have faithfully applied for review of the interim injunction. By a notice of application dated 1.3.2024 they seek a 12 month extension of the routewide interim injunction, redefinition of the HS2 land plans; permission to update the definition of HS2 land and an extension of the prohibited acts to cover drone flying over their works on HS2 land.

16. The evidence in support of the application is set out in the following witness statements: James Dobson dated 28.2.2024; John Groves dated 28.2.2024; Julie Dilcock dated 28.2.2024 and Robert Shaw dated 27.2.2024.

17. The opposition to the application comes only from D6. Interestingly, now he submits that the Claimants should be required to progress the claim to a final hearing against all other Defendants, having submitted to Knowles J. that a final injunction should not be granted at that hearing. He wishes to be released from the claim himself. His counsel informed me at the hearing that he is crowd funded, that explains why he attends so

many of these HS2 hearings. The Claimants have never sought to enforce their costs against the crowd funding bank accounts or trustees.

The Issues

18. There were 5 substantive matters to be determined:
    18.1 Should the Claimants be required to take the claim to a final hearing?
    18.2 Should the duration of the routewide interim injunction be extended?
    18.3 Should the routewide injunction relating to the purple land be ended?
    18.4 Should the amendments to the details of the routewide injunction be permitted?
    18.5 Should D6 and 13 other Defendants be removed as parties to the claim?

The lay witness evidence

19. I have read the evidence from the Claimants' witnesses and from D6.

20. **James Dobson** is a security consultant and advisor to HS2. He reviewed the internal computer and documentary sources. He set out the Claimants' evidence. He asserted that the Claimants no longer considered 13 of the named Defendants to be a sufficient risk to the HS2 project for them to remain parties to the claim. These were D5, 6, 7, 22, 27, 28, 33, 36, 39, 48, 57, 58 and 59. After the removal of these Defendants, only 5 named Defendants would remain.

21. Mr Dobson informed the Court that since 17th March 2023 there had been no major direct action activist events or incidents targeting the HS2 project that had resulted in a delay of works by more than an hour. He considered there was direct evidence from activists that the reason the disruption to the HS2 project had stopped was the deterrent effect of the injunction and gave evidence by way of a few examples. However, he set out what he described as "minor incidences" of random trespasses to land which had not impacted on the works of the project. He asserted there were *increasing* incidences of unlawful occupation of phase 2 property and set these out. There were 24 events set out in a five column table. I summarise them below. Unfortunately he did not specify which was on phase 1 land and which was on phase 2 land. I have done my best to identify which is which in brackets below. In March 2023 urban explorers broke into the Grimstock Hotel in Birmingham (phase 1). The same month 10 caravans trespassed upon a business park in Saltley in Birmingham (phase 1) and, when challenged, left after about 10 hours. In May and June 2023 a group called Universal Law Community Trust occupied a building at Whitmore Heath, which is part of the phase 2A land. The description of the group paints them as debt buyers who control the debtors' behaviour after taking over their debt, for anarchic purposes. In May 2023 in Old Oak Common Road, London (phase 1), a man, who had previously trespassed on HS2 land, assaulted a security officer on a closed road. In July 2023 graffiti and some criminal damage had been done in Westbury Viaduct near Brackley (phase 1 land). In August 2023 three children set up a small campsite on HS2 land in Buckinghamshire (phase 1 land) and, when their parents were asked to remove them, they left. In the same month two people trespassed on land in Greatworth, Oxfordshire (phase 1) and interfered with some

machinery. In the same month a naked rambler walked onto an HS2 site in Western Cutting near Brackley (phase 1) and was escorted off. In the same month a local resident blocked access to an HS2 site at Washwood Heath in Birmingham (phase 1) but left when shown the injunction. In September 2023 D16 and another person entered HS2 land in Warwickshire (phase 1) and two other areas and took photographs which were posted on social media. The next day they went to two further HS2 sites in Warwickshire. The next day they went to one or two sites in Staffordshire (phase 2). In October 2023, at Addison Road, Calvert, (phase 1) fire extinguishers were discharged overnight. In the same month a group of urban explorers entered property at Drayton Lane, Tamworth (phase 1) and posted images. In the same month a group of urban explorers trespassed at Whitmore Heath, Whitmore (phase 2A) and shared photos with other urban explorers online. In the same month fireworks were fired towards security officers on HS2 land at Leather Lane, Great Missenden (phase 1). In November 2023 five members of a group called Unite The Union attended Old Oak Common Road, London (phase 1) with a megaphone but left when informed of the injunction. Later in November, a farm property at Swynnerton in Staffordshire (phase 2A) was entered by urban explorers. Later in November, 13 Unite The Union activists blocked access to HS2 logistics hubs at Channel Gate Road in London (phase 1). In December through to January 2024, D69 flew drones over multiple HS2 sites. However, he has given an undertaking which is satisfactory to the Claimants and so he is not being joined to the claim. In December 2023 vandalization occurred to a site in Aylesbury (phase 1). In January 2024 urban explorers entered an HS2 building at Birmingham Interchange (phase 1) and were escorted off site. Later that month urban explorers trespassed at Drayton Lane, Tamworth (phase 1). Finally, in February 2024 a person asserting to be a social media auditor flew drones over HS2 land at Victoria Road in London (phase 1) and caused a nuisance.

22. In his evidence Mr Dobson set out records of what he described as the displacement of activists to other causes and unlawful direct actions by them for other causes. He asserts that direct action protesters have transferred their interest to other causes including Palestine Action and Just Stop Oil. Mr Dobson asserts that activists will look for loopholes in injunction orders, relying on evidence that D6 made such a pronouncement in relation to Balfour Beatty and the injunction they obtained, which I have set out above, asserting that protesters would attack Balfour Beatty elsewhere, outside the scope of the injunction. Mr Dobson also sought to raise his concern that the group: Universal Law Community Trust had ties with protesters wishing to Stop HS2 because their occupation of a property owned by HS2 was mentioned on some anti HS2 websites. Mr Dobson also raised his concern about urban explorers.

23. Mr Dobson summarised an announcement by the Prime Minister on the 4th of October 2023 that phase two of the HS2 project had been abandoned but he did not set out the Prime Minister's words. Mr Dobson summarised various pronouncements about hit and run tactics published by Lousy Badger, social media threats to re-enter CPL and vague threats to “be back”. Overall, Mr Dobson asserted that the Claimants reasonably fear a

return to the levels of unlawful activity experienced prior to the interim injunction if it is allowed to lapse and asserts that the interim injunction has been remarkably successful in reducing direct unlawful action against HS2 land and saving taxpayers money.

24. John Groves is the chief security officer for HS2 and gave evidence that the costs of the unlawful direct action to date to the taxpayer, through HS2, have totalled £121,000,000. He asserted that the September 2022 interim routewide injunction had had a dramatic effect by reducing direct action, which diminished the quarterly security expenditure from over half a million down to just £100,000. He produced a forecast of the costs of future unlawful direct action of £7 million for phase two, ending in 2024, due to increased security. He said that activists had started campaigning for other causes but they may believe they can cancel the whole of the HS2 scheme. He asserted that unhappy land owners, whose land was taken away in phase 2, may get involved. He asserted that the Claimants need the deterrence of the injunction or the Claimants might need to spend another £12 million on protection. He was concerned about attacks on bridges over motorways as a potential weak spot in the project. He asserted that activity was still continuing despite the injunction but relied solely on the evidence of Mr Dobson.

25. Julie Dilcock, the in house lawyer for HS2, set out a history of the claims and then the rationale for the various alterations needed to the draft order. Robert Shaw gave evidence which assisted in various tidying up operations that are going to be needed.

26. I take into account what D6 set out in his written reasons. He was content to take no further part in the claim and agreed that the Claimants could no longer maintain an injunction against him. He asserted that, according to the Civil Procedure Rules, the Claimants had to issue notice of discontinuance, obtain the Court's permission and, by implication, pay his costs under CPR part 38, if they wished to discontinue against him. However, in my judgment, this was wanting his cake and to eat it. He asserted that, because he would still be bound by the injunction under the umbrella of the term "PU", he could still make submissions at the hearing and I permitted him to do so. His submissions were that the terms of the injunction should be modified so that it no longer covers the land relating to phase 2A of the project because the Prime Minister has announced that the project is not going ahead on phase 2 and therefore the protesters have achieved what they wanted. He suggested that the geographic scope of the injunction should be reduced so that it does not cover the purple land set out in the 2021 Act. He also raised the point that this is an interim injunction binding the world and that the Claimants were under a continuing, onerous, responsibility to disclose relevant matters to the Court as they arose. He asserted that the Claimants had failed, in a timely way, to inform the Court of the Prime Minister's announcement in October 2023 that phase 2 was being abandoned and therefore had failed in their responsibilities and that the sanction for this should be the discharge of the whole interim injunction.

27. I asked the Claimants' counsel to point the Court to the evidence, after the Prime Minister's announcement, that protesters were still going to take direct action against the HS2 land involved in phase 2A, the purple land, on which no construction work will be carried out in future because the project had been cancelled. The Claimants identified Core Bundle pages 152-155. This amounted to little more than announcements on social media of self-congratulation by a few campaigners (for instance Lousy Badger), a desire for a party at Bluebell Wood (CPL) and a call to continue to fight to persuade the Government to scrap phase 1 of the project.

The Law

28. I will set out the key points from the relevant case law put before me below. In *National Highways v PUs, Rodger and 132 Ors* [2023] EWCA Civ. 182, the claimant applied for summary judgment and final (quia timet, what we fear) injunctions, having obtained interim injunctions. The trial Judge granted summary judgment against various defendants found in contempt but not against 109 defendants who had not entered defences and were not individually identified as past tortfeasors. This was overturned on appeal. For an anticipatory injunction, whether interim or final, proof of a past tort by the individual Defendant is not a pre-requisite. The normal rules apply. So, for summary judgment, the normal application of CPR r.24.2 applied and for the quia timet (what we fear) injunction, the normal thresholds applied. The President of the KBD ruled thus:

> "40. The test which the judge should have applied in determining whether to grant summary judgment for a final anticipatory injunction was the standard test under CPR Part 24.2, namely whether the defendants had no real prospect of successfully defending the claim. In applying that test, the fact that (apart from the three named defendants to whom we have referred) none of the defendants served a defence or any evidence or otherwise engaged with the proceedings, despite being given ample opportunity to do so, was not, as the judge thought, irrelevant, but of considerable relevance, since it supported NHL's case that the defendants had no real prospect of successfully defending the claim for an injunction at trial.
>
> 41. It is no answer to the failure to serve a defence or any evidence that, as the judge seems to have thought (see [35(5)] of the judgment), the defendants' general attitude was of disinterest in Court proceedings. Whatever the motive for the silence before the judge, it was indicative of the absence of any arguable defence to the claim for a final injunction. Certainly it was not for the judge to speculate as to what defence might be available. That is an example of impermissible "Micawberism" which is deprecated in the authorities, most recently in *King v Stiefel*. If the judge had applied the right test under CPR 24.2 and had had proper regard

> to CPR 24.5, he would and should have concluded that none of the 109 named defendants had any realistic prospect of successfully defending the claim at trial and that accordingly, NHL was entitled to a final injunction against those defendants."

29. In *TfL v Lee & PUs & Ors* [2023] EWHC 402, Cavanagh J. was considering renewal of a PU injunction about roads and Just Stop Oil protesters. He ordered an expedited trial. He then considered the extension of the interim injunction. He accepted and adopted Freeman J.'s judgment on the earlier review and asked himself this question:

> "20. … The real issue before me, therefore, is whether the evidence of events that have taken place since 31 October 2022 provides grounds for declining to extend the injunction on materially identical terms.
> 21. The answer is that there are no such grounds. The activities of JSO have continued, albeit with a change of tactics, and in my judgment the justification for interim injunctive relief to restrain unlawful activities on the JSO roads is as great as it has ever been."

30. Since the extension of the HS2 interim injunction in May 2023 the Supreme Court has passed judgment in *Wolverhampton City Council v London Gypsies* [2023] UKSC 47. This clarified that PU or newcomer injunctions can be granted on an interim or final basis subject to clear conditions and restraints. I summarised the guidance recently in *Valero Energy v PUs & Bencher & Ors* [2024] EWHC 134. I was considering both a summary judgment application and a final PU/named Defendants injunction. At paras. 57 – 60 I ruled thus:

> "57. I conclude from the rulings in Wolverhampton that the 7 rulings in *Canada Goose* remain good law and that other factors have been added. To summarise, in summary judgment applications for a final injunction against unknown persons ("PUs") or newcomers, who are protesters of some sort, the following 13 guidelines and rules must be met for the injunction to be granted. These have been imposed because a final injunction against PUs is a nuclear option in civil law akin to a temporary piece of legislation affecting all citizens in England and Wales for the future so must be used only with due safeguards in place.
> 58. **(A) Substantive Requirements**
> **Cause of action**
> (1) There must be a civil cause of action identified in the claim form and particulars of claim. The usual quia timet (since he fears) action relates to the fear of torts such as trespass, damage to property, private or public nuisance, tortious interference with trade contracts, conspiracy with consequential damage and on-site criminal activity.

Full and frank disclosure by the Claimant

(2) There must be full and frank disclosure by the Claimant (applicant) seeking the injunction against the PUs.

Sufficient evidence to prove the claim

(3) There must be sufficient and detailed evidence before the Court on the summary judgment application to justify the Court finding that the immediate fear is proven on the balance of probabilities and that no trial is needed to determine that issue. The way this is done is by two steps. Firstly stage (1), the claimant has to prove that the claim has a realistic prospect of success, then the burden shifts to the defendant. At stage (2) to prove that any defence has no realistic prospect of success. In PU cases where there is no defendant present, the matter is considered ex-parte by the Court. If there is no evidence served and no foreseeable realistic defence, the claimant is left with an open field for the evidence submitted by him and his realistic prospect found at stage (1) of the hearing may be upgraded to a balance of probabilities decision by the Judge. The Court does not carry out a mini trial but does carry out an analysis of the evidence to determine if it the claimant's evidence is credible and acceptable. The case law on this process is set out in more detail under the section headed "The Law" above.

No realistic defence

(4) The defendant must be found unable to raise a defence to the claim which has a realistic prospect of success, taking into account not only the evidence put before the Court (if any), but also, evidence that a putative PU defendant might reasonably be foreseen as able to put before the Court (for instance in relation to the PU s civil rights to freedom of speech, freedom to associate, freedom to protest and freedom to pass and repass on the highway). Whilst in *National Highways* the absence of any defence from the PUs was relevant to this determination, the Supreme Court's ruling in *Wolverhampton* enjoins this Court not to put much weight on the lack of any served defence or defence evidence in a PU case. The nature of the proceedings are "ex-parte" in PU cases and so the Court must be alive to any potential defences and the Claimants must set them out and make submissions upon them. In my judgment this is not a "Micawber" point, it is a just approach point.

Balance of convenience - compelling justification

(5) In interim injunction hearings, pursuant to *American Cyanamid v Ethicon* [1975] AC 396, for the Court to grant an interim injunction against a defendant the balance of convenience and/or justice must weigh in favour of granting the injunction. However, in PU cases, pursuant to *Wolverhampton*, this balance is angled against the applicant to a greater extent than is required usually, so that there must

be a "compelling justification" for the injunction against PUs to protect the claimant's civil rights. In my judgment this also applies when there are PUs and named defendants.

(6) The Court must take into account the balancing exercise required by the Supreme Court in *DPP v Ziegler* [2021] UK.SC 23, if the PUs' rights under the *European Convention on Human Rights* (for instance under Articles 10(2) and 11(2)) are engaged and restricted by the proposed injunction. The injunction must be necessary and proportionate to the need to protect the Claimants' right.

Damages not an adequate remedy

(7) For the Court to grant a final injunction against PUs the claimant must show that damages would not be an adequate remedy.

(B) Procedural Requirements - Identifying PUs

(8) The PUs must be clearly and plainly identified by reference to: (a) the tortious conduct to be prohibited (and that conduct must mirror the torts claimed in the Claim Form), and (b) clearly defined geographical boundaries, if that is possible.

The terms of the injunction

(9) The prohibitions must be set out in clear words and should not be framed in legal technical terms (like "tortious" for instance). Further, if and in so far as it seeks to prohibit any conduct which is lawful viewed

on its own, this must also be made absolutely clear and the claimant must satisfy the Court that there is no other more proportionate way of protecting its rights or those of others.

The prohibitions must match the claim

(10) The prohibitions in the final injunctions must mirror the torts claimed (or feared) in the Claim Form.

Geographic boundaries

(11) The prohibitions in the final injunctions must be defined by clear geographic boundaries, if that is possible.

Temporal limits - duration

(12) The duration of the final injunction should be only such as is proven to be reasonably necessary to protect the claimant's legal rights in the light of the evidence of past tortious activity and the future feared (quia timet) tortious activity.

Service

(13) Understanding that PUs by their nature are not identified, the proceedings, the evidence, the summary judgment application and the draft order must be served by alternative means which have been considered and sanctioned by the Court. The applicant must, under the *Human Rights Act 1998* S.12(2), show that it has taken all practicable steps to notify the respondents.

The right to set aside or vary

> (14) The PUs must be given the right to apply to set aside or vary the injunction on shortish notice.
>
> **Review**
>
> (15) Even a final injunction involving PUs is not totally final. Provision must be made for reviewing the injunction in the future. The regularity of the reviews depends on the circumstances. Thus such injunctions are "Quasi-final" not wholly final.
>
> 59. Costs and undertakings may be relevant in final injunction cases but the Supreme Court did not give guidance upon these matters."

31. Before me is a quia timet interim injunction. The Claimants had to and still have to prove a real and imminent risk of serious harm caused by tortious or criminal activity on their land, see *Canada Goose v PUs* [2020] EWCA Civ. 303, per Sir Terence Etherton MR at para. 82(3) (approved in *Wolverhampton*).

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

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

34. In relation to the issue of whether final quia timet injunctions can be granted against PUs, the Court of Appeal in *Canda Goose* ruled that they could not be granted (para. 89) in a protester case against persons unknown who were not parties at the date of the final order, since a final injunction operated only between the parties to the proceedings. The Supreme Court in *Wolverhampton* overruled this decision. At para. 134 they together stated:

> "134. Although we do not doubt the correctness of the decision in Canada Goose, we are not persuaded by the reasoning at paras 89-93, which we summarised at para 103 above. In addition to the criticisms made by the Court of Appeal which we have summarised at para 107

above, and with which we respectfully agree, we would make the following points."

At para 143 they ruled as follows:

"143. The distinguishing features of an injunction against newcomers are in our view as follows:
(i) They are made against persons who are truly unknowable at the time of the grant, rather than (like Lord Sumption's class 1 in *Cameron*) identifiable persons whose names are not known. They therefore apply potentially to anyone in the world.
(ii) They are always made, as against newcomers, on a without notice basis (see para 139 above). However, as we explain below, informal notice of the application for such an injunction may nevertheless be given by advertisement.
(iii) In the context of Travellers and Gypsies they are made in cases where the persons restrained are unlikely to have any right or liberty to do that which is prohibited by the order, save perhaps Convention rights to be weighed in a proportionality balance. The conduct restrained is typically either a plain trespass or a plain breach of planning control, or both.
(iv) **Accordingly, although there are exceptions, these injunctions are generally made in proceedings where there is unlikely to be a real dispute to be resolved, or triable issue of fact or law about the claimant's entitlement, even though the injunction sought is of course always discretionary. They and the proceedings in which they are made are generally more a form of enforcement of undisputed rights than a form of dispute resolution.**
(v) Even in cases where there might in theory be such a dispute, or a real prospect that article 8 rights might prevail, the newcomers would in practice be unlikely to engage with the proceedings as active defendants, even if joined. This is not merely or even mainly because they are newcomers who may by complying with the injunction remain unidentified. Even if identified and joined as defendants, experience has shown that they generally decline to take any active part in the proceedings, whether because of lack of means, lack of pro bono representation, lack of a wish to undertake costs risk, lack of a perceived defence or simply because their wish to camp on any particular site is so short term that it makes more sense to move on than to go to court about continued camping at any particular site or locality.
(vi) By the same token the mischief against which the injunction is aimed, although cumulatively a serious threatened invasion of the claimant's rights (or the rights of the neighbouring public which the

> local authorities seek to protect), is usually short term and liable, if terminated, just to be repeated on a nearby site, or by different Travellers on the same site, so that the usual processes of eviction, or even injunction against named parties, are an inadequate means of protection.
>
> (vii**) For all those reasons the injunction (even when interim in form) is sought for its medium to long term effect even if time-limited, rather than as a means of holding the ring in an emergency, ahead of some later trial process, or even a renewed interim application on notice (and following service) in which any defendant is expected to be identified, let alone turn up and contest.**
>
> (viii) Nor is the injunction designed (like a freezing injunction, search order, Norwich Pharmacal or Bankers Trust order or even an anti-suit injunction) to protect from interference or abuse, or to enhance, some related process of the court. Its purpose, and no doubt the reason for its recent popularity, is simply to provide a more effective, possibly the only effective, means of vindication or protection of relevant rights than any other sanction currently available to the claimant local authorities.
>
> 144. Cumulatively those distinguishing features leave us in no doubt that the injunction against newcomers is a wholly new type of injunction with no very closely related ancestor from which it might be described as evolutionary offspring, although analogies can be drawn, as will appear, with some established forms of order. It is in some respects just as novel as were the new types of injunction listed in sub-paragraph (viii) above, and it does not even share their family likeness of being developed to protect the integrity and effectiveness of some related process of the courts." (My emboldening).

Furthermore at para. 167 they ruled that:

> "167. These considerations lead us to the conclusion that, although the attempts thus far to justify them are in many respects unsatisfactory, there is no immoveable obstacle in the way of granting injunctions against newcomer Travellers, on an essentially without notice basis, regardless of whether in form interim or final, either in terms of jurisdiction or principle."

35. It is clear from this passage that quia timet injunctions against PUs, relating to private land owned or possessed by a claimant, are different beasts from old fashion injunctions against known defendants which need to be taken to trial. They do not "hold the ring pending trial". They are an end in themselves for the short or the medium term and may

never lead to service of defences from the PUs, whether or not the PUs become crystallised as Defendants.

Changes in the law

36. Just before and since the interim injunction was extended, new offences relating to protesters and others were created as follows. They are in the *Public Order Act 2023.*

> **"6. Obstruction etc of major transport works**
>
> (1) A person commits an offence if the person—
>
> (a) obstructs the undertaker or a person acting under the authority of the undertaker—
>
> (i) in setting out the lines of any major transport works,
>
> (ii) in constructing or maintaining any major transport works, or
>
> (iii) in taking any steps that are reasonably necessary for the purposes of facilitating, or in connection with, the construction or maintenance of any major transport works, or
>
> (b) interferes with, moves or removes any apparatus which—
>
> (i) relates to the construction or maintenance of any major transport works, and
>
> (ii) belongs to a person within subsection (5).
>
> (2) It is a defence for a person charged with an offence under subsection (1) to prove that—
>
> (a) they had a reasonable excuse for the act mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b) of that subsection, or
>
> (b) the act mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b) of that subsection was done wholly or mainly in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute.
>
> (3) A person who commits an offence under subsection (1) is liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for a term not exceeding the maximum term for summary offences, to a fine or to both.
>
> (4) In subsection (3) "the maximum term for summary offences" means—
>
> (a) if the offence is committed before the time when section 281(5) of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 (alteration of penalties for certain summary offences: England and Wales) comes into force, six months;
>
> (b) if the offence is committed after that time, 51 weeks.
>
> (5) The following persons are within this subsection—
>
> (a) the undertaker;
>
> (b) a person acting under the authority of the undertaker;
>
> (c) a statutory undertaker;
>
> (d) a person acting under the authority of a statutory undertaker.

(6) In this section "major transport works" means—

(a) works in England and Wales—

(i) relating to transport infrastructure, and

(ii) the construction of which is authorised directly by an Act of Parliament, or

(b) works the construction of which comprises development within subsection (7) that has been granted development consent by an order under section 114 of the Planning Act 2008.

(7) Development is within this subsection if—

(a) it is or forms part of a nationally significant infrastructure project within any of paragraphs (h) to (l) of section 14(1) of the Planning Act 2008,

(b) it is or forms part of a project (or proposed project) in the field of transport in relation to which a direction has been given under section 35(1) of that Act (directions in relation to projects of national significance) by the Secretary of State, or

(c) it is associated development in relation to development within paragraph (a) or (b)."

…

"7. Interference with use or operation of key national infrastructure

(1) A person commits an offence if—

(a) they do an act which interferes with the use or operation of any key national infrastructure in England and Wales, and

(b) they intend that act to interfere with the use or operation of such infrastructure or are reckless as to whether it will do so.

(2) It is a defence for a person charged with an offence under subsection (1) to prove that—

(a) they had a reasonable excuse for the act mentioned in paragraph (a) of that subsection, or

(b) the act mentioned in paragraph (a) of that subsection was done wholly or mainly in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute.

(3) A person who commits an offence under subsection (1) is liable—

(a) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding the general limit in a magistrates' court, to a fine or to both;

(b) on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months, to a fine or to both.

(4) For the purposes of subsection (1) a person's act interferes with the use or operation of key national infrastructure if it prevents the infrastructure from being used or operated to any extent for any of its intended purposes.

> (5) The cases in which infrastructure is prevented from being used or operated for any of its intended purposes include where its use or operation for any of those purposes is significantly delayed.
> (6) In this section "key national infrastructure" means—
> (a) road transport infrastructure,
> (b) rail infrastructure,
> (c) air transport infrastructure,
> (d) harbour infrastructure,
> (e) downstream oil infrastructure,
> (f) downstream gas infrastructure,
> (g) onshore oil and gas exploration and production infrastructure,
> (h) onshore electricity generation infrastructure, or
> (i) newspaper printing infrastructure.
> Section 8 makes further provision about these kinds of infrastructure."

Submissions

37. The Claimants submitted that the Act of 2021 (phase 2A) remains in force, despite the Government announcement on the 4th of October 2023 that construction would not go ahead on phase 2. In addition, the high speed rail link between Crewe and Manchester was covered by a bill that was still in the Parliamentary process. The second Claimant had acquired 60% of the phase 2A land and had not announced what it was going to do with it. The Claimants relied on the evidence from Mr Groves and Mr Dobson and asserted that the routewide injunction had reduced unlawful protests and reduced the wasted costs paid by the taxpayer from spending of around £100 million to spending of around £100,000. The Claimants accepted there had been no major direct action since the 17th of March 2023, there had only been isolated incidents, but they submitted this showed that the injunction was working not that it should be terminated. There were individual protests by urban explorers, drone flyers and some "freeman of the land" groups. It was submitted that the Claimants should not lose the protection of the injunction on the purple land just because the injunction had been effective, that would be self defeating.

38. In response, D6 submitted that circumstances had changed since the granting and renewal of the routewide injunction. Firstly, the Government announcement took away the very sub strata for the injunction covering the purple land of phase 2A. It was submitted that the campaigners had "won", that they had no continued interest in phase 2A and therefore the injunction should no longer cover it. No written evidence or submission was made that the injunction should not be renewed for the blue part of the track, phase 1, which is currently under construction, although an en-passant verbal attempt was so made in the hearing. Furthermore, D6 submitted that new criminal offences had been created in the *Public Order Act,* in sections 7 and 6, which meant

that there was no need for the continuation of the civil injunction. It was submitted that the Claimants had an alternative remedy through the *Public Order Act*. Thirdly, it was submitted that the Claimants had substantially broken their duty to the Court of full and frank disclosure, which is required during the life of an injunction which is anticipatory and against newcomers/PUs, because the Claimants had failed to inform the Court of the Prime Minister's announcement until finally making the application in March 2023. That failure, it was submitted, should lead the Court to refuse to deploy its equitable power to continue the injunction. Further, it was submitted that it was inappropriate for the Claimants to "warehouse" the action against the named Defendants and the PUs and to fail to seek a final hearing. It was submitted that warehousing is contrary to the Civil Procedure Rules and is an abuse of process. In addition, D6 submitted that the claim against D6 should be struck out because the Claimants now admitted that the Claimants had no continuing cause of action against D6 or any good reason to pursue the injunction any further. Alternatively, D6 submitted that the Claimants should have issued a notice of discontinuance under CPR Part 38 which would have led to a liability for costs under CPR rule 38.6, unless the Court ordered otherwise. No notice of discontinuance having been issued D6 submitted that the claim against D6 should be struck out.

Changes to material matters

39. In my judgment, there have been clear and obvious changes which are material to the interim injunction. Firstly, phase 2A to Crewe is no longer going ahead. Nor is 2B to Manchester and Leeds. This means that no construction will take place on the purple and the orange land. This takes away the primary objective of the anti-HS2 protesters in relation to that land. Secondly, there are new criminal offences which will deter and punish protesters taking direct action, with penalties including imprisonment. Thirdly, some HS2 protesters have been imprisoned for breaching the injunction. Fourthly, no protester has applied for a final hearing.

Applying the law to the facts

40. I shall consider each of the requirements for granting and, where necessary, continuing an interim injunction in turn.

(A) Substantive Requirements -

Cause of action

41. In this case there is a civil cause of action identified in the claim form and particulars of claim. A quia timet (since he fears) action is pleaded and relates to the fear of torts such as trespass, damage to property, private and public nuisance, potential tortious interference with trade contracts and on-site criminal activity. The Claimants have proven, to the satisfaction of previous judges, under the enhanced test for injunctive remedies against PUs, that previous torts (and potentially crimes) have been committed on HS2 land and proven that their fears were justified. Previous interim injunctions have been granted routewide. This condition is satisfied.

Full and frank disclosure by the Claimants

42. There has mostly been full and frank disclosure by the Claimants seeking the injunction renewal against the PUs, save that there has been delay informing the Court about the Prime Minister's announcement. That delay amounts to about 4 months. I must ask: what would the Court have done if informed in November or December about the announcement, alongside an application for a review hearing? It is likely that, taking into account the alternative service requirements necessary for PUs and Defendants, the hearing would have been listed before a High Court judge at some time in the late Winter of 2023 or Spring of 2024. In the event the application was made in March 2024 and listed in May 2024. Whilst not as serious as the default in *Ineos v PUs* [2022] EWHC 684 (Ch), this delay was inappropriate and I shall take it into account when considering the equitable remedy below.

No realistic defence

43. The Defendants have not yet been required to enter any formal defence, although some did before Knowles J. for the hearing of the application for the routewide interim injunction and many emailed their case to the Court. None have put forwards a defence to any of the past tortious or criminal actions. This, as anticipated or summarised by the Supreme Court in *Wolverhampton* is not unusual in protester PU injunction cases.

Sufficient evidence to prove the claim/likely to succeed at trial and compelling justification

44. The Claimants provided sufficient evidence to prove their claim before Knowles J. The test which I must apply when considering continuing the injunction is more than whether there is a serious issue to be tried. This is a contra mundum (against the world) PU injunction. So the test is whether the Claimants are likely to succeed at trial against the PUs and the Defendants and that there is a compelling reason for granting or continuing the interim injunction. I am aware, of course, that Julian Knowles J. has already made that finding on the evidence before him and that I renewed it in May 2023 using the same test, but that was then and this is now. This is a review. Circumstances have changed. I am not at all convinced that the Claimants will succeed at trial in relation to the purple land on the evidence before me. If the evidence had been sufficient, on the balance of probabilities, to find that the Claimants are likely to be awarded an injunction at trial over the purple land, this Court must then take into account the balancing exercise required by the Supreme Court in *DPP v Ziegler* [2021] UK.SC 23. The PUs' rights under the *European Convention on Human Rights* (for instance under Articles 10(2) and 11(2)) are engaged and may be restricted by the extension of the injunction. Julian Knowles J. has also considered and ruled on that point. It is crucial to remember that I am dealing mainly but not wholly with private land. I take into account that the injunction must be necessary and proportionate to the need to protect the Claimants' rights. I take into account that the Government is no longer pursuing the purple route. I take into account that there are now specific criminal offences in S.s 6 and 7 of the *Public Order Act 2023* to punish and deter protesters

from interfering with national infrastructure, only one of which was in force when I last renewed the injunctions. Whether or not a protestor in future, entering phase 2A land on which no HS2 project construction is taking place or will ever again take place, but intent on causing loss by interfering with the effort to rewild or restore the land or to sell it, would be sufficient to justify a renewed injunction, will be a matter for another Judge dependent on the facts. I have no sufficient evidence before me which goes to show that the remaining 5 Defendants or any anti HS2 PUs wish to interfere with: rewilding or restoration, deconstruction of any HS2 construction, HS2 selling land back to previous or new owners or otherwise disposing of the purple or orange land. Quite the opposite. As the Claimants assert, many of the anti HS2 phase 2 protesters, who themselves consider that they have won, are engaged in supporting other causes. The situation is quite different for phase 1. There has been no question of any win for the anti HS2 protesters there.

45. I have carefully considered the evidence put before the Court by the Claimants. I summarised much of it, but not all, above. I also take into account the evidence accepted and found by Knowles J. Standing back, the current evidence consists of a recognition that the protestors feel that they have won in relation to stopping the construction on the purple land of phase 2A. Their motivation for using direct action against that has gone. Such future action will not delay any construction works. It is no longer a construction project on the purple land. In addition, the evidence of quia timet (what we fear) is watery, thin, scattered geographically (some of the relied on events were in London) and un-compelling. Naked ramblers, children setting up tented camps for a few hours, some graffiti and some anti-law/establishment groups are included, but these are hardly enough, in my judgment, to prove a substantial and real fear of imminent and serious harm through direct action on the purple land. I do not accept, even from experienced security experts, that the mere assertion of fear is enough. It must be logically based and it must be sufficiently evidenced. Nor do I consider that the postings of crowing or gloating by some protesters about their perceived success on phase 2A and the need to continue vaguely against HS2 generally, bites on the purple land sufficiently. The past and the recent evidence does however support the continued injunction covering the construction works in phase 1.

Damages not an adequate remedy

46. In my judgment the Claimants continue to show that damages would not be an adequate remedy in relation to their phase 1 construction work on the blue land. They have not shown that this threshold is still justified for the purple land upon which no construction is being carried out.

(B) Procedural Requirements -

Identifying PUs

47. In my judgment, in the draft injunction, the PUs are clearly and plainly identified by reference to: (a) the tortious conduct to be prohibited (and that conduct mirrors the

torts claimed in the particulars of claim (as re-amended) and (b) clearly defined geographical boundaries. Subject to the purple land being excluded from the extended interim injunction this requirement is satisfied.

The terms of the injunction

48. In my judgment, the prohibitions remain set out in clear words and are not framed in legal technical terms. Further, they do not seek to prohibit conduct which viewed on its own is lawful. In my judgment they should be extended to cover drone flying which is likely to interfere with any construction work or operations carried out by the first Claimant and is dangerously close to such works.

The prohibitions must match the claim

49. In my judgment the prohibitions in the extended injunction mirror the torts claimed (or feared) in the re-amended particulars of claim. The pleading will need re amendment to cover drones.

Geographic boundaries

50. The prohibitions in the injunctions to be extended are defined by clear geographic boundaries, but shall be altered to cover only the phase 1 blue land, not the phase 2 purple land.

Temporal limits - duration

51. The duration of the injunction is to be extended by 12 months. In the light of the continued HS2 construction of phase 1, I am satisfied that it is proven to be compellingly necessary to protect the Claimants' legal rights in the light of the evidence of past hugely extensive tortious activity and the future feared (quia timet) tortious activity for the HS2 construction work on phase 1.

Service

52. Because PUs are, by their nature, not identified, the proceedings, the evidence, this judgment and the order will be served by the alternative means which have been previously considered and sanctioned by this Court. I consider that under the *Human Rights Act 1998* S.12(2), the Claimants have previously shown that they have taken all practicable steps to notify the Defendants.

The right to set aside or vary

53. The PUs are given the right to apply to set aside or vary the injunction on shortish notice by the existing interim injunction and this will continue.

Review

54. In the extended order I shall make provision for reviewing the injunction in the future. The regularity of the reviews depends on the circumstances and I consider that 12 months is the right length of time.

Conclusion on the extension application and balance of convenience

55. I do not consider that there are compelling reasons to continue the injunction over the purple land or that the balance of convenience test is satisfied for the purple land. For the reasons set out above I do not consider that the injunction should be extended in future in relation to the purple HS2 land acquired or possessed for the purposed of phase 2A. In summary, the reasons are that this part of the project has been abandoned; there are alternative remedies because the new *Public Order Act* provisions are in place; the evidence provided to the Court did not reach the required level to show a real and imminent need, in part because the protesters' motivation to take direct action against the purple land has gone and in part because taking direct action against purple land would not cause disruption to the construction works for the HS2 project, it would cause peripheral nuisance. In addition, the Claimants have failed fully to comply with their clear duty to inform the Court of material change which occurred when the Prime Minister announced phase 2A would not be built.

Removing various Defendants as parties.

56. Because none of the 13 Defendants to be released has made any submissions to this Court, despite due alternative service of the application and because the Claimants are content on their own information to release them and no further costs orders are sought against them, I give permission for the above listed 13 Defendants to be removed as parties to the proceedings, save in relation to D6 who I shall consider below. I dispense with the need for the Claimants to file a Notice of Discontinuance pursuant to CPR 38.3(1)(a) for the 13 Defendants and make an order under CPR 6.28 dispensing with service of a Notice of Discontinuance. I note that Morris J. took a different route in *Tfl v PUs* & *Ors* [2023] EWHC 1038, and took that into account.

Removing D6 as a party

57. Whilst in actions in which there are only a few Defendants the procedure in Part 38 should clearly be followed. In PU injunction claims with multiple defendants, different and more flexible procedures are being developed by the Courts to bind and yet to safeguard PUs, add and then release defendants and to streamline costs. So far, many Defendants have been deleted from this claim. Some have been added. Another 13 have just been deleted with my permission in the previous paragraph. D6, wishes to be different. He has objected to any more simple method. He requires the Claimants to serve a formal Notice of Discontinuance. His rationale was nothing more than the desire for his own costs of the claim to be paid. I suspect also a desire to increase the Claimants' costs. I dealt with the costs of the hearing at the hearing so, because D6 had succeeded on the purple land point, I awarded some costs to D6 against the Claimants. Inter alia I reduced counsel's brief fee (which included the skeleton) from £18,000 to £5,000. There was no need for a Notice of Discontinuance to enable this Court to award costs for succeeding on that issue. So, the rationale for the submission was without weight in relation to costs. CPR r.38.2 requires a claimant to seek the permission of the Court to discontinue where the Court has granted an interim injunction. This the Claimants did, via their witness statements and skeleton, a formal method but not in

accordance with CPR r.38.3, which sets out the procedure and is mandatory for discontinuance. A form N279 notice is required. In this case I do not consider that such formality assists. Of the 65 named Defendants, 60 have now been removed. It has been efficient to remove and add Defendants at the various reviews. So, to the extent that it is necessary, I grant the Claimants relief from sanctions and expressly permit the Claimants to delete D6 as a Defendant to the claim and the injunction without the need for a notice. D6 had notice in the application notice anyway. No other Defendant has objected. I also bear in mind that this Court could have removed D6 as a party at the start of the hearing and then heard argument on whether he should have been heard at all on the substantive issues, but I considered that it was helpful and just to have a voice for the Defendants and the PUs at the hearing. I therefore dispense with the need for the Claimants to file a Notice of Discontinuance pursuant to CPR 38.3(1)(a) in respect of D6 and make an order under CPR 6.28 dispensing with service of any Notice of Discontinuance.

Should the claim be brought to a final hearing?

58. There is no summary judgment application made by the Claimants. I set out the law above and in particular highlighted in bold passages from the Supreme Court on the nature of these injunctions concerning private land against PUs. I have carefully considered whether D6 was right, in submissions, to assert that such claims, against named Defendants (as distinct from PUs only claim) should be brought to trial with reasonable expedition. It was submitted that claims against named Defendants should not be left on the shelf or in the warehouse. However, no Defendant has made use of the power granted to them in the May 2023 Order I made to bring the case to trial. I take into account that it is normally the Claimants' responsibility to follow through to trial with the claim which they issued. However, in claims for possession of land where a final order for possession has been granted and the trespassers have been removed, there is no longer a need for another order. What then should be done about the interim injunction? Should it be brought to a final hearing? This would usually be answered: "yes". But in claims against PUs only and claims against named defendants and PUs, different factors apply. The Claimants have been and are required to keep the list of Defendants under review. When some have been (1) evicted, or (2) proven in contempt and imprisoned, or (3) have withdrawn or truthfully disavowed their previous intention to engage in unlawful direct action, the Claimants have properly released them from the action with this Court's permission. Others have given undertakings. Procedurally, it would be a nonsense to take the actions to a final hearing for a final injunction, based on the past tortious actions of the evicted ex-Defendants and proven contemnors, who have already been released as parties. As for the claims against the 5 remaining Defendants, if they had wished to be released from the action, they could have applied to bring the action to final determination, or asked the Claimants to be released, but have not. I see little point in requiring the Claimants to go to trial against them when the basis remains quia timet, only to have them submit at trial, that the released ex-Defendants were the tortfeasors, not them. The real mischief being addressed is the Claimants' need for protection from the PUs. That is fully satisfied on a continuing

basis already by the interim injunction. I would see the merit of requiring a final hearing if the test for the interim injunction was merely a "serious issue to be tried", but in these PU claims the test is higher. It is "likely to succeed at trial". So, in relation to the burden of proof, there is no injustice in the absence of a final injunction, so long as each Defendant has the right to apply for a final hearing. In addition, the reviews give each the opportunity to gain release from the action by applying for that.

59. I shall not be making a direction requiring the Claimants to bring the claim to trial or to finality through a summary judgment application or directing defences to be filed and served, disclosure and evidence. I do not see the need for it to achieve justice in this claim. I do not seek to lay down any general rule by this decision.

Variations to the terms of the injunction

60. Certain variations were requested to the terms of the injunction for the extension. I give permission for those which were not in dispute and are necessary.

61. The potential Defendant, D69, had been identified and there was a request to add him to the claim but he signed an undertaking so I do not have to consider that application.

62. There was a typing error in the May 2023 injunction relating to service of the review papers, which should be corrected.

Conclusion

63. I shall extend the interim injunction for 12 months. It will be limited to the phase 1 works and land. I do not consider that the Claimants should be required to bring the action to finality. D6 is released from the claim and the injunction. I invite the Claimants to draft the necessary orders and directions and to submit them before 31.5.2024.

ANNEX A

SCHEDULE OF DEFENDANTS 7-65

DEFENDANT NUMBER	NAMED DEFENDANTS
(7)	**Ms Leah Oldfield**
(8)	Not Used
(9)	Not Used
(10)	Not Used
(11)	Not Used
(12)	Not Used
(13)	Not Used
(14)	Not Used
(15)	Not Used

(16)	**Ms Karen Wildin (aka Karen Wilding / Karen Wilden / Karen Wilder)**
(17)	**Mr Andrew McMaster (aka Drew Robson)**
(18)	Not Used
(19)	Not Used
(20)	**Mr George Keeler (aka C Russ T Chav / Flem)**
(21)	Not Used
(22)	**Mr Tristan Dixon (aka Tristan Dyson)**
(23)	Not Used
(24)	Not Used
(25)	Not Used
(26)	Not Used
(27)	**Mr Lachlan Sandford (aka Laser / Lazer)**
(28)	**Mr Scott Breen (aka Scotty / Digger Down)**
(29)	Not Used
(30)	Not Used
(31)	Not Used
(32)	Not Used
(33)	**Mr Elliot Cuciurean (aka Jellytot)**
(34)	Not Used
(35)	Not Used
(36)	**Mr Mark Keir**
(37)	Not Used
(38)	Not Used
(39)	**Mr Iain Oliver (aka Pirate)**
(40)	Not Used
(41)	Not Used
(42)	Not Used
(43)	Not Used
(44)	Not Used
(45)	Not Used
(46)	Not Used
(47)	Not Used
(48)	**Mr Conner Nichols**
(49)	Not Used
(50)	Not Used
(51)	Not Used
(52)	Not Used
(53)	Not Used

(54)	Not Used
(55)	Not Used
(56)	Not Used
(57)	**Ms Samantha Smithson (aka Swan / Swan Lake)**
(58)	**Mr Jack Charles Oliver**
(59)	**Ms Charlie Inskip**
(60)	Not Used
(61)	Not Used
(62)	Not Used
(63)	**Mr Dino Misina (aka Hedge Hog)**
(64)	**Stefan Wright (aka Albert Urtubia)**
(65)	Not Used

END