

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW1

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

CLAIM NO: KB-2024-002317

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION
ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:-

(1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED

AND THREE OTHERS

- v -



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

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

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

BEFORE The Honourable Mr Justice Ritchie sitting at the Royal Courts of Justice, the Strand, London on 18 July 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form issued on 16 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' ex-parte application for an injunction issued on 16 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the first witness statements: of Alexander James Wright dated 16 July 2024, 17 July 2024, (another) 17 July 2024; and 18 July 2024, Vincent Hodder dated 15 July 2024, Nicholas Jones dated 16 July 2024 and Alberto Martin dated 15 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**").

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

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

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

DEFINITIONS

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

"Warning Notice" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order (and warning of the existence and general nature of this Order, the consequences of breaching it, identifying a point of contact and contact details from which copies of the Order may be requested and identifying the website address

<https://www.leedsbradfordairport.co.uk/injunction>. at which copies of this Order may be viewed and downloaded).

NOW IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the First Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of Leeds Bradford Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the First Claimant.
2. This Order is subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the First Claimant at intervals not exceeding 12 months and if such review does not take place the Order expires at 4pm on the anniversary of this Order.

SERVICE

3. Pursuant to CPR 6.15, 6.27, and r. 81.4(2)(c) and (d), the First Claimant shall take the following steps by way of service of copies of the Claim Form, the Application, and Witness Statements with their exhibits (“**the Claim Documents**”) and this Order upon the First Defendant:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website:
<https://www.leedsbradfordairport.co.uk/injunction>.
 - b. Sending an email to each of the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order (1) stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above and (2) attaching this Order.
 - c. Affixing a notice at those locations marked with an “X” on Plan 1 setting out where the Claim Documents and this Order can be found and obtained in hard copy in the form of Schedule 4.
4. Within 2 working days of receipt of the sealed Order, it shall be provided to Reuters news agency so that it can be used by press organisations to publicise its existence.
5. The taking of such steps set out at paragraph 3 and 4 shall be good and sufficient service of this Order and of the Claim Documents upon the First Defendant and each of them.
6. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the First Claimant’s solicitors for service (whose details are set out below).

7. The deemed date of service of the Claim Documents shall be the date shown on the relevant certificate of service on completion of the steps described at paragraph 3. The step described at paragraph 3(c) will be completed when those notices are first affixed.
8. The deemed date of service of this Order shall be the date shown on the relevant certificate of service on completion of the steps described at paragraph 3 and 4. The step described at paragraphs 3(c) will be completed when those notices are first affixed.

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

9. Service on the First Defendant of any further applications or documents in the proceedings by the First Claimant shall be effected by carrying out each of the steps in paragraph 3.
10. Anyone may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge this Order or so much of it as affects that person but they must first give the First Claimant's solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by email to the First Claimant's solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Roger Hallam, Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified (in so far as that is possible) by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and this Order by email addressed to them at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the First Claimant's solicitors.
13. The First Claimant has liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

Ritchie J

Made 19 July 2024

NOTES

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE FIRST CLAIMANT

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


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

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

(3) Alexander Wright
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
alexwright@eversheds-sutherland.com
07500 578620

Leeds Bradford Airport - Plan 1

Amended by The Hon. Mr Justice Ritchie under the Slip Rule CPR 40.12
dated 19.07.2024, 2nd amendment to schedule 1 made 22.7.2024



Yeadon

Map scale 1:10,000

Assumes printed map area measures 315mm by 272mm.

**ORBITAL
WITNESS**

SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE FIRST CLAIMANT

- (1) The First Claimant will take steps to serve the First Defendant with a note of the hearing which took place on 18 July 2024 by 1 August 2024.
- (2) The First Claimant will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 – EMAIL ADDRESSES

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

SCHEDULE 4 – WARNING NOTICE

High Court Injunction in Force

NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 18 JULY 2024 (“the Order”)

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

FROM: Leeds Bradford Airport Limited (the “**First Claimant**”)

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

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

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

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

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

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 18 July 2024 may be viewed at: <https://www.leedsbradfordairport.co.uk/injunction>

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



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION
ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:-

(2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED

AND THREE OTHERS



- v -

KB-2024-002317

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

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

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

BEFORE The Honourable Mr Justice Ritchie sitting at the Royal Courts of Justice, the Strand, London on 19 July 2024.

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form issued on 16 July 2024.

AND UPON the Claimants' ex parte application for an injunction issued on 16 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the witness statements of: Alexander James Wright dated 16 July 2024, dated 17 July 2024, (and another) 17 July 2024 and dated 18 July 2024; Vincent Hodder dated 15 July 2024; Nicholas Jones dated 16 July 2024 and Alberto Martin dated 15 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**").

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

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

AND UPON the Second Claimant informing the Court that any requests from those wishing to carry out peaceful protest to designate an area for that purpose at London Luton Airport, as defined by this Order, should be made by email to protestrequest@ltn.aero.

DEFINITIONS

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

"Warning Notice" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order (and warning of the existence and general nature of this Order, the consequences of breaching it, identifying a point of contact and contact details from which copies of the Order may be requested and identifying the website address <https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/lla-publications/injunction> at which copies of this Order may be viewed and downloaded.

NOW IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the Second Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of London Luton Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Second Claimant.
2. This Order is subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the Second Claimant at intervals not exceeding 12 months and if such review does not take place the Order expires at 4pm on the anniversary of this Order.

SERVICE

3. Pursuant to CPR 6.15, 6.27, and r. 81.4(2)(c) and (d), the Second Claimant shall take the following steps by way of service of copies of the Claim Form, the Application, and Witness Statements with their exhibits (“**the Claim Documents**”) and this Order upon the Second Defendant:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website: <https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/lla-publications/injunction>.
 - b. Sending an email to the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above and attaching this Order.
 - c. Affixing a notice at those locations marked with an “X” on Plan 2 setting out where the Claim Documents and this Order can be found and obtained in hard copy in the form in Schedule 4.
4. Within 2 working days of receipt of the sealed Order, it shall be provided to Reuters news agency so that it can be used by press organisations to publicise its existence.
5. The taking of such steps set out at paragraphs 3 and 4 shall be good and sufficient service of this Order and of the Claim Documents upon the Second Defendant and each of them.
6. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the Second Claimant’s solicitors for service (whose details are set out below).
7. The deemed date of service of the Claim Documents shall be the date shown on the relevant certificate of service on completion of the steps described at paragraph 3. The step described at paragraph 3(c) will be completed when those notices are first affixed.

8. The deemed date of service of this Order shall be the date shown on the relevant certificate of service on completion of the steps described at paragraph 3. The step described at paragraphs 3(c) will be completed when those notices are first affixed.

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

9. Service on the Second Defendant of any further applications or documents in the proceedings by the Second Claimant shall be effected by carrying out each of the steps in paragraph 3.
10. Anyone may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge this Order or so much of it as affects that person but they must first give the Second Claimant's solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by writing to the Second Claimant's solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Roger Hallam, Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified (in so far as that is possible) by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and this Order by email addressed to them at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the Second Claimant's solicitors.
13. The Second Claimant has liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

Ritchie J

Made 19 July 2024

NOTES

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE SECOND CLAIMANT

The Second Claimant's solicitors and their contact details are:

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


07712 881 393

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

(3) Alexander Wright
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
alexwright@eversheds-sutherland.com
07500 578620

SCHEDULE 1

London Luton Airport - Plan 2



**ORBITAL
WITNESS**

SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE SECOND CLAIMANT

- (1) The Second Claimant will take steps to serve the Second Defendant with a note of the hearing which took place on 18 July 2024 by 1 August 2024.
- (2) The Second Claimant will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 – EMAIL ADDRESSES

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

SCHEDULE 4 – WARNING NOTICE

High Court Injunction in Force

NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 18 JULY 2024 (“the Order”)

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

FROM: London Luton Airport Operations Limited (the “**Second Claimant**”)

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

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


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

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

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

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 18 July 2024 may be viewed at: <https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/lla-publications/injunction>

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



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KINGS BENCH DIVISION
ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE

BETWEEN:-

(3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
(4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

AND TWO OTHERS



- v -

KB-2024-002317

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

AND TWO OTHERS

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

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

ANY OTHER PERSON WHO KNOWS OF THIS ORDER AND DOES ANYTHING WHICH HELPS OR PERMITS THE DEFENDANTS OR ANY OF THEM TO

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

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

BEFORE The Honourable Mr Justice Ritchie on 18 July 2024

UPON the Claimants' claim by the Claim Form issued on 16 July 2024

AND UPON the Claimants' ex parte application for an injunction issued on 16 July 2024 ("**the Application**")

AND UPON READING the Application and the witness statements of: Alexander James Wright dated 16 July 2024, 17 July 2024, (and another) 17 July 2024, dated 18 July 2024, Vincent Hodder dated 15 July 2024, Nicholas Jones dated 16 July 2024 and Alberto Martin dated 15 July 2024 ("**the Witness Statements**")

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

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

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

DEFINITIONS

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

"Warning Notice" means a notice in the form as set out in Schedule 4 to this Order (and warning of the existence and general nature of this Order, the consequences of breaching it, identifying a point of contact and contact details from which copies of the Order may be requested and identifying the website address <https://www.newcastleairport.com/about-your-airport/airport-company/injunction/> at which copies of this Order may be viewed and downloaded).

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. With immediate effect, unless varied, discharged or extended by further order, the Third Defendant and each of them are forbidden from entering, occupying or remaining on any part of Newcastle International Airport for the purpose of protesting about fossil fuels or the environment without the prior consent of the Third and Fourth Claimants (or either of them).
2. This Order is subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the Third and Fourth Claimants at intervals not exceeding 12 months and if such review does not take place the Order expires at 4pm on the anniversary of this Order.

SERVICE

3. Pursuant to CPR 6.15, 6.27, and r. 81.4(2)(c) and (d), the Third and Fourth Claimants shall take the following steps by way of service of copies of the Claim Form, the Application, and Witness Statements with their exhibits (“**the Claim Documents**”) and this Order upon the Third Defendant:
 - a. Uploading a copy onto the following website:
<https://www.newcastleairport.com/about-your-airport/airport-company/injunction/>
 - b. Sending an email with this Order attached to the email addresses listed in Schedule 3 to this Order stating that a claim has been brought and an application made, and that the documents can be found at the website referred to above.
 - c. Affixing a notice at those locations marked with an “X” on Plan 3 setting out where these documents can be found and obtained in hard copy in the form of Schedule 4.
4. Within 2 working days of receipt of the sealed Order, it shall be provided to Reuters so that it can be used by press organisations to publicise its existence.
5. The taking of such steps set out at paragraph 3 shall be good and sufficient service of this Order and of the Claim Documents upon the Third Defendant and each of them.
6. The Court will provide sealed copies of this Order to the Third and Fourth Claimants’ solicitors for service (whose details are set out below).

7. The deemed date of service of the Claim Documents shall be the date shown on the relevant certificate of service on completion of the steps described at paragraph 3. The step described at paragraph 3(c) will be completed when those notices are first affixed.
8. The deemed date of service of this Order shall be the date shown on the relevant certificate of service on completion of the steps described at paragraphs 3. The step described at paragraphs 3(c) will be completed when those notices are first affixed.

FURTHER DIRECTIONS

9. Service on the Third Defendant of any further applications or documents in the proceedings by the Third and Fourth Claimants shall be effected by carrying out each of the steps in paragraph 3.
10. Anyone may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge this Order or so much of it as affects that person but they must first give the Third and Fourth Claimants' solicitors 72 hours' notice of such application by email to StuartWortley@eversheds-sutherland.com. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be communicated in writing or by email to the Third and Fourth Claimants' solicitors at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.
11. Roger Hallam, Phoebe Plummer and/or Indigo Rumbelow shall be notified by being sent a link to the Claim Documents and this Order by email addressed to them at the addresses in Schedule 3 to this Order as soon as practicable.
12. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service to the Third and Fourth Claimants' solicitors.
13. The Third and Fourth Claimants (or either of them) have liberty to apply to vary, extend or discharge this Order or for further directions.
14. No acknowledgment of service, admission or defence is required by any party until further so ordered.
15. Costs are reserved.

Ritchie J

Made 19.7.2024

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE THIRD AND FOURTH CLAIMANTS

The Third and Fourth Claimants' solicitors and their contact details are:

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

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

(3) Alexander Wright
Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP
alexwright@eversheds-sutherland.com
07500 578620

SCHEDULE 1

Newcastle International Airport - Plan 3



**ORBITAL
WITNESS**

**SCHEDULE 2 - UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN BY THE THIRD AND FOURTH
CLAIMANTS**

- (1) The Third and Fourth Claimants will take steps to serve the Third Defendant with a note of the hearing which took place on 18 July 2024 by 1 August 2024.
- (2) The Third and Fourth Claimants will comply with any order for compensation which the Court might make in the event that the Court later finds that the injunction in paragraph 1 of this Order has caused loss to a Defendant and the Court finds that the Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.

SCHEDULE 3 – EMAIL ADDRESSES

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

SCHEDULE 4 – WARNING NOTICE

High Court Injunction in Force**NOTICE OF HIGH COURT ORDER DATED 18 JULY 2024 ("the Order")**

TO: PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT ON THE PREMISES AT NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 3 TO THE CLAIM FORM (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE) AND WHO ENTER UPON THOSE PREMISES; AND PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO PROTEST ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT ON THOSE PREMISES (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE) (the "**Defendants**")

FROM: Newcastle International Airport Limited and NIAL Services Limited (the "**Third and Fourth Claimants**")

This notice relates to the land known as Newcastle International Airport which is shown edged red on the Plan below (the "**Airport**")

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

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


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

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

The Order, copies of the Claim Documents which relate to the Order and a note of the hearing on 18 July 2024 may be viewed at:

<https://www.newcastleairport.com/about-your-airport/airport-company/injunction/>

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



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW2

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

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

BEFORE: THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE BOURNE

ON: 24 June 2025

B E T W E E N : -

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED**
(2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
(3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
(4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED



Claimants

-and-

KB-2024-002317

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

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

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

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

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

UPON the injunction made by Order dated 19 July 2024 by Ritchie J (“**the Ritchie J Order**”)

AND UPON the Claimants’ application dated 2 June 2025

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

AND UPON reading the application and the witness evidence in support

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Ritchie J Order shall remain in full force and effect subject to the amendment referred to in paragraph 2 below (and subject to review, as provided for in paragraph 2 of the Ritchie J Order).

2. Paragraph 2 of the Ritchie J Order is amended so as to read:

“This Order is subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the First Claimant at intervals not exceeding 12 months and if such review does not take place the Order expires at 4pm on the anniversary of this Order. If such review takes place, it shall be heard with the review of any injunctions made in all or any of the Claims, with a time estimate of 1 day.”

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

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

BEFORE: THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE BOURNE

ON: 24 June 2025

B E T W E E N : -

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED**
(2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
(3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
(4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED



Claimants

-and-

KB-2024-002317

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

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

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

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

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

UPON the injunction made by Order dated 19 July 2024 by Ritchie J (“**the Ritchie J Order**”)

AND UPON the Claimants’ application dated 2 June 2025

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

AND UPON reading the application and the witness evidence in support

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Ritchie J Order shall remain in full force and effect subject to the amendment referred to in paragraph 2 below (and subject to review, as provided for in paragraph 2 of the Ritchie J Order).

2. Paragraph 2 of the Ritchie J Order is amended so as to read:

“This Order is subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the First Claimant at intervals not exceeding 12 months and if such review does not take place the Order expires at 4pm on the anniversary of this Order. If such review takes place, it shall be heard with the review of any injunctions made in all or any of the Claims, with a time estimate of 1 day.”

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

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

BEFORE: THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE BOURNE

ON: 24 June 2025

B E T W E E N : -

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED**
(2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
(3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
(4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED



Claimants

-and-

KB-2024-002317

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

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

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

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

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

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS

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

UPON the injunction made by Order dated 19 July 2024 by Ritchie J (“**the Ritchie J Order**”)

AND UPON the Claimants’ application dated 2 June 2025

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

AND UPON reading the application and the witness evidence in support

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Ritchie J Order shall remain in full force and effect subject to the amendment referred to in paragraph 2 below (and subject to review, as provided for in paragraph 2 of the Ritchie J Order).

2. Paragraph 2 of the Ritchie J Order is amended so as to read:

“This Order is subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the First Claimant at intervals not exceeding 12 months and if such review does not take place the Order expires at 4pm on the anniversary of this Order. If such review takes place, it shall be heard with the review of any injunctions made in all or any of the Claims, with a time estimate of 1 day.”

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

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW3

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

Case No: KB-2024-001765

Neutral Citation Number: [2025] EWHC 2223 (KB)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand
London, WC2A 2LL

Wednesday, 26th August 2025

BEFORE:

MR JUSTICE BOURNE

BETWEEN:

LONDON CITY AIRPORT LTD & ORS

Claimants

- and -

PERSONS UNKNOWN

Defendants

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

JUDGMENT

(Approved)

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

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

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

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

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

“...will give all parties an opportunity to make full and complete disclosure to the court, supported by appropriate evidence as to how effective the order has been, whether any reasons or grounds for its discharge has emerged, whether there is any proper justification for continuance; and whether and on what basis, a further order ought to be made.”
10. In *High Speed Two (HS2) Ltd & Anor v Persons Unknown* [2024] EWHC 1277 (KB), Richie J described the court’s task at a review hearing:

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

unlawful attacks, the extension may be granted so long as procedural and legal rigour has been observed and fulfilled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lower Ground, 46 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JE

Email: civil@epiqglobal.co.uk

This transcript has been approved by the Judge

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW4

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



Injunction

On 19 July 2024, the High Court granted us an injunction, which prohibits anyone from entering, occupying or remaining on Leeds Bradford Airport in connection with protesting about fossil fuels or the environment (whether in connection with Just Stop Oil or Extinction Rebellion or other campaign) without our permission.

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

1. [Sealed Order](#)
2. [Hearing Bundle](#)
3. [Skeleton Argument](#)
4. [Note of the Hearing](#)

2025 – Extension Application

On 24 June 2025, the High Court extended the injunction. Documents relating to the review hearing are available here.

1. [Supplemental Hearing Bundle](#)
2. [Chronology](#)
3. [Skeleton Argument for Review Hearing](#)
4. [Sealed Order 24.06.2025](#)
5. [Judgment](#)

[ABOUT](#) ▾[CAREERS](#) ▾[SUSTAINABILITY](#) ▾[CORPORATE](#) · [LLA PUBLICATIONS](#) · [INJUNCTION](#)

Injunction

On 18 July 2024, the High Court granted an injunction which prohibits anyone from entering, occupying or remaining on London Luton Airport in connection with the Just Stop Oil campaign (or any other environmental campaign) without our permission.

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

Documents relating to the Injunction can be found on the following links on this page.

Injunction Application 2024

[Sealed Order 2024](#)

[Sealed Order granting permission to amend Claim Form etc.](#)

[Amended Claim Form](#)

[Plans 1-3 to the Claim Form](#)

[Amended Particulars of Claim](#)

[Hearing Bundle](#)

[Alex Wright - Second Witness Statement](#)

[Alex Wright - Third Witness Statement](#)

[Alex Wright - Fourth Witness Statement](#)

[Skeleton Argument](#)

[Note of the Hearing](#)

Extension Application 2025

On 24 June 2025, the High Court extended the injunction.

Documents relating to the review hearing are available below.

[Sealed Order 2025](#)

[Supplemental Hearing Bundle](#)

[Claimant's Skeleton Argument](#)

[Claimant's Chronology](#)

[Airport Injunction Renewal Transcript](#)



Injunction

Injunction

[Court Order 16.07.24](#)

[The hearing Bundle Part 1](#)

[The hearing Bundle Part 2](#)

[The hearing Bundle Part 3](#)

[Skeleton Argument](#)

[Notes of the hearing](#)

2025 Renewal Hearing

[Court Order 24.06.25](#)

[Supplemental hearing Bundle](#)

[Skeleton Argument](#)

[Chronology](#)

[Transcript of the Judgement](#)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-


PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW5


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



Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database rights 2024

Map scale 1:10,000
Assumes printed map area measures 315mm by 272mm.

ORBITAL
WITNESS



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW6

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

Owen, Elin

From: Wright, Alexander
Sent: 09 June 2026 15:58
To: enquiries@extinctionrebellion.co.uk; juststopoilpress@protonmail.com; info@juststopoil.org; juststopoil@protonmail.com
Subject: Leeds Bradford Airport, London Luton Airport and Newcastle International Airport Injunction - Order from 2025 Review Hearing (24 June 2025)
Attachments: Leeds Bradford Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329804.1).pdf; London Luton Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329807.1).pdf; Newcastle International Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329809.1).pdf

To whom it may concern

We write further to the first review hearing heard by Bourne J on 24 June 2025 (“**the First Review Hearing**”) in respect of the injunctions granted in these proceedings by Order dated 19 July 2024 by Ritchie J.

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

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

Airport	Action Number	Webpage address
Leeds Bradford Airport	KB-2024-2317	Injunction Leeds Bradford Airport
London Luton Airport		Injunction London Luton Airport
Newcastle International Airport		Injunction

Regards

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

T: +44 161 831 8582

M: +44 7500 578 620

www.linkedin.com/in/alexwrighteversheds

www.eversheds-sutherland.com

Eversheds Sutherland

Helping our clients, our people and our communities to thrive

Owen, Elin

From: Wright, Alexander
Sent: 09 June 2026 16:02
To: enquiries@extinctionrebellion.uk
Subject: Leeds Bradford Airport, London Luton Airport and Newcastle International Airport Injunction - Order from 2025 Review Hearing (24 June 2025)
Attachments: Leeds Bradford Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329804.1).pdf; London Luton Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329807.1).pdf; Newcastle International Airport - Injunction Review Hearing Order 2025 (Bourne J 24.06.25)(252329809.1).pdf

To whom it may concern

We write further to the first review hearing heard by Bourne J on 24 June 2025 (“**the First Review Hearing**”) in respect of the injunctions granted in these proceedings by Order dated 19 July 2024 by Ritchie J.

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

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

Airport	Action Number	Webpage address
Leeds Bradford Airport	KB-2024-2317	Injunction Leeds Bradford Airport
London Luton Airport		Injunction London Luton Airport
Newcastle International Airport		Injunction

Regards

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

T: +44 161 831 8582

M: +44 7500 578 620

www.linkedin.com/in/alexwrighteversheds

www.eversheds-sutherland.com

Eversheds Sutherland

Helping our clients, our people and our communities to thrive

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants


AJW7

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

Schedule 1 3

Leeds Bradford Airport - Plan 1

Amended by The Hon. Mr. Justice Ritchie under the Slip Rule CPR 40.12 dated 19.07.2024, 2nd amendment to schedule 1 made 22.7.2024



**ORBITAL
WITNESS**

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database rights 2024

Map scale 1:10,000


Assumes printed map area measures 315mm by 272mm.




London Luton Airport - Plan 2

**ORBITAL
WITNESS**

Contains OS data © Crown copyright and database rights 2024



Newcastle International Airport - Plan 3



**ORBITAL
WITNESS**



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW8

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

OFFICIAL



LONDON LUTON AIRPORT BYELAWS

July 2025

OFFICIAL

LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED

BYELAWS 2025

CONTENTS

PART 1	DEFINITIONS, INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION	2
PART 2	INTERFERENCE WITH AIRPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND AIRPORT ACTIVITIES.....	7
PART 3	COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROPER FUNCTIONING OF THE AIRPORT	8
PART 4	RESTRICTED ACCESS.....	9
PART 5	IDENTITY PASSES.....	9
PART 6	ALCOHOL, DRUGS AND INTOXICATION.....	10
PART 7	OFFENSIVE BEHAVIOUR.....	10
PART 8	PROHIBITED BEHAVIOUR.....	11
PART 9	LITTER AND WASTE.....	12
PART 10	ANIMALS.....	13
PART 11	UNAUTHORISED TRADE	13
PART 12	SMOKING AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES	13
PART 13	PROHIBITED ACTS INVOLVING VEHICLES ON PARTS OF THE AIRPORT TO WHICH THE ROAD TRAFFIC ENACTMENTS DO NOT APPLY	14
PART 14	PROHIBITED ACTS INVOLVING VEHICLES ON ALL PARTS OF THE AIRPORT	14
PART 15	LAWFUL REMOVAL OF VEHICLES FROM THE AIRPORT	16
PART 16	TAXIS & PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES.....	16
PART 17	AIRSIDE OPERATIONS.....	16
PART 18	LOST PROPERTY	18
PART 19	AIRPORT EXCLUSION.....	20
PART 20	PENALTIES.....	21
PART 21	REVOCATION OF EARLIER BYELAWS	21

OFFICIAL

London Luton Airport Operations Limited, in exercise of the powers conferred on it by sections 63 and 64 of the Airports Act 1986, and in accordance with all other requirements, approvals and powers enabling it in that regard hereby makes the following byelaws which shall apply within the Airport.

PART 1 DEFINITIONS, INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION

1.1 In these byelaws the following words shall have the following meanings:

- 1.1.1 **“Aeronautical Information Publication”** means the publication issued or otherwise made available by the United Kingdom’s en-route air navigation service provider which sets out aeronautical information essential to air navigation in the United Kingdom;
- 1.1.2 **“Aircraft”** means a heavier than air power driven flying machine and includes, but is not limited to, aeroplane (land plane), aeroplane (seaplane), aeroplane (amphibian), aeroplane (self-launching motor glider), powered lift (tilt rotor) and rotorcraft (helicopter and gyroplane);
- 1.1.3 **“Aircraft Operator”** means in relation to any Aircraft the person who at the relevant time manages the operations of that Aircraft;
- 1.1.4 **“Aircraft Passenger”** means a person attending, or intending to attend, the Airport for the purpose of being carried on board an Aircraft which undertakes a flight that departs from, or arrives at, the Airport (except if that person is a member of the flight crew or cabin staff operating that Aircraft);
- 1.1.5 **“Airport”** means the area constituting London Luton Airport shown edged in red on the map at Schedule 1 of these byelaws;
- 1.1.6 **“Airport Infrastructure”** means all buildings, structures, fixtures, fittings, services, cables, pipes, drains and other conduits, (whether portable or fixed) at the Airport including, but not limited to:
 - 1.1.6.1 radio and other navigational aids for the purpose of controlling, guiding or assisting the operation of Aircraft either at the Airport or serving the Airport;
 - 1.1.6.2 walls, fences, railings, gates and barriers;
 - 1.1.6.3 lighting columns and lights;
 - 1.1.6.4 car park cameras, pay machines and entry or exit barriers;
 - 1.1.6.5 road traffic, no-waiting and unloading signs and other wayfinding;
 - 1.1.6.6 parking infringement enforcement equipment including cameras, Vehicles, automatic number plate recognition systems, and other equipment used for such purposes;
 - 1.1.6.7 public seating;
 - 1.1.6.8 fittings and equipment within toilets to which the public have access;
 - 1.1.6.9 fire alarm, fire detection, fire prevention, and fire-fighting equipment;

OFFICIAL

- 1.1.6.10 closed circuit television cameras;
- 1.1.6.11 baggage handling equipment;
- 1.1.6.12 x-ray machines, conveyor systems, and all other equipment used for the purposes of security;
- 1.1.6.13 any Vehicle used in connection with the operation of the Airport and any of its services or facilities;
- 1.1.6.14 doors, escalators, lifts, and conveyor belts;
- 1.1.6.15 telephone, radio, or other apparatus provided for transmitting and receiving messages;
- 1.1.6.16 check-in desk and boarding gate desk equipment; and
- 1.1.6.17 gas pipes, gas outlets, electric cables, fuse boxes and electric outlets;
- 1.1.7 **"Airport Equipment"** means all equipment, machinery, tools and Vehicles utilised by or on behalf of LLA, or another person, in connection with the operation of the Airport;
- 1.1.8 **"Airport Manager"** means a person employed or otherwise engaged by LLA as an "airport manager", or in a senior management or executive position, from time to time;
- 1.1.9 **"Airport Official"** means a person:
 - 1.1.9.1 employed or otherwise engaged by LLA, or by a contractor to LLA (including LLA's appointed air traffic controller), to work at the Airport from time to time;
 - 1.1.9.2 a person employed or otherwise engaged by Border Force or HM Revenue & Customs at the Airport from time to time; or
 - 1.1.9.3 a person otherwise authorised by LLA from time to time to act as an "airport official";
- 1.1.10 **"Airside"** means such parts of the Airport which are within the Security Perimeter from time to time, including those parts of a Public Terminal within the Security Perimeter and all gates, stands, aprons, taxiways and runways;
- 1.1.11 **"Airside Entrance Point"** means each part of the Airport as is designated by LLA from time to time (or a person authorised by LLA) for use as an entrance to an Airside location from a Landside location;
- 1.1.12 **"Airside Exit Point"** means each part of the Airport as is designated by LLA from time to time (or a person authorised by LLA) for use as an exit from an Airside location to a Landside location;
- 1.1.13 **"Animal"** means any animal, wild or domesticated, that is brought into the Airport;
- 1.1.14 **"Border Control Area"** each part of the Airport designated by LLA from time to time as a "border control area", including all areas in which border control and immigration checks

OFFICIAL

and functions are undertaken by UK Border Force;

- 1.1.15 **"Car Park"** means any area of the Airport designated by LLA:
- 1.1.15.1 for use by the public to wait in, or park, Vehicles; or
 - 1.1.15.2 in which Vehicles are permitted to be used by the public to drop off or pick up any person;
- 1.1.16 **"Compliance Authority Identity Pass"** a valid and in date identification pass issued to a person who is categorised as Compliance Authority Personnel, which is issued in accordance with the requirements of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1998 of 5 November 2015 and the Single Consolidated Direction (Aviation) 2/2021;
- 1.1.17 **"Compliance Authority Personnel"** has the meaning set out in the Single Consolidated Direction (Aviation) 2/2021;
- 1.1.18 **"Constable"** means any person attested as such pursuant to section 29 of the Police Act 1996;
- 1.1.19 **"Crew Identity Pass"** a valid and in date crew identification pass issued to a member of crew working for an Aircraft operator operating at the Airport, which is issued in accordance with the requirements of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1998 of 5 November 2015 (and if the crew identification pass is issued by a UK registered airline, also in accordance with the Single Consolidated Direction (Aviation) 2/2021);
- 1.1.20 **"Customs Area"** each part of the Airport designated by LLA from time to time as a "customs area", including all areas in which customs checks and functions are undertaken by HM Revenue & Customs;
- 1.1.21 **"Emergency Services"** means the police, security, military, fire and ambulance services;
- 1.1.22 **"Emergency Vehicle"** means any Vehicle in use for operational purposes by any of the Emergency Services;
- 1.1.23 **"Exempt Person"** means a person who at the then current time:
- 1.1.23.1 is an Aircraft Passenger;
 - 1.1.23.2 holds a Crew Identity Pass; or
 - 1.1.23.3 holds a Compliance Authority Identity Pass;
- 1.1.24 **"Exclusion Notice"** means a written notice directing that a person not enter the Airport during the Exclusion Period set out in that written notice;
- 1.1.25 **"Exclusion Period"** such period, which may be indefinite, during which a person may not enter the Airport in accordance with byelaw 19.5, as determined by the Airport Manager or Constable issuing the relevant Exclusion Notice in accordance with byelaw 19.3;
- 1.1.26 **"Hazardous Substance"** means any substance (whether solid, liquid or gaseous) which is:
- 1.1.26.1 capable of causing an actionable nuisance whether alone or in combination

OFFICIAL

with one or more others; or

- 1.1.26.2 capable of polluting the environment or causing harm to human health, any living organism, ecosystem or property (including hydrocarbons);
- 1.1.27 “**ID Centre**” means the part of the Airport designated by LLA to be used in connection with the issue and collection of Identity Passes;
- 1.1.28 “**Identity Pass**” means a valid and in date Airport identification pass issued by LLA (or a person authorised by LLA) to the person identified on that identity pass;
- 1.1.29 “**Landside**” means such parts of the Airport which are not within the Security Perimeter from time to time;
- 1.1.30 “**LLA**” means London Luton Airport Operations Limited or its successors as operator of the Airport;
- 1.1.31 “**Lost Property Agent**” a person appointed by LLA to administer the collection and processing of Lost Property (and any other person engaged by that person to carry out such functions);
- 1.1.32 “**Lost Property**” means any item which is found on any part of the Airport operated by, or on behalf of, LLA, that is both unattended by a person who owns (or is otherwise in possession) of that item; and which does not have a proper purpose for being situated in the location in which it is found, but excluding:
- 1.1.32.1 any Vehicle;
- 1.1.32.2 any item found:
- 1.1.32.2.1 on board an Aircraft,
- 1.1.32.2.2 in a Vehicle not operated by or on behalf of LLA, or
- 1.1.32.2.3 on premises sublet to another person; or
- 1.1.32.3 any item that appears to have been thrown away, or otherwise discarded, as refuse;
- 1.1.33 “**Lost Property Office**” means the area designated by LLA for the collection of Lost Property;
- 1.1.34 “**Night**” means each period commencing at 23:00 on a day and ending at 07:00 on the following day;
- 1.1.35 “**NOTAM**” means a notice issued or otherwise made available by the United Kingdom’s en-route air navigation service provider containing information concerning the establishment, condition or change in any aeronautical facility, service, procedure or hazard concerned with flight operations;
- 1.1.36 “**Notice**” means any method or means (whether fixed or moveable) of conveying warnings, information, requirements, terms, restrictions or prohibitions of any description including signs, display screens, road markings and written communications, issued by or on behalf of LLA, an Airport Official or a Constable;

OFFICIAL

- 1.1.37 **"Permission"** means the prior consent given by, or on behalf of, LLA (and such consent may include, where the context permits, permissions given verbally or in writing by Airport Officials, permissions set out in Notices, or consents or permission set out in agreements, permits, licences or leases entered into with, or issued by, LLA);
- 1.1.38 **"Pilot"** in relation to an Aircraft means the member of the flight crew designated as commander of that Aircraft by the relevant Aircraft Operator, or, if there is no such person, the person who is at the then current time the pilot in command of that Aircraft;
- 1.1.39 **"Private Hire Vehicle"** means a vehicle licensed by an appropriate licensing authority under section 48 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 to be utilised as a private hire vehicle;
- 1.1.40 **"Public Terminal"** means the building or buildings at the Airport operated by LLA from which Aircraft Passengers transfer to and from Aircraft;
- 1.1.41 **"Regulator Standards"** means all standards, directions, rules, guidelines and codes (including "civil aviation publications") from time to time issued by the Civil Aviation Authority, UK Border Force, the Health and Safety Executive, the Department for Transport, and of any other relevant regulatory authority which apply to the operation of, or activities at, the Airport;
- 1.1.42 **"Road Traffic Enactments"** has the same meaning as in section 63(3) of the Airports Act 1986;
- 1.1.43 **"Security Area"** means each part of the Airport designated by LLA from time to time as a "security area", including all areas in which security screening and checking functions are undertaken by, or on behalf of, LLA;
- 1.1.44 **"Security Perimeter"** means the security perimeter at the Airport (as designated by LLA) which separates Airside locations (including "critical parts") from Landside locations;
- 1.1.45 **"Taxi"** means a hackney carriage licensed by the appropriate licensing authority under section 37 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 to be utilised to ply for hire within an area that includes the Airport; and
- 1.1.46 **"Vehicle"** means any mechanically or manually propelled vehicle or machinery, or any wheeled apparatus designed to be towed by another vehicle, including cars, vans, lorries, mobile homes, mobile plant, caravans, motorbikes, scooters, bicycles and trailers.
- 1.2 These byelaws may be cited as the London Luton Airport Byelaws 2025.
- 1.3 These byelaws shall apply throughout the Airport, except to the extent otherwise set out in these byelaws.
- 1.4 In these byelaws:
- 1.4.1 the inclusion of a byelaw under a particular heading does not limit the scope of that byelaw to the subject matter of the heading; and
- 1.4.2 in every case where a byelaw permits a person to commit an act or omission if Permission is granted to that person, it shall be a breach of that byelaw if that act is committed, or that

OFFICIAL

omission occurs, contrary to the terms or extent of that Permission.

- 1.5 No provision in these byelaws shall apply to any Airport Official or any member of the Emergency Services when acting properly in the course of their duty, or to any Vehicle or Emergency Vehicle being used by any Airport Official or any member of the Emergency Services acting properly in the course of their duty.
- 1.6 In any proceedings concerning a defendant's contravention of these byelaws, it shall be a defence to prove that at the time of such contravention that the defendant:
- 1.6.1 was an Airport Official or a member of the Emergency Services acting properly in the course of their duty; or
- 1.6.2 was acting properly upon the instruction or with the authority of an Airport Official or a Constable.

PART 2 INTERFERENCE WITH AIRPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND AIRPORT ACTIVITIES

- 2.1 No person, without Permission, shall operate, or interfere with, any Airport Infrastructure or Airport Equipment, or attempt to do so.
- 2.2 No person, without Permission, shall enter into any area in which construction works are being undertaken, or otherwise interfere with any construction works or attempt to do so.
- 2.3 No person shall damage, tamper with, intentionally or recklessly misuse, or intentionally or recklessly prevent the normal operation of, any Airport Infrastructure or Airport Equipment.
- 2.4 No person shall activate or use any alarm, emergency stop control switch or lever, emergency door release, fire-fighting equipment, or emergency equipment other than for a reasonable and proper purpose.
- 2.5 No person shall enter, attempt to enter or mount, or use any Airport Equipment or Airport Infrastructure, other than in the ordinary course of its use and for a reasonable and proper purpose.
- 2.6 No person shall operate or use any radio transmitter, or other thing capable of radiating or generating electrical interference, in such a way as to interfere with the operation of any Aircraft, Airport Infrastructure or Airport Equipment, other than with Permission (and only then, in the ordinary course of its use and for a reasonable and proper purpose).
- 2.7 No person, without Permission, shall undertake any works of construction, maintenance or repair to any Airport Infrastructure or Airport Equipment.
- 2.8 No person, without Permission, shall operate or use any item of Airport Infrastructure or Airport Equipment that that person knows, or ought reasonably to know, is in an unsafe condition.
- 2.9 No person shall take any baggage trolley, pushchair, wheelchair, or other mobility aid provided by LLA (or a person authorised by LLA) outside of the Airport, or leave or store any such item of equipment other than in a location designated by LLA (or a person authorised by LLA) for that purpose.
- 2.10 No person, without Permission, shall deface, displace, move, remove, or otherwise interfere with any Notice or advertisement.

OFFICIAL

- 2.11 No person, without Permission, shall operate, or cause to be operated, any vehicle, drone or aircraft which is unmanned (whether operated autonomously or controlled remotely).
- 2.12 No person, without Permission, shall climb any building, structure, wall, fence, barrier, railing, post, ladder or tower.
- 2.13 No person, without Permission, shall erect or place any structure, apparatus, container or equipment within three meters of the Security Perimeter.

PART 3 COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROPER FUNCTIONING OF THE AIRPORT

- 3.1 No person, without Permission, shall fail to comply with:
 - 3.1.1 any reasonable instruction given to them by an Airport Official or by a Constable in connection with the proper functioning of the Airport (including the operation of an Aircraft);
 - 3.1.2 all Regulator Standards; and
 - 3.1.3 all Notices which are applicable to that person, or the activities undertaken, or intended to be undertaken, by that person.
- 3.2 No person shall fail to state their correct name, address and purpose for being at the Airport upon request by an Airport Official or Constable.
- 3.3 No Aircraft Passenger shall fail to produce on demand to an Airport Official or Constable:
 - 3.3.1 proof of that Aircraft's Passenger's entitlement to be carried on board an Aircraft which is scheduled to undertake, or has undertaken, a flight that departs from, or arrives at, the Airport; and
 - 3.3.2 a form of photographic identification issued by a national authority confirming that Aircraft Passenger's identity.
- 3.4 No person shall fail to immediately evacuate a part of the Airport if:
 - 3.4.1 instructed to do so by an Airport Official, a member of the Emergency Services or by Notice; or
 - 3.4.2 if an alarm is sounded to evacuate that part of the Airport.
- 3.5 No person shall obstruct an Airport Official or a member of the Emergency Services from acting properly in the course of their duty.
- 3.6 No person shall fail to submit to a personal search, or to a search of their belongings, Vehicle, or any other item under their control, on demand by an Airport Official or Constable, if that Airport Official or Constable:
 - 3.6.1 has a reasonable suspicion that the individual is about to commit, has committed or is committing a criminal offence (including a breach of these byelaws); or
 - 3.6.2 that search is properly required to be undertaken by that Airport Official or Constable in the course of their duty.

OFFICIAL

- 3.7 No person (without lawful excuse) shall fail to immediately remove from the Airport a Vehicle, Animal, or item which has been brought into the Airport by that person:
- 3.7.1 if its presence is forbidden by Notice; or
 - 3.7.2 after having been instructed to remove it from the Airport by an Airport Official or a member of the Emergency Services.
- 3.8 No person (without lawful excuse) shall fail to immediately move a Vehicle, Animal or item brought into the Airport by that person, to such other part of the Airport as an Airport Official or member of the Emergency Services directs.

PART 4 RESTRICTED ACCESS

- 4.1 No person, without Permission, shall enter, or attempt to enter, an Airside location other than through an Airside Entrance Point (except if such entry occurs whilst being carried on board an Aircraft landing at the Airport).
- 4.2 No person, without Permission, shall exit, or attempt to exit, an Airside location other than through an Airside Exit Point (except if such exit occurs whilst being carried on board an Aircraft taking off from the Airport).
- 4.3 No person shall fail to submit themselves, or any items in their possession, for any properly conducted security checks, procedures or screening conducted by an Airport Official or a Constable.
- 4.4 No person, without Permission, shall enter or remain in an Airside location other than for a reasonable and proper purpose.
- 4.5 No person, without Permission, shall take an item into, or otherwise cause an item to enter or be left in, an Airside location, if that item, or type of item, is designated by LLA as being prohibited from being taken into, or otherwise entering, an Airside location.

PART 5 IDENTITY PASSES

- 5.1 LLA may at any time, at its discretion:
- 5.1.1 issue an Identity Pass to any person; or
 - 5.1.2 remove or revoke an Identity Pass issued to any person;
- and shall not be liable to any person for any loss or damage arising as a consequence of LLA's issue, removal or revocation of an Identity Pass in accordance with these byelaws.
- 5.2 No person (other than an Exempt Person) shall enter, remain or work in any Airside location, unless:
- 5.2.1 that person holds an Identity Pass which permits that person access to the relevant Airside location, or
 - 5.2.2 that person is escorted at all times by another person with an Identity Pass that permits that other person access to the relevant Airside location.
- 5.3 No person, without Permission, may escort another person in any Airside location.

OFFICIAL

- 5.4 No person who holds an Identity Pass, Crew Identity Pass or Compliance Authority Identity Pass shall fail at all times to wear, each such pass at chest or shoulder height on outer clothing whilst present at the Airport.
- 5.5 No person, to the extent requested by an Airport Official or a Constable, shall fail to surrender or produce on demand an Identity Pass held by that person to that Airport Official or Constable.
- 5.6 No person who is issued with an Identity Pass shall fail to inform an Airport Official working in the ID Centre as soon as practicable if that Identity Pass is lost or stolen.
- 5.7 No person who is issued with an Identity Pass, without Permission, shall:
- 5.7.1 give that Identity Pass to any other person other than for a reasonable and proper purpose; or
 - 5.7.2 permit that Identity Pass to be used by any other person.

PART 6 ALCOHOL, DRUGS AND INTOXICATION

- 6.1 No person shall consume alcohol, or be in possession of any open alcohol container, in any public areas of the Airport, except in such parts of the Airport as are designated by LLA for the sale or consumption of alcohol.
- 6.2 No person shall consume or continue to consume alcohol, or take or continue to take any non-prescribed intoxicating drug, when requested by an Airport Official or a Constable to desist, provided that that Airport Official or Constable has reasonable cause to believe that such person is intoxicated.
- 6.3 No person who holds an Identity Pass, Crew Identity Pass or Compliance Authority Identity Pass, shall attend the Airport, or continue to remain at the Airport, in the course of performing their duties whilst intoxicated with a quantity of alcohol or drugs which causes them to be unfit to properly perform their duties.
- 6.4 No person who holds an Identity Pass, Crew Identity Pass or Compliance Authority Identity Pass, whilst attending the Airport in the course of their duties, shall fail to submit to a test for alcohol or drugs on demand by an Airport Official or Constable, if:
- 6.4.1 that Airport Official or Constable has a reasonable suspicion that that person has alcohol or a drug in their body and is unfit to properly perform their duties; or
 - 6.4.2 that person has been involved in an incident which caused, or gave rise to a danger of causing, injury to another person or damage to property.

PART 7 OFFENSIVE BEHAVIOUR

- 7.1 No person, without Permission, shall deface (whether by graffiti or otherwise) or damage any Airport Infrastructure, Airport Equipment, item, or any other property (including buildings, structures, fixtures, fittings, services, cables, pipes, drains and other conduits), equipment, machinery, tools or Vehicles which are owned by another person (other than with the consent of that owner).
- 7.2 No person shall use any language or make any gesture or commit any other act which is lewd, foul or offensive.

OFFICIAL

- 7.3 No person shall conduct themselves in a disorderly manner or behave in a manner which causes or may cause undue distress or offence to any other person.
- 7.4 No person shall intentionally spit, urinate or defecate other than in a functioning toilet.
- 7.5 No person shall cause any other person to reasonably suspect, by any language or behaviour, by wearing any clothing or emblems, or carrying any signs or items, that there is a threat of:
- 7.5.1 terrorism (as defined by the Terrorism Act 2000) or other security threat at the Airport (including falsely asserting that that person or another person has in their possession an item which is prohibited by Notice from being taken Airside); or
 - 7.5.2 public protest, demonstration or procession (for which Permission has not been granted) or public disorder;
- if that person has no reasonable cause to believe that such threat exists.

PART 8 PROHIBITED BEHAVIOUR

- 8.1 No person, without Permission, shall leave baggage, or any other item, which that person has brought into the Airport or which is otherwise in that person's possession, unattended in any part of the Airport (unless it is left in an area designated for that purpose by LLA, or if it has been properly given over to the possession of another person).
- 8.2 No person, without Permission, shall enter, loiter on, frequent or remain at the Airport or any part of it other than for a reasonable and proper purpose.
- 8.3 No person, without Permission, shall walk on any grassed or cultivated area.
- 8.4 No person, without Permission, shall behave in such a way so as to endanger themselves or any other person.
- 8.5 No person, without Permission, shall walk on any part of the Airport which is not designated by LLA for pedestrian use (including any road other than in the proper course of using a pedestrian crossing point marked for that purpose).
- 8.6 No person, without Permission, shall sing, dance, shout, play a musical instrument or erect or use any apparatus for transmission, receipt, recording, reproduction or amplification of sound, speech or images.
- 8.7 No person, without Permission, shall engage in, or facilitate, gambling, betting, wagering, bookmaking or other similar activity.
- 8.8 No person, without Permission, shall organise or take part in any public assembly, protest, demonstration or procession.
- 8.9 No person, without Permission, shall:
- 8.9.1 display or erect any flags, banners, or signs; or
 - 8.9.2 wear or display any clothing, badges or emblems likely to cause harassment, alarm, distress or a breach of the peace.

OFFICIAL

- 8.10 No persons (without lawful excuse) shall fail to remove from the Airport any flags, banners, signs or emblems displayed or erected by that person at the Airport after being asked to undertake such removal by an Airport Official or a Constable.
- 8.11 No person, without Permission, shall take any photograph, or undertake any filming, live streaming, broadcast or recording activity in:
- 8.11.1 any area in the course of that person's trade or profession, for monetary reward, or for any other commercial or business purpose; or
 - 8.11.2 any part of a Security Area, Customs Area, or Border Control Area for any purpose.
- 8.12 No person, without Permission, shall fail to permanently erase from an item under their control any recording or image of:
- 8.12.1 any part of a Security Area, Customs Area or Border Control Area; or
 - 8.12.2 any Airport Official or Constable acting properly in the course of their duty;
- including on demand by an Airport Official or Constable.
- 8.13 No person, without Permission, shall distribute or display signs, advertisements, pamphlets, flyers, circulars or other printed or written matter.
- 8.14 No person, without Permission, shall undertake any market research for any purpose.
- 8.15 No person, without Permission, shall beg or solicit funds or contributions of any kind.
- 8.16 No person, without Permission, may enter a Car Park or any other part of the Airport, except for the purposes of:
- 8.16.1 parking a Vehicle in that Car Park;
 - 8.16.2 collecting a Vehicle from that Car Park; or
 - 8.16.3 picking up or dropping off a person using a Vehicle in that Car Park.
- 8.17 No person, without Permission, shall charge any device, equipment or Vehicle utilising the Airport Infrastructure.
- 8.18 No person, without Permission, shall:
- 8.18.1 erect, or sleep in, a tent, or sleep in any Vehicle (including any trailer or caravan); or
 - 8.18.2 sleep in any other part of the Airport (except for an Aircraft Passenger scheduled to depart the Airport on an Aircraft within the following 6 hours).
- 8.19 No person, without Permission, shall use skateboards, roller blades, roller skates, scooters or any similar device within a Public Terminal or any Airside area (except for mobility aids, mobility scooters and wheelchairs used by a person with reduced mobility).

PART 9 LITTER AND WASTE

- 9.1 No person, without Permission, shall drop or leave litter, waste or refuse except in a receptacle provided

OFFICIAL

for the purpose.

- 9.2 No person, without Permission, shall place any waste or refuse container on any part of the Airport and, if with Permission, only then in a location designated by LLA for such purpose.
- 9.3 No person, without Permission, shall, deposit any construction waste or excavated materials.
- 9.4 No person, without Permission, shall use any open refuse containers (other than litter bins for the disposal of litter) or skips.
- 9.5 No person, without Permission, shall cause anything other than surface water to be discharged into the surface water drains.

PART 10 ANIMALS

- 10.1 No person, without Permission, shall bring an Animal into a Public Terminal other than:
 - 10.1.1 assistance dogs;
 - 10.1.2 dogs under the control of an Airport Official or a member of the Emergency Services; or
 - 10.1.3 Animals which have been approved for travel by an Aircraft Operator or an Airport Official.
- 10.2 No person in charge of an Animal shall:
 - 10.2.1 fail to keep it under control, or permit it to foul on any part of the Airport (provided it shall be a defence for a person contravening this byelaw to demonstrate that they took all reasonable precautions and exercised all due diligence to avoid a contravention of this byelaw); or
 - 10.2.2 fail to remove from the Airport, or dispose of in an appropriate waste receptacle, any faeces defecated by that Animal at the Airport.
- 10.3 No person, without Permission, shall bring a horse on to the Airport, or otherwise ride or lead a horse at the Airport.
- 10.4 No person in charge of an Animal, without Permission, shall allow that Animal to graze.
- 10.5 No person, without Permission, shall interfere with, trap, remove, harm or damage any wild fauna or flora.

PART 11 UNAUTHORISED TRADE

- 11.1 No person, without Permission, shall conduct any business or any form of trading activity at the Airport (including offering for sale, selling or distributing goods or services).
- 11.2 No person, without Permission, shall personally solicit or tout for business at the Airport.

PART 12 SMOKING AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

- 12.1 No person shall smoke or use an electronic cigarette other than in an area designated by LLA for such purpose.
- 12.2 No person shall smoke in or otherwise bring into or light any naked flame or create sparks in:

OFFICIAL

- 12.2.1 any place where any such act is prohibited by Notice;
- 12.2.2 any place within 15 metres of any Aircraft; or
- 12.2.3 any place where liquid fuel, gas, explosives or other highly flammable material is stored or used.
- 12.3 No person, without Permission, shall cause by any act or omission a fire to be lit.
- 12.4 No person, without Permission, shall fill or discharge liquid fuel, including in the course of refuelling any Vehicle or Aircraft, other than in a place designated for that purpose by LLA.
- 12.5 No person, without Permission, shall store, transport or handle any Hazardous Substance.
- 12.6 No person shall store, transport or handle any Hazardous Substance in a condition or manner likely to result in a discharge prohibited in accordance with byelaw 12.7.
- 12.7 No person, without Permission, shall cause or permit the discharge onto any surface of any:
 - 12.7.1 Hazardous Substance, or
 - 12.7.2 other substance of whatever nature which might obstruct or be or become a source of damage to drains, sewers or other Airport Infrastructure.
- 12.8 No person shall fail to adhere to any applicable safety requirements, including the use of suitable personal protective equipment, which they are directed to adhere to by an Airport Official, member of the Emergency Services or as out in any applicable Notice.

PART 13 PROHIBITED ACTS INVOLVING VEHICLES ON PARTS OF THE AIRPORT TO WHICH THE ROAD TRAFFIC ENACTMENTS DO NOT APPLY

- 13.1 No person in charge of a Vehicle, without Permission, shall on any part of the Airport to which the Road Traffic Enactments do not apply:
 - 13.1.1 drive a Vehicle if it would be unlawful for that person to drive that Vehicle on a road to which the Road Traffic Enactments do apply; or
 - 13.1.2 commit any act or omission whilst driving, parking or leaving that Vehicle which would be unlawful on a road to which the Road Traffic Enactments do apply.

PART 14 PROHIBITED ACTS INVOLVING VEHICLES ON ALL PARTS OF THE AIRPORT

- 14.1 No person, without Permission, shall:
 - 14.1.1 wash any Vehicle other than in an area designated by LLA for such purpose; or
 - 14.1.2 undertake maintenance or repair work to any Vehicle.
- 14.2 A person in charge of a Vehicle which is not in a roadworthy condition or has broken down shall as soon as reasonably practicable procure that such Vehicle is removed from the Airport.
- 14.3 No person, without Permission, shall wait in, leave or park a Vehicle:
 - 14.3.1 within three metres of the Security Perimeter, except in a marked parking bay;

OFFICIAL

- 14.3.2 within three metres of a Public Terminal, except in a marked parking bay; and
- 14.3.3 other than in accordance with all applicable Notices.
- 14.4 No person, without Permission, in charge of a Vehicle shall:
 - 14.4.1 bring that Vehicle into the Airport if it is in an unsafe condition;
 - 14.4.2 park or leave that Vehicle:
 - 14.4.2.1 in any part of the Airport, other than in a part of the Airport in which that type of Vehicle is permitted to be parked or left in accordance with one or more applicable Notices;
 - 14.4.2.2 other than in a marked parking space or in accordance with any applicable Notice; or
 - 14.4.2.3 in an unsafe condition, or in such a way so as to create or likely to create a hazard or obstruction to other persons or Vehicles, an impairment to the operation of the Airport or a risk to the security of the Airport; or
 - 14.4.3 permanently abandon that Vehicle;
 - 14.4.4 drop off passengers from that Vehicle, other than in a part of the Airport in which that type of Vehicle is permitted to be used to drop-off passengers in accordance with one or more applicable Notices;
 - 14.4.5 pick-up passengers with that Vehicle, other than in a part of the Airport in which that type of Vehicle is permitted to be used to pick-up passengers in accordance with one or more applicable Notices; or
 - 14.4.6 drive that Vehicle, other than on a road to which the public has access or a part of the Airport in which that type of Vehicle is permitted to be driven in accordance with one or more applicable Notices.
- 14.5 Where an incident occurs which involves damage to a Vehicle, or a Vehicle causing injury to another person or damage to other property, if present at the time of that incident the person in charge of that Vehicle, and any other person involved in the incident, shall stop and give:
 - 14.5.1 their name and address;
 - 14.5.2 details of the incident; and
 - 14.5.3 if that person is the person in charge of that Vehicle:
 - 14.5.3.1 the name and address of the person who was the owner of the Vehicle at the time of the incident; and
 - 14.5.3.2 the vehicle registration number of that Vehicle;

to an Airport Official or a Constable, as soon as practicable after the incident.
- 14.6 No person in charge of a Vehicle shall fail to produce to an Airport Official or a Constable, within seven

OFFICIAL

days of demand, details of the insurance for the operation of that Vehicle which is required to be in place in accordance with the Road Traffic Enactments.

- 14.7 No person in charge of a Vehicle shall fail to control or park that Vehicle other than in accordance with any applicable Notice, or a direction given by an Airport Official or a Constable.

PART 15 LAWFUL REMOVAL OF VEHICLES FROM THE AIRPORT

- 15.1 For the purposes of Section 54 of the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, any Airport Official or Constable has authority, conferred by these byelaws, to move a Vehicle by any means if that Vehicle is:

15.1.1 situated in an area where that type of Vehicle is not permitted to be parked or left in, in accordance with one or more applicable Notices;

15.1.2 left in a manner (including outside of marked parking bay) contrary to any applicable Notices;

15.1.3 in the reasonable opinion of an Airport Official or Constable, is in an unsafe condition or creates or likely to creates a hazard or obstruction to other persons or Vehicles, an impairment to the operation of the Airport or a risk to the security of the Airport; or

15.1.4 in the reasonable opinion of any Airport Official or Constable has been permanently abandoned.

PART 16 TAXIS & PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES

- 16.1 No person, without Permission, shall offer a Vehicle (including a Taxi or Private Hire Vehicle) for hire to another person at the Airport.

- 16.2 No person in charge of a Taxi or Private Hire Vehicle, without Permission, shall use that Vehicle to drop off passengers from that Vehicle, or pick-up passengers with that Vehicle.

- 16.3 No person in charge of a Vehicle, may:

16.3.1 permit that Vehicle to be used as a Taxi without that person holding a licence issued by an appropriate public authority which lawfully permits that person to operate that Vehicle as a Taxi within the area in which the Airport is situated; or

16.3.2 permit that Vehicle to be used as a Private Hire Vehicle without that person holding a licence issued by an appropriate public authority which lawfully permits that person to operate that Vehicle as a Private Hire Vehicle within the area in which the Airport is situated.

PART 17 AIRSIDE OPERATIONS

- 17.1 No person, other than an Aircraft Passenger (whilst being escorted by a person holding an Identity Pass), shall enter or remain in any outdoor area located Airside without wearing a high-visibility vest or jacket at all times.

- 17.2 No person, without Permission, shall drive a Vehicle in an Airside area without:

17.2.1 a reasonable and proper purpose for doing so;

17.2.2 holding an airside driving permit, issued by or on behalf of LLA, which permits that person

OFFICIAL

to drive a Vehicle in that Airside area; and

- 17.2.3 an airside vehicle permit having been issued by or on behalf of LLA in respect of that Vehicle, which permits that Vehicle to be driven in that Airside area.
- 17.3 No person in charge of a Vehicle being driven in an Airside area, shall fail to produce on demand to an Airport Official or a Constable:
- 17.3.1 airside driving permit, issued by or on behalf of LLA to that person; or
- 17.3.2 an airside vehicle permit which has been issued by or on behalf of LLA in respect of that Vehicle.
- 17.4 No person shall pass on foot or drive a Vehicle within close proximity to the rear of an Aircraft while it is displaying collision lights indicating that it is about to be pushed back.
- 17.5 No person shall loiter near, or climb upon, or enter any Aircraft, or attempt to do so, without Permission, lawful authority, or the permission of the Pilot of that Aircraft.
- 17.6 No person shall deliberately damage any Aircraft, without Permission, lawful authority, or the permission of the owner of that Aircraft.
- 17.7 No person shall tamper with any Aircraft or do anything that causes, or is likely to cause, damage to or interference with the safe running or security of any Aircraft.
- 17.8 No person, without Permission, shall:
- 17.8.1 move an Aircraft; or
- 17.8.2 park an Aircraft in a location, other than a location allocated by an Airport Official for that Aircraft to be parked (except in an emergency).
- 17.9 No person in charge of an Aircraft shall fail to ensure that whilst that Aircraft is parked, it is chocked properly, or otherwise properly secured, so that it remains stationary.
- 17.10 No person, without Permission, shall fuel, service, de-ice or maintain an Aircraft, Vehicle or other equipment.
- 17.11 No person, without Permission, shall run or test an Aircraft engine.
- 17.12 No person, without Permission, shall cause or permit the obstruction of the passage of a Vehicle used for the purposes of refuelling an Aircraft.
- 17.13 No person, without Permission, shall cause or permit the obstruction of the passage of an Aircraft.
- 17.14 No person, to the extent it is applicable to that person, shall fail to comply with any requirement, procedure, restriction or regulation set out in the Aeronautical Information Publication or any NOTAM which relates to the Airport, or the operation of Aircraft in and around the Airport.
- 17.15 Where an incident occurs which involves damage to an Aircraft, or an Aircraft causing injury to another person or damage to other property, if present at the time of that incident the Pilot of that Aircraft (or, if the Aircraft is being towed, the tug-driver), and any other person involved in the incident, shall stop and give:

OFFICIAL

- 17.15.1 their name and address;
- 17.15.2 details of that incident; and
- 17.15.3 if that person is the Pilot:
 - 17.15.3.1 the name and address of the person who was the Aircraft Operator at the time of the incident; and
 - 17.15.3.2 the identification marks of the Aircraft;

to an Airport Official or a Constable, as soon as practicable after the incident.

- 17.16 No person shall leave an item in any Airside location which may damage, or interfere with the operation of, any Aircraft, Airport Infrastructure or Airport Equipment, other than in the ordinary course of its use and for a reasonable and proper purpose.

PART 18 LOST PROPERTY

- 18.1 Except as required by any other applicable law (including in respect of customs and excise), a person who finds, or otherwise comes into possession of, Lost Property shall as soon as practicable, either:
 - 18.1.1 hand it to any person reasonably claiming to be the owner of that Lost Property, or inform that person where it is located;
 - 18.1.2 hand it to an Airport Official or Lost Property Agent, and inform that Airport Official or Lost Property Agent of the state and circumstances in which that Lost Property was found or otherwise came into their possession; or
 - 18.1.3 inform an Airport Official where it is located.
- 18.2 Where any Lost Property is, or is contained in, a package, bag or other receptacle, an Airport Official, Lost Property Agent or Constable may cause such receptacle to be opened and the contents examined for the purposes of:
 - 18.2.1 identifying and tracing the owner of the Lost Property;
 - 18.2.2 ascertaining the nature of the contents; or
 - 18.2.3 any other reasonable purpose.
- 18.3 All Lost Property handed to an Airport Official or Lost Property Agent shall be retained in safe custody by LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) for a period of at least two months from the date on which LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) first came into possession of that Lost Property, except:
 - 18.3.1 if collected by, or delivered to, the owner of that Lost Property at an earlier time in accordance with these byelaws;
 - 18.3.2 for Lost Property that LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) reasonably considers to be relevant to the commission or intended commission of a criminal offence (including a breach of these byelaws), which LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) may hand over to the police or an appropriate government agency at any time;

OFFICIAL

18.3.3 for Lost Property that is in the form of an official document, including but not limited to a driving licence or passport, which LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) may hand over to the police or to the appropriate government department, local authority or other body or person responsible for issuing it or for controlling or dealing with it at any time;

18.3.4 for Lost Property that:

18.3.4.1 is perishable;

18.3.4.2 is, or contains, a Hazardous Substance;

18.3.4.3 is of negligible value;

18.3.4.4 may reasonably be considered to have been deliberately and permanently abandoned; or

18.3.4.5 is of a size or quantity which cannot be safely or adequately stored in the Lost Property Office;

which LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) may sell, donate to charity, or otherwise dispose of as LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) may think fit at any time.

18.4 If a person:

18.4.1 satisfies LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) that they are the owner of Lost Property held by LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf); and

18.4.2 pays such charges as LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) specify in respect of the storing, handling, and administration of the Lost Property and its return to that person;

then LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) shall make that Lost Property available for collection to that person at the Lost Property Office for a period of at least two months from the date on which LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) first came into possession of that Lost Property, or deliver that Lost Property to that person, by such means and to such address as LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) may otherwise agree with that person.

18.5 LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) shall not be required to identify or to trace the owner of Lost Property, except if the name and address of the owner of that Lost Property is readily ascertainable on the face of that Lost Property, in which case LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) shall attempt to contact the owner of that Lost Property to inform them that the Lost Property is being held by LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) and may be collected (or delivered) in accordance with these byelaws.

18.6 LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) shall keep for a period of not less than twelve months a record showing particulars of the Lost Property, the circumstances in which it was found and recording the ultimate return or disposal of the Lost Property.

18.7 LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) will not be liable to the owner of Lost Property for any loss of, or damage to, that Lost Property, arising as a consequence of:

OFFICIAL

- 18.7.1 LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) selling, donating, or otherwise disposing of that Lost Property in accordance with these byelaws;
 - 18.7.2 LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) handing over or delivering that Lost Property to another person claiming to be the lawful owner of that Lost Property, as long as LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) acted in good faith and had reasonable grounds to believe that that other person was the lawful owner of that Lost Property;
 - 18.7.3 that Lost Property being damaged in the course of another person delivering it to an address which the owner of the Lost Property has requested it be delivered to, or a failure by another person to deliver that Lost Property to that address;
 - 18.7.4 that item of Lost Property perishing whilst being held by LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf); or
 - 18.7.5 the movement or storage of that item of Lost Property, if that item of Lost Property requires specialist equipment or careful handling to avoid loss or damage to that Lost Property whilst it is being moved or stored.
- 18.8 Any unclaimed Lost Property held by LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) for more than two months, from the date on which LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) first came into possession of that Lost Property, may be sold, donated to charity, or otherwise disposed of as LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) may think fit, and any proceeds of sale obtained will first be applied towards the payment of LLA's (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) charges for the storage, handling and administration of the item of Lost Property concerned and the costs of disposal, and any surplus (if any) will be retained or distributed by LLA (or a Lost Property Agent acting on its behalf) as it thinks fit.

PART 19 AIRPORT EXCLUSION

- 19.1 An Airport Official or Constable may make an oral or written request to a person, for that person to leave the Airport and not return for a period of 24 hours from the time of that request, if that Airport Official or Constable has reasonable grounds to believe that that person has committed or intends to commit a criminal offence (including a breach of these byelaws).
- 19.2 No person, without Permission, shall fail to immediately leave the Airport, and not return for a period of at least 24 hours, if requested to do so by an Airport Official or Constable in accordance with byelaw 19.1.
- 19.3 An Airport Manager or Constable may issue an Exclusion Notice to a person, in accordance with byelaw 19.4, directing that that person may not enter or remain at the Airport during such reasonable Exclusion Period as is determined by that Airport Manager or Constable, if that Airport Manager or Constable has reasonable grounds to believe that that person has committed or intends to commit a criminal offence (including a breach of these byelaws).
- 19.4 An Airport Manager or a Constable may issue an Exclusion Notice to a person by either handing that Exclusion Notice to that person or by posting or leaving it at the last known residential address of that person.
- 19.5 No person issued with an Exclusion Notice in accordance with byelaw 19.4, without Permission, shall:

OFFICIAL

- 19.5.1 if present at the Airport when issued with that Exclusion Notice, fail to immediately leave the Airport; or
- 19.5.2 enter the Airport at any time during the Exclusion Period set out in that Exclusion Notice.

PART 20 PENALTIES

- 20.1 Any person contravening any of the following byelaws shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine, which in respect of a contravention of:
 - 20.1.1 byelaw 2.9, 2.10, 5.4, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.9, 8.13, 8.14, 8.15, 8.16, 8.17, 8.18, 9.1, 9.4, 10.2, 10.4, 10.5, 17.1, or 18.1 shall not exceed level 2 on the standard scale;
 - 20.1.2 byelaw 6.1, 6.2, 7.2, 8.8, 8.10, 8.19, 9.2, 9.3, 10.1, 10.3, 11.1, 11.2, 12.1, 14.1, 14.2, 14.6, 16.1, 16.2 or 16.3 shall not exceed level 3 on the standard scale; and
 - 20.1.3 byelaw 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 8.4, 8.11, 8.12, 9.5, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 12.8, 13.1, 14.3, 14.4, 14.5, 14.7, 17.2, 17.3, 17.4, 17.5, 17.6, 17.7, 17.8, 17.9, 17.10, 17.11, 17.12, 17.13, 17.14, 17.15, 17.16, 19.2 or 19.5, shall not exceed level 4 on the standard scale¹

PART 21 REVOCATION OF EARLIER BYELAWS


- 21.1 The byelaws which were made by LLA under sections 63 and 64 of the Airports Act 1986 on 3 October 2005 and which were confirmed by the Secretary of State for Transport on 20 November 2005 are hereby revoked.

¹ As at the date of these byelaws the relevant levels of the standard scale are, by virtue of section 37(2) of the Criminal Justice Act 1982, as follows: Level 2 - £500, Level 3 - £1,000, Level 4 - £2,500. These levels are, however, subject to amendment from time to time by statute or by order made under section 143 of the Magistrates' Court Act 1980.

OFFICIAL

THE COMMON SEAL of LONDON LUTON AIRPORT
OPERATIONS LIMITED was hereunto affixed this

~~26~~ day of August 2025
in the presence of:



- Alberto Martin
Director

Mee-Ling Skelington
Company Secretary



The foregoing byelaws are hereby confirmed by the Secretary of State for Transport and shall come into operation on 30th July 2025.


SIGNED BY


.....

Michael Stark
Deputy Director,
Aviation - Commercial, Strategy and Sponsorship
by authority of the Secretary of State for Transport

30th July 2025

Schedule 1 - Map



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-


PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW9

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



Official copy of register of title

Title number BD230068

Edition date 04.11.2024

- This official copy shows the entries on the register of title on 14 MAR 2025 at 17:38:08.
- This date must be quoted as the "search from date" in any official search application based on this copy.
- The date at the beginning of an entry is the date on which the entry was made in the register.
- Issued on 02 Jun 2026.
- Under s.67 of the Land Registration Act 2002, this copy is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original.
- This title is dealt with by HM Land Registry, Peterborough Office.

A: Property Register

This register describes the land and estate comprised in the title. Except as mentioned below, the title includes any legal easements granted by the registered lease but is subject to any rights that it reserves, so far as those easements and rights exist and benefit or affect the registered land.

LUTON

- 1 (23.10.1992) The Leasehold land shown edged with red on the plan of the above Title filed at the Registry and being Hangar 60, Percival Way, London Luton Airport, Luton.
- 2 (23.10.1992) Short particulars of the lease(s) (or under-lease(s)) under which the land is held:
 Date : 6 October 1992
 Term : 100 years from 24 April 1992
 Rent : As therein mentioned
 Parties : (1) London Luton Airport Limited
 (2) Monarch Aircraft Engineering Limited
NOTE: Copy filed under BD173594.
- 3 (23.10.1992) There are excepted from the effect of registration all estates, rights, interests, powers and remedies arising upon, or by reason of, any dealing made in breach of the prohibition or restriction against dealings therewith inter vivos contained in the Lease.
- 4 Unless otherwise mentioned the title includes any legal easements granted by the registered lease(s) but is subject to any rights that it reserves, so far as those easements and rights exist and benefit or affect the registered land.

B: Proprietorship Register

This register specifies the class of title and identifies the owner. It contains any entries that affect the right of disposal.

Title absolute

- 1 (03.04.2024) PROPRIETOR: LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED (Co. Regn. No. 03491213) of Percival House, 134 Percival Way, London Luton Airport, Luton LU2 9NU.

Title number BD230068

B: Proprietorship Register continued

2 (03.04.2024) The price stated to have been paid on 29 February 2024 was
£1,025,000 exclusive of VAT.

End of register

These are the notes referred to on the following official copy

The electronic official copy of the title plan follows this message.

Please note that this is the only official copy we will issue. We will not issue a paper official copy.

This official copy was delivered electronically and when printed will not be to scale. You can obtain a paper official copy by ordering one from HM Land Registry.

There is an/are application(s) pending in HM Land Registry and if we have only completed the mapping work for a pending application affecting the title concerned, such as a transfer of part:

- additional colour or other references, for example 'numbered 1', may appear on the title plan (or be referred to in the certificate of inspection in form CI), but may not yet be mentioned in the register
- colour or other references may also have been amended or removed from the title plan (or not be referred to in form CI), but this may not be reflected in the register at this stage.


This official copy is issued on 04 June 2026 shows the state of this title plan on 14 March 2025 at 17:38:08. It is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original (s.67 Land Registration Act 2002). This title plan shows the general position, not the exact line, of the boundaries. It may be subject to distortions in scale.

Measurements scaled from this plan may not match measurements between the same points on the ground.

This title is dealt with by the HM Land Registry, Peterborough Office .



© Crown Copyright. Produced by HM Land Registry.
Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without the prior written permission of Ordnance Survey. Licence Number AC0000851063.



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW10

This is the exhibit marked "AJW10" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

LTN 2005 Area

LTN 2025 Areas



Area 3

Area 1

Area 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-


PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW11

This is the exhibit marked "AJW11" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Official copy of register of title

Title number HD544934

Edition date 10.07.2015

- This official copy shows the entries on the register of title on 03 JUN 2026 at 15:06:05.
- This date must be quoted as the "search from date" in any official search application based on this copy.
- The date at the beginning of an entry is the date on which the entry was made in the register.
- Issued on 03 Jun 2026.
- Under s.67 of the Land Registration Act 2002, this copy is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original.
- This title is dealt with by HM Land Registry, Leicester Office.

A: Property Register

This register describes the land and estate comprised in the title. Except as mentioned below, the title includes any legal easements granted by the registered lease but is subject to any rights that it reserves, so far as those easements and rights exist and benefit or affect the registered land.

HERTFORDSHIRE : NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE

- 1 (10.07.2015) The Leasehold land demised by the lease referred to below which lies within the area shown edged with red on the plan of the above Title filed at the Registry and being Landing lights lying to the east of Airport Way, London Luton Airport, Luton.
- 2 (10.07.2015) The land edged yellow on the title plan has the benefit of but is subject to all rights of way public or private or of water drainage light and other easements and rights of adjoining owners.
- 3 (10.07.2015) The land edged brown on the title plan land has the benefit of the rights reserved by but is subject to the rights granted by a Deed of Gift dated 26 October 1990 made between (1) The Honourable Richard Oakley Pleydell-Bouverie and (2) Gillian Margaret Victoria Pleydell-Bouverie.

NOTE:-No copy of the deed is held by Land Registry. But see the entry in the Charges Register referring to this deed.
- 4 (10.07.2015) The land has the benefit of the rights reserved by but is subject to the rights granted by a Deed of Grant dated 21 January 1991 made between (1) Robert William Smith and Mark Iain Tennant (Grantors) and (2) Fina plc.

NOTE: Copy filed under HD511283.
- 5 (10.07.2015) The land has the benefit of and is subject to the rights contained in a Transfer of the freehold estate in the land edged and numbered 1 & 2 in blue on the title plan and other land dated 5 April 2005 made between (1) Mark Iain Tennant and Andrew Leslie Pym and (2) Harriot Isobel Pleydell-Bouverie and Bartholemew Richard Pleydell-Bouverie.

NOTE:-Copy filed under HD442451.
- 6 (10.07.2015) Short particulars of the lease(s) (or under-lease(s)) under which the land is held:
Date : 6 July 2015

A: Property Register continued

- Term : 21 years beginning on and including 7 February 2014 and ending on and including 6 February 2035
- Parties : (1) Gillian Margaret Victoria Pleydell-Bouverie
(2) Bartholomew Richard Pleydell-Bouverie and Harriot Isobel Pleydell-Bouverie
(3) Richard Oakley Pleydell-Bouverie
(4) London Luton Airport Operations Limited
- 7 (10.07.2015) The Lease prohibits or restricts alienation.
- 8 (10.07.2015) The land has the benefit of any legal easements granted by clause LR11.1 of the registered lease dated 6 July 2015 referred to above.
- 9 (10.07.2015) The landlord's title is registered.

B: Proprietorship Register

This register specifies the class of title and identifies the owner. It contains any entries that affect the right of disposal.

Title absolute

- 1 (10.07.2015) PROPRIETOR: LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED (Co. Regn. No. 3491213) of Navigation House, Airport Way, London Luton Airport, Luton LU2 9LY.

C: Charges Register

This register contains any charges and other matters that affect the land.

- 1 (10.07.2015) The land edged yellow on the title plan is subject to the following rights reserved by a Deed of Gift of the freehold estate in the land edged yellow on the title plan and other land dated 26 October 1990 made between (1) The Honourable Richard Oakley Pleydell-Bouverie and (2) Gillian Margaret Victoria Pleydell-Bouverie:-

EXCEPTING AND RESERVING the right set out in the Second Schedule hereto

THE SECOND SCHEDULE

(Rights excepted or reserved)

1. A right of way in fee simple to the Donor and his successors in title the owners and occupiers for the time being of all or any part of OS 0025 shown edged blue on the Plan annexed hereto and his servants and licensees going to or from OS 0025 or any part thereof full right and liberty from time to time and at all times hereafter and for all purposes to pass and repass with or without animals and vehicles across through and over OS 7218 and every part thereof.

NOTE: Copy plan filed under HD511407.

End of register

These are the notes referred to on the following official copy

The electronic official copy of the title plan follows this message.


Please note that this is the only official copy we will issue. We will not issue a paper official copy.

This official copy was delivered electronically and when printed will not be to scale. You can obtain a paper official copy by ordering one from HM Land Registry.

This official copy is issued on 03 June 2026 shows the state of this title plan on 03 June 2026 at 15:06:51. It is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original (s.67 Land Registration Act 2002). This title plan shows the general position, not the exact line, of the boundaries. It may be subject to distortions in scale. Measurements scaled from this plan may not match measurements between the same points on the ground. This title is dealt with by the HM Land Registry, Leicester Office .


HM Land Registry
Official copy of
title plan

Title number **HD544934**
Ordnance Survey map reference **TL1321SE**
Scale **1:2500**
Administrative area **Hertfordshire : North**
Hertfordshire



© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey AC0000851063.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

The land in this title lies within the area edged red hereon and is more particularly described in the lease or leases referred to in the property register.



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-


PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW12

This is the exhibit marked "AJW12" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Official copy of register of title

Title number BD146644

Edition date 16.11.2017

- This official copy shows the entries on the register of title on 21 JUL 2025 at 21:47:18.
- This date must be quoted as the "search from date" in any official search application based on this copy.
- The date at the beginning of an entry is the date on which the entry was made in the register.
- Issued on 03 Jun 2026.
- Under s.67 of the Land Registration Act 2002, this copy is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original.
- This title is dealt with by HM Land Registry, Peterborough Office.

A: Property Register

This register describes the land and estate comprised in the title.

LUTON

- 1 (10.05.1989) The Freehold land shown edged with red on the plan of the above Title filed at the Registry and being land on the North East side of Spittlesea Road, Luton.
- 2 The land has the benefit of the rights granted by but is subject to the rights reserved by the Transfer dated 12 April 1989 referred to in the Charges Register.
- 3 The Transfer dated 12 April 1989 referred to above contains a provision as to boundary structures.
- 4 (12.09.1995) A Deed dated 31 July 1995 made between (1) London Luton Airport Limited and (2) St Modwen Developments Limited is expressed to grant rights as therein mentioned.

NOTE: Copy filed.

- 5 (20.02.1998) The land edged and numbered in green on the title plan has been removed from this title and registered under the title number or numbers shown in green on the said plan.
- 6 (20.02.1998) The land has the benefit of the following rights reserved by the Transfer dated 2 February 1998 referred to in the Charges Register:-

"subject to the exceptions and reservations set out in Schedule 3

Schedule 3

(Exceptions & Reservations)

Except and reserving in favour of the Retained Land and every part thereof for the benefit of the Seller and its successors in title and the persons deriving title under them and their servants agents licensees and invitees:-

1. the free and uninterrupted passage of water steam oil air gas electricity telephone communications and other services from and to any part of the Property through the drainage facility shown approximately on Plan 2 and any other Conducting Media commonly used for those

A: Property Register continued

purposes which may in the future but during the period of eighty years after the date hereof be in upon or under the Property and serving the Retained Land or any part thereof

2. the right on giving reasonable prior notice (except in emergency) to enter upon the Property in order to lay inspect maintain repair renew alter and construct in on over or under the external areas of the Property (but not the buildings constructed on the Property and avoiding so far as reasonably possible the service yard on the Property) new Conducting Media for the benefit of the Retained Land independent of any such Conducting Media serving the Property Provided That:

(A) the routes of any new Conducting Media shall be first approved by the owner for the time being of the Property (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed)

(B) all such works shall be carried out as quickly as reasonably possible and without causing unnecessary interference disruption or disturbance to the owners and occupiers of the Property

(C) all such works shall be carried out in a good and workmanlike manner and in accordance with all necessary consents and any other reasonable requirements of the owners and occupiers of the Property

(D) any damage caused by the said works to the Property is to be made good as soon as reasonably possible

(E) as regards the Option Land referred to in an Agreement ("Option Agreement") dated 15th December 1993 and made between (1) The Council of the Borough of Luton and (2) Allied Investment and Property Holdings Limited the rights in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Schedule shall cease to exist upon any transfer of the Option Land pursuant to the Option Agreement and shall be replaced by rights equivalent to those set out in clause 12(ii)(c) of the Option Agreement and the parties undertake that they or their successors in title will enter into such documentation as may be required to give effect to such variation in the rights hereby granted

3. the full and free right to repair rebuild alter demolish develop and alter and to carry out any other works upon or to the Retained Land and any buildings from time to time thereon in such manner as the Seller or its successors in title thinks fit notwithstanding any interference with the light or air to or in respect of the Property."

NOTE: Copy plan 2 filed.

- 7 (28.02.2000) The land has the benefit of the rights reserved by a Transfer dated 1 December 1999 referred to in the charges register.

B: Proprietorship Register

This register specifies the class of title and identifies the owner. It contains any entries that affect the right of disposal.

Title absolute

- 1 (24.12.2013) PROPRIETOR: LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED (Co. Regn. No. 3491213) of Navigation House, Airport Way, London Luton Airport, Luton LU2 9LY.
- 2 (28.02.2000) RESTRICTION: Except under an order of the registrar no transfer or grant of a lease for more than 25 years is to be registered unless a certificate by a solicitor is lodged that the provisions of clause 18.9.1 of the Transfer dated 1 December 1999 referred to in the Charges Register have been complied with.
- 3 (09.11.2001) A Transfer of the land in this title dated 19 October 2001 made between (1) St Modwen Ventures Limited and (2) TBI plc contains vendors personal covenant(s) details of which are set out in the schedule of personal covenants hereto.

B: Proprietorship Register continued

- 4 (24.12.2013) The price stated to have been paid on 22 November 2013 was £1,400,000 plus £280,000 VAT.
- 5 (24.12.2013) The Transfer to the proprietor contains a covenant to observe and perform the covenants referred to in the Charges Register and of indemnity in respect thereof.
- 6 (16.11.2017) RESTRICTION: No disposition of the registered estate by the proprietor of the registered estate is to be registered without a written consent signed by the proprietor for the time being of the Charge dated 16 August 2017 in favour of The Royal Bank of Scotland plc referred to in the Charges Register.

Schedule of personal covenants

- 1 The following are details of the personal covenants contained in the Transfer dated 19 October 2001 referred to in the Proprietorship Register:-

"The Transferor covenants with the Transferee and its successors in title to each and every part of the Property that the Transferor will keep the Transferee and its successors in title indemnified against all costs claims and liabilities arising out of any outstanding obligations on the part of "the Developer" contained or referred to in an Agreement dated 18 June 1996 made between (1) The Council of the Borough of Luton (2) St Modwen Developments Limited (3) Midland Bank Plc and (4) Allied Investment and Property Holdings Limited, as varied by an Agreement dated 3 June 1997 and made between the same parties."

C: Charges Register

This register contains any charges and other matters that affect the land.

- 1 A Transfer of the land in this title dated 12 April 1989 made between (1) Vauxhall Motors Limited and (2) Allied Investment and Property Holdings Limited contains restrictive covenants.

NOTE: Original filed.

- 2 (20.02.1998) The land is subject to the following rights granted by a Transfer of the land edged and numbered BD180840 in green on the filed plan dated 2 February 1998 made between (1) St. Modwen Developments Limited (Seller) and (2) Midland Bank Trust Company Limited (Buyer):-

"together with the rights set out in Schedule 2

Schedule 2

(Rights Granted)

In favour of the Property and every part thereof for the benefit of the Buyer and its successors in title and the persons deriving title under them and their servants agents licensees and invitees (but subject to the Buyer and its successors in title indemnifying the Seller and its successors in title and the occupiers for the time being of the Retained Land from and against all costs claims losses proceedings demands and expenses arising out of the exercise of such rights) the right upon giving reasonable prior written notice (except in the case of emergency) to the Seller or its successors in title and the occupiers for the time being of the Retained Land to enter only so far as necessary upon the Retained Land for the purpose of inspecting and executing repairs and other works to or on the Property so far as the same cannot otherwise reasonably be carried out the persons so entering causing as little damage disturbance or inconvenience as reasonably possible to the Retained Land the Seller and its successors and the said occupiers or the business being carried on upon the Retained Land and making good as soon as practicable all damage to the Retained Land by the exercise of this right Provided That the persons exercising such rights shall not carry out or permit to be carried out any works or other activity or activities which would or might damage the impermeable membrane installed by the Seller within the Retained Land"

C: Charges Register continued

3 (28.02.2000) A Transfer of the land edged and numbered BD213759 in green on the filed plan dated 1 December 1999 made between (1) St Modwen Ventures Limited and (2) Vauxhall Motors Limited contains restrictive covenants by the Transferor.

NOTE:- Copy in Certificate.

4 (16.11.2017) REGISTERED CHARGE contained in a Security Agreement dated 16 August 2017 affecting also other titles.

NOTE: Charge reference BD146644.

5 (16.11.2017) Proprietor: THE ROYAL BANK OF SCOTLAND PLC (Scot. Co. Regn. No. 090312) of Level 9, 250 Bishopsgate, London EC2M 4AA.

6 (16.11.2017) The proprietor of the Charge dated 16 August 2017 referred to above is under an obligation to make further advances. These advances will have priority to the extent afforded by section 49(3) Land Registration Act 2002.

End of register

These are the notes referred to on the following official copy

The electronic official copy of the title plan follows this message.

Please note that this is the only official copy we will issue. We will not issue a paper official copy.

This official copy was delivered electronically and when printed will not be to scale. You can obtain a paper official copy by ordering one from HM Land Registry.

There is an/are application(s) pending in HM Land Registry and if we have only completed the mapping work for a pending application affecting the title concerned, such as a transfer of part:

- additional colour or other references, for example 'numbered 1', may appear on the title plan (or be referred to in the certificate of inspection in form CI), but may not yet be mentioned in the register
- colour or other references may also have been amended or removed from the title plan (or not be referred to in form CI), but this may not be reflected in the register at this stage.

This official copy is issued on 03 June 2026 shows the state of this title plan on 21 July 2025 at 21:47:18. It is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original (s.67 Land Registration Act 2002). This title plan shows the general position, not the exact line, of the boundaries. It may be subject to distortions in scale. Measurements scaled from this plan may not match measurements between the same points on the ground. This title is dealt with by the HM Land Registry, Peterborough Office .

© Crown copyright. Produced by HM Land Registry. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without the prior written permission of Ordnance Survey. Licence Number AC0000851063.

H.M. LAND REGISTRY

TITLE NUMBER

BD 146644

ORDNANCE SURVEY
PLAN REFERENCE

TL 1120 NW TL 1121 SW

Scale
1/1250

COUNTY BEDFORDSHIRE

~~DISTRICT LUTON~~


© Crown copyright

ADMINISTRATIVE AREA LUTON

The boundaries shown by dotted lines have been plotted from the plans on the deeds. The title plan may be updated from later survey information



TL 1121 SW
TL 1120 NW



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW13

This is the exhibit marked "AJW13" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.


London Luton Airport - Plan 2



London Luton Airport - Plan 2A




- Partly Third Party Areas
- Wholly Third Party Areas
- Public Highways
- Injunction
- Luton DART



London Luton Airport - Plan 2B



- HD544934
- BD216008
- BD206048
- BD235078
- BD332840
- BD339131
- BD146644
- BD230068



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW14

This is the exhibit marked "AJW14" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Terrorism threat levels



What are terrorism threat levels?

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

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

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

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

Current national threat level

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

Current Northern Ireland-related Terrorism in Northern Ireland threat level

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

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

Threat level change alerts



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

How are threat levels decided?

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

Both threat levels are kept under regular review.

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

These include:

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

What does this mean for you?

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

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

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

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

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

Are there threat levels for other countries?

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



Countering terrorism

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

[Find out more](#)

Threat level history

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

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

National Threat Level

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

Northern Irish Related Terrorism in Northern Ireland Threat Level

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

Threat levels prior to July 2019

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

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



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW15

This is the exhibit marked "AJW15" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Incidents from July 2025

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

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

Aviva employees challenged to be climate heroes.

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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





Insurance conference blockade heralds nationwide week of action

July 03, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

July 02, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

Media enquiries:

insureoursurvival@gmail.com

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

For immediate release

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

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

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

GLOBAL PROJECTS, LOCAL CONSEQUENCES

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

But the impacts aren’t confined to distant places.

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

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

LOCAL ACTION, GLOBAL RESISTANCE

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



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

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

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

— *Nicholas Omonuk, End Fossil Occupy Uganda*

WHAT’S NEXT: A GLOBAL ESCALATION

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

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

TAKE ACTION

- **Join the IOS Telegram** for updates, action support, and resources:
<https://t.me/+wV2EEWPpMJtlMzQ0>
- **Visit the IOS website** and sign up to get involved:
[InsureOurSurvival.org](https://insureoursurvival.org)
- **Socials**
Instagram: <https://xrb.link/GA8tN8nk5>
Bluesky: <https://xrb.link/jz6Y7618>
- **Media enquiries:** insureoursurvival@gmail.com

References

- [1] [‘Monstrous’ east African oil project will emit vast amounts of carbon, data shows](#)
- [2] [Death, violence and endless delay: Inside Africa’s most troubled energy project](#)
- [3] [Explainer: Russia’s ambitions and challenges in Arctic](#)
- [4] [More banks rule out support for TotalEnergies’ Papua LNG project](#)
- [5] [Carbon bombs under the spotlight](#)

London Oxford Airport: Extinction Rebellion to hold protest

Oxford Airport

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

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

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

They say the demonstration will be peaceful.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Extinction Rebellion protest outside insurance brokers



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

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

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

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

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

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



extinction
rebellion

SCOTLAND

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

February 16, 2025

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



Credit: Siobhan Chalmers @_schal

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

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

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

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

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



Credit: Siobhan Chalmers @_schal

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

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

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

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

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

Dr Anthony Graham from Scientists for Extinction Rebellion stated:

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

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

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

Alex Cochrane from Extinction Rebellion Scotland said:

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



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

July 09, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

[Early images](#)

“INSURING DISASTER, NOT SURVIVAL”

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

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

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

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



Photo credit: Denise Baker

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

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

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

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

BRITISH INSURANCE AWARDS: A CELEBRATION OF CLIMATE HYPOCRISY

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

Insurers and brokers being called out include:

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

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

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

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

INSURE PEOPLE, NOT POLLUTION

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

It's time to turn public anger into action.

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

🔗 [[Insure our Survival website](#)]

NOTES FOR EDITORS

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

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

About Extinction Rebellion

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

[Donate](#) | Support our work

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

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

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

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

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

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

Extinction Rebellion target Howden and Marsh offices in Shrewsbury

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Other protest

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

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

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

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

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



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



Rebels target insurance HQ in solidarity with detained Ugandan protesters

July 16, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Notes to editors

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

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

[3] Carbon Bombs – LINGO

<https://www.leave-it-in-the-ground.org/projects/carbon-bombs/>

[4] 'Monstrous' east African oil project will emit vast amounts of carbon, data shows

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/oct/27/east-african-crude-oil-pipeline-carbon>

[5] How climate change worsens heatwaves, droughts, wildfires and floods

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-58073295>

[6] United Nations, 8 June 2021, 'Secretary General's closing remarks to Insurance

[https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/statement/2021-06-08/secretary-generals-closing-remarks-insurance-development-](https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/statement/2021-06-08/secretary-generals-closing-remarks-insurance-development-forum#:~:text=I%20have%20recently%20been%20calling,for%20small%20businesses%20and%20individuals.)

[forum#:~:text=I%20have%20recently%20been%20calling,for%20small%20businesses%20and%20individuals.](https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/statement/2021-06-08/secretary-generals-closing-remarks-insurance-development-forum#:~:text=I%20have%20recently%20been%20calling,for%20small%20businesses%20and%20individuals.)

[7] Development Forum 5 Association of British Insurers, 'Briefing: Insurers as Investors

<https://www.abi.org.uk/data-and-resources/tools-and-resources/regulation/insurers-as-investors/>

[8] Climate change accounts for over a third of insured weather losses this century and rising

<https://global.insure-our-future.com/scorecard-2024-insurers-climate-losses/>

[9] How insurers are using climate change as an excuse to TRIPLE the cost of home cover

<https://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-12748421/How-insurers-using-climate-change-excuse-TRIPLE-cost-home-cover.html>

[10] Uncovering the Role of Insurance Companies in Fueling the Climate Crisis

<https://bank.green/blog/insuring-climate-crisis>

[11] Insure our Future, December 2024, 'Within our power, 2024 scorecard on insurance,

climate change and the energy transition <https://global.insure-our-future.com/scorecard-2024-report/>

[12] Insuring disaster: the insurance industry's support for fossil fuels January 2025]

<https://green-alliance.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Insuring-disaster.pdf>

[13] "Our Trust is Broken": Loss of Land and Livelihoods for Oil Development in Uganda
HRW

<https://www.hrw.org/report/2023/07/10/our-trust-broken/loss-land-and-livelihoods-oil-development-uganda>

[14] "I was evicted and left homeless" Exploring social and environmental (in)justice along the East African Crude Oil Pipeline Project March 2025

<https://www.hakidefenders.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/EACOP-REPORT.pdf>

[15] Urgent call: TotalEnergies and its shareholders must take immediate action to protect environmental defenders in Uganda in the context of the Tilenta/Kingfisher and EACOP

projects June 22, 2025 <https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2025->

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

About Extinction Rebellion

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

[Donate](#) | Support our work

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

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

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

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

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

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



Reading: Extinction Rebellion protest above A329 motorway

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Extinction Rebellion protesters 'die' during demonstration at bank



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





Scientists for XR occupy the Bank of England

July 23, 2025 by Extinction Rebellion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

About Extinction Rebellion

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

[Donate](#) | Support our work

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ten Greenpeace activists arrested after suspending themselves from bridge outside Edinburgh

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

🕒 Saturday 26 July 2025 12:38, UK



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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Police Scotland confirmed five men aged between 35 and 40, as well as five women aged between 25 and 42, had been arrested.

It said further inquiries were ongoing and the Forth Road Bridge remained closed to traffic as of Saturday morning.

Read more:

[25% of young children now malnourished in Gaza, charity says](#)

[Trump issues warning to leaders as he arrives in Scotland](#)

Amy Cameron, programme director at Greenpeace UK, said: "By blocking Ineos, we've drawn global attention to the company's bottomless appetite for plastic production, false solutions and profit for its billionaire boss Jim Ratcliffe."

Describing the "plastic pollution problem" as "massive", she added: "Less than 10% of plastic is currently recycled globally, and this is set to rise to just 17% by 2060, while the amount of plastic we're producing is set to triple.

"The only solution is to address the problem at source which means securing a strong global plastics treaty that imposes legally-binding caps on plastic production."

Greenpeace insists its protest was safe and caused "minimal disruption".

It stressed the climbers had spent weeks training for the demonstration and pointed out the Forth Road Bridge carries low volumes of bus, cycle and pedestrian traffic.

Bank of England 'heist' as ministers face fresh anti-Rosebank oil field protests



Protesters outside the Bank of England. Photo: Fossil Free London

MINISTERS have faced a fresh protest against their possible renewal of permission for the Rosebank oil field, after the original decision was found to be unlawful in a landmark Supreme Court ruling last year.

Fossil Free London activists dressed as robbers emblazoned with the Norwegian flag staged a "heist" at the Bank of England on Monday evening to highlight the "daylight robbery" that approval of the application for exploitation of the oil field would entail.

Rosebank is the largest undeveloped oil field in the North Sea. If its development goes ahead, this would lead to the release of carbon emissions equal to those produced by all of the world's 28 low-income countries, the activists said.

Chanting "Rosebank Oil is a scam. Labour, do you give a damn?" the campaigners carried sacks labelled "UK taxpayer money" filled with fake cash from a makeshift vault and held placards reading "£1.5 billion for Norway, net loss for UK."

Fossil Free London director Robin Wells said: "It's plain and simple, Rosebank is daylight robbery."

“If allowed, Equinor, a Norwegian oil giant, will rob us blind, hoarding massive profits for themselves and leaving behind nothing but a trail of climate chaos and a net loss for us.

“The UK government needs to stop this carbon bomb and act in the interests of the general public — scrap Rosebank and invest in a just transition.”

In January, the Court of Session in Edinburgh found that a Supreme Court ruling that planning authorities should consider the full climate impact of burning oil from new wells should apply retrospectively to the former Tory government’s decision to approve the Rosebank and Jackdaw oil and gas fields.

The environmental assessments for these projects did not count the greenhouse gases that would be released when the fossil fuels produced by them were eventually burned.

The January ruling said that work on both fields could continue while the new information was gathered, but no oil and gas could be extracted unless fresh approval was granted.

Ministers later confirmed that they would consider the significance of a project’s environmental impact, “while taking into account and balancing relevant factors on a case-by-case basis, such as the potential economic impact and other implications of the project.”

No decisions are expected until the autumn.

The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero was contacted for comment.



Direct Action / 18 August 2025

Activists cut utilities to world's biggest fossil fuel investors declaring 'Summer of Sabotage'



M Shut the System activists cut the electricity to Barclays' Barclaycard's Northampton headquarters, August 18, 2025

ACTIVISTS sabotaged utilities infrastructure at the offices of major fossil fuel investors today, declaring the start of “disruption like never before” against fossil fuel finance.

Shut The System cut cables and superglued electrical service cabinets at JPMorganChase and Allianz in London, demanding they stop financing the climate emergency and genocide in Gaza.

At Barclaycard’s Northampton headquarters, activists cut the 5G communications mast serving the building.

The underground climate campaign said the action marked the launch of a period of sustained sabotage against financial institutions deemed “key culprits” in the climate crisis, running until the end of September.

It urged civilians to join a “Summer of Sabotage” by destroying the property and operating systems of institutions providing “critical support to deadly industries globally.”

JPMorgan is the world’s largest fossil fuel investor, while Barclays is the biggest in Europe, according to a June report by Reclaim Finance.

And Allianz is the sixth-largest fossil fuel insurer and insures Elbit Systems, an Israeli arms firm supplying the majority of weapons used in Gaza.

A Shut The System statement said: “We have been forced underground by draconian anti-protest laws.

“The British state has recently shown how much they are willing to suppress peaceful protest.

“History shows direct action and sabotage are highly effective so we cannot stop while the climate emergency wages on and we see the most hopeful path forward is to operate beyond the state’s reach.”

The group has pledged to escalate its actions in October if demands are ignored.

Earlier this year, it cut fibre optic cables at insurance firms in Leeds and Birmingham, disrupted internet access, and carried out nationwide graffiti

actions at Barclays branches during its annual general meeting.

JPMorgan, Allianz and Barclays were approached for comment.

Extinction Rebellion 'unearth the truth' at Welwyn Garden City protest

The Welwyn & Hatfield Times

26 Aug 2025 13:00

Copyright 2025 NewsQuest Media Group Limited All Rights Reserved



Author: Huw Richards

Print Edition: Welwyn Hatfield Times

Length: 391 words

Body

Extinction Rebellion claim to have "unearthed the truth" about a Welwyn Garden City insurance broker during a demonstration.

On Saturday, August 23, members of Hertfordshire Extinction Rebellion groups, dressed as oil workers and insurance executives, protested outside Howden Insurance in the town centre.

Extinction Rebellion members protest outside Howden, Welwyn Garden City. (Image: Derek Langley)

-The group called the protest due to its belief that Howden "supports the fossil fuel industry".

At the action on Saturday, an oil rig was set up outside the Howden branch, and members of the group dressed as oil workers allegedly "engaged" with Howden-s senior executives.

Phil from North Herts Extinction Rebellion said: "I hope people found our actions today both eye-opening and entertaining. Although there is widespread concern about the climate crisis among the public, the influence of the insurance companies on averting disaster may not be so well known.

"If a new oil or gas project can't get insurance they simply can't operate, so the insurance companies are in a uniquely powerful position.

"But companies like Howden are still actively supporting these industries, while at the same time home insurance premiums are doubling or even tripling to pay for the increased risks from extreme weather events like flooding and heatwaves. This is good business for them and a disaster for the rest of us."

(Image: Derek Langley)He added: "Many of us use Howden to insure our homes, cars, and even our pets. But they are secretly making millions by also acting as brokers for new oil, gas, and coal projects - despite dire warnings from scientists.

"We were asking Howden to do the right thing: pull the plug on insuring any new fossil fuel projects - this would send a powerful signal to the industry."

The demonstration was part of Extinction Rebellion's --Insure Our Survival" campaign, urges insurance companies to withdraw from insuring new fossil fuel operations which are believed to be worsening the climate crisis.

Insurance offices up and down the country have been targeted in a wave of nationwide actions, with activists demanding that key insurers stop backing destructive new fossil fuel projects and end their complicity in climate disaster and human rights abuses.

When contacted, Howden did not wish to comment.

(Image: Derek Langley)

Classification

Industry:

Insurance (92%), Insurance Overview (92%), Fossil Fuels (89%), Insurance Agencies & Brokerages (89%), Energy & Utilities (89%), Homeowners Insurance (78%), Property & Casualty Insurance (78%), Natural Gas Extraction (75%), Insurance Premiums (73%), Coal Industry (50%)

Subject:

Protests & Demonstrations (91%), Negative News (90%), Environmental Activism (90%), Negative Misc News (90%), Fossils (89%), Negative Environmental News (89%), Climate Change (89%), Severe Weather (88%), Environmental Accidents & Disasters (79%), Activism (78%), Negative Personal News (78%), Executives (77%), Floods & Flooding (73%), Heat Waves (68%), Weather (68%), Extreme Temperatures (68%), Human Rights Violations (63%), Human Rights (60%)

Climate protesters removed from Reform conference after heckling Nigel Farage

The protesters from Climate Resistance targeted the Reform leader to accuse him of working for super-rich donors.



A protester is removed from an address by Reform UK leader Nigel Farage during the party's annual conference (Jacob King/PA) (PA Wire)

Three climate protesters were carried out of the [Reform](#) UK party conference after shouting at [Nigel Farage](#) while he was on stage.

The protesters from Climate Resistance, a group calling for the government to tax the super-rich to fund public services and climate action, had planned to interrupt the Reform UK leader and [Clacton](#) MP during his keynote speech.

But he delivered it several hours earlier than originally planned after [Angela Rayner](#) resigned from the government.

They staged their protest as Mr Farage returned later to appear with special guest Preston Manning, the founder of Canada's now-defunct Reform party.

Climate Resistance targeted Mr Farage to accuse him of working for super-rich donors, such as property tycoon Nick Candy.

"You work for billionaires!" one shouted at Mr Farage.

Another said he was "paid by the super-rich to scapegoat migrants".

Mr Farage paused to say: "Off you go, mate...boring!"

One shouted "f*** the fascists" and "tax the rich" as security guards carried her out.

The audience chanted "out out out" and booed her.

Sam Simons, spokesperson for Climate Resistance, said: "Farage will go on national TV and say how he cares about the people in the UK, and then vote to keep us from getting our sick pay.

"This grifter will scapegoat anyone just so we don't talk about the oil barons and billionaire property tycoons who fund him.

"It's really about keeping everyone so divided and downtrodden that we won't even have time to think about taxing the super-rich."

Mr Simons added: "Meanwhile, the super-rich are fanning the flames of climate collapse with their lavish lifestyles, and exploiting people and the planet for profit.

"The top 10% in the UK hold more wealth than all the rest of us combined, and pollute far more than ordinary people.

"The majority of Britain wants a wealth tax. It's time to tax the super-rich and finally do what Reform never would: fund our schools, our hospitals, our climate and our futures."



Campaigners around the country fight to stop Rosebank



CAMPAIGNERS to stop Rosebank took to the streets across the country on Saturday, protesting outside the offices of oil giants and in Prime Minister Sir Keir Starmer's backyard.

In Aberdeen, environmentalists joined forces with Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign (SPSC), protesting at the offices of Equinor and Ithaca to call for a ban on the development of the 300-million barrel field.

Speaking from the protest — one of almost 20 which took place around the country — Aberdeen SPSC activist, Kate Ramsden told the Star: "Rosebank isn't just an environmental disaster, Ithaca's involvement would generate hundreds of millions for Delek who are already literally fuelling the genocide in Gaza.

"Starmer needs to locate his conscience and stop Rosebank."

Four hundred miles away, campaign groups including Mothers Rise Up took that same message to the heart of Sir Keir's Holburn and St Pancras constituency.

Mothers Rise Up's Lorna Powell said: "Approving new fossil fuel projects like Rosebank in the context of an escalating, deadly climate crisis is simply unjustifiable."

The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero said its priority was to “deliver a fair, orderly and prosperous transition,” but could not comment on individual licences.



Two insurers named as targets in next Extinction Rebellion climate protest offensive

Two insurers are in the sights of Extinction Rebellion's next coordinated climate protest campaign

Insurers operating in the UK have been warned to expect a fresh wave of coordinated climate protests in September.

Activist group Extinction Rebellion (XR) has confirmed plans to target companies it says are enabling fossil fuel projects and arms trading.



Its campaign – dubbed *Insure Our Survival* – is set to run from 8 to 22 September 2025, with large-scale demonstrations confirmed for London on 8 and 9 September and further actions planned nationwide.

XR said the campaign would include coordinated actions in Europe, the Americas, Africa and Asia, with groups in the Global North working alongside those in the Global South to “amplify frontline voices” opposing fossil fuel and arms financing.

Targeted insurers

XR said the campaign will focus on international firms Axa and AIG, saying the call for action is an effort to draw attention to the broader insurance sector's role in underwriting high-carbon and defence projects.

The group claims fossil fuel and arms insurance represent just 2% to 3% of targeted firms' portfolios, arguing they could be removed without material financial harm.

Insurers have faced increasing scrutiny from climate campaigners in recent years, with several large players adopting restrictions on coal, oil and gas underwriting in response to public and shareholder pressure. However, XR maintains that such commitments remain inadequate to meet climate goals.

The September actions will form part of XR's ongoing global pressure campaign, which the group says will continue until targeted insurers commit to stopping fossil fuel and arms underwriting.



Protesters project 'toxic' images onto insurers' City offices

'Axa and AIG present themselves as protecting homes and families, yet continue to underwrite projects that accelerate climate breakdown and fuel conflict,' says spokesperson

Activists staged protests at the City of London offices of Axa and AIG yesterday (8 September 2025), blocking access to the buildings and calling on insurers to stop underwriting fossil fuel and defence-related risks.



The demonstration formed part of a two-week wave of coordinated global actions led by campaign group Insure Our Survival, which is planning protests across more than 30 cities worldwide between 8 and 22 September. Demonstrations are also [scheduled in London for today](#).

According to organisers, the London blockade began around 8am outside Axa's offices, with campaigners dressed in suits and gas masks carrying placards urging a boycott of Axa and AIG. Activists also threw fake blood-stained £50 notes and projected images onto buildings as part of the action.

The campaigners accused both insurers of profiting from fossil fuel expansion and from companies linked to armed conflict. They argued that such underwriting activities account

for less than 2% of global insurance profits, suggesting that insurers could exit the sectors without significant financial impact.

Lucy Porter, UK spokesperson for Insure Our Survival, said: "Axa and AIG present themselves as protecting homes and families, yet continue to underwrite projects that accelerate climate breakdown and fuel conflict."

Carbon boycott

Yesterday's London action followed a weekend of projection protests at Axa and AIG offices in London, Paris, Cologne, Johannesburg, Manchester, Glasgow, Auckland and Ipswich. Images of senior executives wearing gas masks were projected onto buildings, which campaigners said symbolised insurers' exposure to "toxic" industries.

Research cited by organisers alleged that Axa holds investments in fossil fuel firms linked to so-called "carbon bomb" projects, including coal, oil sands and shale operations. At the same time, AIG has been identified as one of the world's largest coal insurers with more than \$24bn (£17.73bn) invested in fossil fuel-related assets as of 2022.

Extinction Rebellion (XR) [previously occupied](#) AIG's office in London on October 30, 2024.

Speakers from climate and political groups, including Palestine-focused organisations, also scheduled addressed the demonstration throughout the day.

Insure Our Survival said it is also encouraging consumers and businesses to boycott other large insurers, including Allianz and Aviva.

Extinction Rebellion (XR) [previously protested at the Premiership rugby final](#) on June 14, 2025, to demand that the Rugby Football Union (RFU) end its sponsorship deal with Allianz.



Extinction Rebellion protesters stage 'die in' at Barclays Bank in Reading



Protesters from Extinction Rebellion performed a 'die-in' at Barclays Bank in Reading to link fossil fuel funding to climate change and global deaths.

Extinction Rebellion says: "Around the world, millions of people are dying as a result of heatwaves, wildfires, torrential rain, drought, flooding and landslides, all caused by changes in our climate brought about by the constant increase in greenhouse gas emissions.

"Barclays Bank is still funding fossil fuel projects which contribute to climate change, thus indirectly contributing to the deaths of humans and wildlife.

"Analyses from the World Weather Attribution organisation show that extreme weather is becoming more likely due to climate change.

"Heatwaves are the deadliest type of extreme weather globally, contributing to at least 500,00 deaths a year, including some in the UK. Researchers from the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) and Imperial College London, estimate that high heat killed 2,300 people across 12 major cities as temperatures soared across Europe this summer. They attributed 1,500 of the deaths to climate breakdown, which is heating the planet and making the worst extremes even hotter."

Dr Ben Clarke, researcher at the Centre for Environmental Policy at Imperial College London, said: "Heatwaves don't leave a trail of destruction like wildfires or storms. Their impacts are mostly invisible but quietly devastating – a change of just 2 or 3C can mean the difference between life and death for thousands of people.' He warned that countries need to speed up the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy.

Greece, Turkey and Cyprus suffered devastating wildfires. Greece experienced a heatwave above 45C, drought and strong winds. At least 17 lives were lost, including 10 firefighters and rescue workers.

An intense two-week heatwave in Norway, Finland and Sweden was hotter, with temperatures of 30C and more, resulting in many more hospital admissions.

A new study, published in the medical journal JAMA, links more than 400 additional deaths to the wildfires in Los Angeles earlier this year. The study comes as hundreds of wildfires burn across the US and Canada.

Climate change not only increases the risk of wildfires around the world but also makes them particularly explosive. Relatively small blazes rapidly "blow up" so suddenly and with such ferocity that they become difficult to control.

Climate change also intensified heavy monsoon rain in Pakistan, which suffered its worst floods on record, killing hundreds of people.

In late June 2025, several days of heavy rainfall swept across Colombia and Venezuela, causing widespread flooding, overflowing rivers, and numerous landslides, one of which killed 27 people.

Moscow suffered its worst flooding since 1879, with some parts experiencing far more than the monthly average.

These extreme weather events will only continue to become worse if governments do not do more to reduce emissions from greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide and methane-

Extinction Rebellion will pose as dead bodies (a 'die-in') to remind people of how they say that Barclays continues to fund projects that are contributing to over-heating planet Earth. Extinction Rebellion also says that they also hope to encourage visitors to the branch to move their accounts from Barclays to other banks with much 'greener' credentials.



Extinction Rebellion protestors spotted in Ipswich

Ipswich Star

15 Sep 2025 11:27

Copyright 2025 NewsQuest Media Group Limited All Rights Reserved



Author: Paris Maben-Hume

Print Edition: Ipswich Star

Length: 271 words

Body

Extinction Rebellion protestors were seen outside a block of offices in Ipswich.

Local activists for the environmental movement in the Suffolk town and nearby Colchester are taking part in a coordinated global campaign targeting insurance giants AXA and AIG.

The campaign started on September 8 and will run until September 22.

It is calling for a boycott of the insurance giants and their sub-brand and is urging people to switch providers.

READ MORE: School pledges 'rapid' change after being issued with government warning

The protestors held up banners outside the entrance to the office block (Image: Newsquest)

On Monday morning, Extinction Rebellion Ipswich was protesting outside the AXA building at Brooke Lawrence House in Civic Drive.

The group held up banners which read: "We are all vulnerable. Stop insuring fossil fuels."

Blue and white tape saying "climate crime scene" was put up on the entrance steps to the office block.

They also handed out flyers to passers-by and AXA staff.

READ MORE: Hundreds of staff at housing association have data leaked in payroll breach

Tina, from Extinction Rebellion Ipswich, said: "Ipswich is on a tidal river, so people are already living with the risk of flooding, and this will only get worse as the climate gets hotter.

"New homes have just been built along the riverside. How long will it be before these become uninsurable?

"Knowing that AXA is not only profiting from these crises but exacerbating them while claiming to protect us is outrageous.

"As we have a large AXA office here in Ipswich, I thought it was important to join this global campaign to highlight this issue locally."

Classification

Industry:

Insurance (90%), Insurance Overview (90%), Energy & Utilities (73%), Data Breaches (66%), Fossil Fuels (54%)

Subject:

Negative Misc News (93%), Environmental Activism (92%), Protests & Demonstrations (91%), Negative News (90%), Activism (90%), Community Activism (90%), Environmentalism (78%), Environment & Natural Resources (78%), Negative Personal News (78%), Government & Public Administration (71%), Negative Technology News (68%), Rivers (66%), Data Breaches (66%), Crime, Law Enforcement & Corrections (53%)

Load Date: 15 Sep 2025 11:27



[About](#) [Privacy Policy](#) [Trust Center](#) [Processing Notice](#)

[Terms & Conditions](#) [Cookies](#)



Copyright © 2025 LexisNexis®

Wash It Off: Private jet sprayers found guilty



Two young people who spray-painted two private jets at Stansted Airport in June 2024 were found guilty of criminal damage at Chelmsford Crown Court today. They took action with Just Stop Oil to demand the UK government negotiate a treaty to phase out oil and gas by 2030. [1]

Jennifer Kowalski, 29, from Dumbarton, and Cole Macdonald, 23, from Brighton, had cut through the wire perimeter fence and sprayed paint from a fire extinguisher onto two private jets parked at Stansted Airport, just hours after Taylor Swift's plane had landed. [2]

After the 4 day trial the jury returned a unanimous verdict of guilty. Sentencing will be on the 27th of October.

During the trial, the prosecution argued that extensive professional cleaning was required for the two planes after the action. The total cost of cleaning was assessed to be around £12,000.

The defendants told the jury they did not set out to cause damage. They explained that they had deliberately avoided spraying the engines and cockpits and believed the diluted

paint would wash off easily. They argued that they lacked the necessary criminal intent: they neither intended to cause damage nor realised that damage was a likely consequence of their actions.

In her defence Jennifer Kowalski explained that the action had been designed to target Taylor Swift's plane because of her personal interest in the famous singer and the immense influence that she carries. She said:

"She's one of the most famous people in the world; she's talked about everywhere, she's the only singer ever to be named Time Magazine Person of the Year; she earned 2 billion dollars last year; reporters devote their lives to covering her; if we devoted that much energy to tackling climate change we could change things."

"I thought a lot about what she might say – if we could get her attention – if she saw this it might get a reaction from her, from a place of care from a fan, instead of from a place of apathy – she's famous for saying how much she loves her fans, and yet her fans are dying because of climate change."

At trial, Judge Mill ruled that the damage was too serious for the rights to free expression and assembly under Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights to apply. As a result, the jury was not asked to consider whether a restriction on the defendants rights to protest was proportionate response in the light of the alleged damage, and that defence was blocked from the trial.

Following the verdict Cole MacDonald said:

"We were released from remand the day before the general election that elected a left wing government and that under that government the country has slipped into fascism and has become continually more corrupt."

Jennifer Kowalski said:

"I broke into Stansted airport to spray paint Taylor Swift's private jet because this is a dangerous time – the era of global boiling. This era will not end when it's time for a new album – it's the era to end all others."

"When I look out people's windows, I see entire settlements swept off the map and thousands killed by climate disasters. On this reckless path 1 billion people will be displaced by 2050. When you strip people of their basic rights and cram them into perilous conditions violence inevitably ensues."

"But it's not too late to be brand new. I just think you are what you love. And I'll fight for the music and people I love. Won't you?"

While two young people face an uncertain penalty for taking action targeting private jet use, it is estimated that 80% of the world's population has never taken a flight. Just 1% of people cause 50% of global aviation emissions and private jet users are responsible for up to 14 times as much carbon emissions compared with a commercial flight. A single flight in a private jet can easily emit as much carbon dioxide as the average annual carbon footprint for an EU citizen – 8.2 tonnes. Private aviation contributed at least 15.6 Mt CO₂ in direct emissions in 2023, or about 3.6 t CO₂ per flight. Almost half of all flights (47.4%) are

shorter than 500 km. Private aviation is concentrated in the USA, where 68.7% of the aircraft are registered. [3] [4] [5][6]

Scotland / 22 September 2025

Insurance giant accused of 'keeping killers safe' at Glasgow protest



M Protesters outside AXA offices. Photo: Extinction Rebellion Scotland

Stop Rosebank



Any day now, the UK government will face a major climate test. Equinor is expected to reapply to develop Rosebank: the biggest undeveloped oil field in the UK.

We use cookies on our website to give you the most relevant experience by remembering your preferences and repeat visits. By clicking "Accept All", you consent to the use of ALL the cookies. However, you may visit "Cookie Settings" to provide a controlled consent. [Our Privacy Policy](#)

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accept All](#)

Activists disrupt BP panel over hurricane-fuelling profits



[Pic: Fossil Free London]

ACTIVISTS have disrupted a panel event featuring senior BP executive Stewart Macfarlane, as the oil giant announced quarterly profits of \$2.2 billion (£1.7bn), surpassing analysts' forecasts.

Campaigners from Fossil Free London interrupted the discussion on Tuesday evening, chanting: "As Hurricane Melissa tears down lives, do your profits help you sleep at night?" before being escorted out of the event hosted by the Association of International Energy Negotiators at Simmons & Simmons LLP's London office.

The protest came just days after Hurricane Melissa devastated Jamaica, with scientists warning that the climate crisis intensified the storm's impact.

BP has faced mounting criticism after scaling back its climate commitments.

Earlier this year, the company increased its annual investment in oil and gas to \$10bn (£8.2bn) while cutting more than \$5bn (£4.1bn) from its low-carbon spending plans.

A Global Witness analysis found that the rollback could cause around 72,000 additional heat-related deaths worldwide by the end of the century.

Fossil Free London director Robin Wells said the BP profits show that the company's "green mask has slipped to reveal the oily mouth behind," accusing the firm of fuelling global destruction while "CEOs and shareholders wine and dine in luxury."



Campaigners disrupt Oil Executive awards dinner in London

To highlight damage caused by the oil and gas industry, campaigners from Fossil Free London interrupted the World Energy Council Assembly's dinner at the Hilton in Mayfair on 3 December.

[Oil and gas](#) executives had gathered to present and receive industry "achievement awards". Award nominees and attendees [included](#) Shell, BP, and Ithaca Energy.

Campaigners chanted "no awards for climate criminals", as they were dragged out of the building by security.

The protest comes after [devastating flooding](#) has killed at least 1,250 people across much of southeast Asia in recent days. Human-caused [climate breakdown](#) has [increased](#) the intensity of such extreme weather events.

Oil damages

A report recently found that oil and gas giants are [responsible](#) for €25 trillion in climate damages. Now, survivors of Super Typhoon Odette in the Philippines are [suing](#) Shell for damages, in a legal first for holding big oil accountable for its role in climate destruction.

Robin Wells, Director of Fossil Free London said:

Whilst executives drink champagne in tuxedos, the world floods outside. They pat themselves on the back for the 'deal of the year', whilst their projects sign death warrants for communities in the Global South and future generations everywhere.

How can it be that business as usual awards the fossil fuel corporations that depend on the systematic destruction of our life support systems? The science is clear: every new oil field is an act of violence. We crashed their party to remind them that history will not give them an award; it will put them on trial.

Featured image via the Canary





Arrest made as climate activists stage protest in Southampton

Story by Ross Marshall • 5mo • 1 min read



[L](#) The protesters took to Threefield Lane in Southampton (Image: NQ)

A woman has been arrested during a climate protest in Southampton today.

Campaign group, Cut The Ties To Fossil Fuels, have taken to Threefield Lane in Southampton to stage a demonstration today.

The group were seen holding signs and banners, reading 'cut ties to carbon pollution' and it is understood that police arrested one of the protesters at the scene.

Hampshire police have been approached for more information on the arrest.

A police spokesperson said: "We were called at 12:41pm today (Wednesday 10 December), to reports of a protest at a business on Threefield Lane in Southampton.

"Officers are in attendance.

"Policing these events requires us to balance the rights of those lawfully protesting, and the rights of others to go about their lives without being subject to unacceptable disruption, whilst keeping the public safe.

"Our priority with protests is always public safety."

Activists stage Extinction Rebellion protest against private jet expansion in London



Extinction Rebellion campaigners gather outside the Macquarie Group headquarters to protest the proposed expansion of Farnborough Airport. Two activists, dressed in airplane costumes, occupy the entrance canopy while unfurling a banner that calls for a ban on private jets and urges the investment firm to sever its connections to fossil fuels. The demonstration highlights the environmental impact of business aviation, as the Australian-based global financial services group faces criticism over its majority ownership of the airport and its plans to increase annual flight limits. (Photo by Joao Daniel Pereira/Sipa USA)



Cut ties to Big Oil to stop energy crisis sparked by Trump's war on Iran – protest footage

Outside the US Embassy in London on 1 April, two activists were tied by fuel hoses to a life-sized petrol pump in response to Donald Trump's war on Iran.

The protest criticised the increase in oil company profits in the wake of the war's destruction and trade disruption. The pump carried the label: "Oil Profit\$\$\$ for Oil Bosses".

Campaigners from Fossil Free London held signs saying "Stop Trump Tying us Into Fossil Fuels", "Break Free from Climate Crisis" and "Break Free from Big Oil".

[Thousands have died](#) to date across the region following US and Israeli attacks on Iran. Trump has recently stated his intention to "[take the oil in Iran](#)" following major attacks on [fossil fuel](#) infrastructure.

Meanwhile, oil dependency is increasing the cost of living once again for families in the UK as petrol prices rise. Whilst [fossil fuel companies stand to make a windfall of billions](#) on the back of the price shock.

One of Reform's major donors, Jeremy Hoskings, has seen his fossil fuel and energy hedge fund investments [rise by more than \\$25m](#) since the war began in Iran.

This comes as Trump and Reform are using the oil price spike to call for our government to approve [new UK oil and gas projects](#), like the [controversial Rosebank oil field](#). Despite the fact that drilling in the North Sea would not make the UK more energy secure. If production began, [Rosebank's oil would still go for export](#) – like 80% of all UK oil.

Robin Wells, director of Fossil Free London said:

Right now we are seeing the horrors of Trump's war on Iran in the faces of dead schoolgirls and facing skyrocketing energy costs at home. And Big Oil cashes out big, with bumper profits.

We're protesting today to say that for as long as the UK stays tied up in fossil fuels, we'll see more oil wars, more extreme weather deaths and more instability.

The UK needs to cut ties with Trump and Big Oil. We need to break free from this knot of violence.

That starts with scrapping new UK oil and gas and rejecting Rosebank. Until then, being tied into Big Oil's big disaster leaves us paying the price.

Featured image via Fossil Free London



FØSSIL FREE LONDON

PHOTOCALL: Body bags piled outside Equinor as Q1 profit spike expected from Iran war

When: 8.15am, Tuesday 5th May

Where: Equinor Offices, W2 6BD

Details: Activists from Fossil Free London will pile several life-sized body bags outside the offices of Rosebank co-owner Equinor, as one campaigner dressed as an oil executive stands on top of them.

The protest comes as the UK Government's decision on whether to approve or reject the Rosebank oil field approaches.

Equinor's quarterly profits are **also expected to jump** when announced on Wednesday 6th May, amidst the US-Iran war.

Photos can be used in coverage of Equinor's quarterly profit announcement.

(We will also stage a stunt ahead of Shell's Q1 profit results on Wednesday the 6th at 8:15 a.m. outside Shell's HQ, we will send a separate photocall tomorrow.)

For further information, to find us on the day, or to organise an interview please contact campaigner@fossilfreelondon.org, or 020 3886 2590.

Notes:

1. For further information, please contact Rosie, 020 3886 2590, campaigner@fossilfreelondon.org.
2. Fossil Free London is a grassroots climate group that protests Big Oil and campaigns for a London beyond fossil fuels.
Instagram: [@fossilfreelondon](https://www.instagram.com/_@fossilfreelondon) Twitter: [@fossilfreeldn](https://twitter.com/_@fossilfreeldn).
3. Photos from other Fossil Free London actions are available [here](#) and can be used in your journalism at any time without prior permission. Please credit Fossil Free London.

Protesters take aim at Aviva as shareholder meetings face disruption



The tie-up will create a significant force in the motor insurance sector (Alamy/PA)

Aviva's York offices were disrupted by protesters targeting the insurer's activities in the latest twist in a turbulent season for shareholder meetings.

It comes after NatWest's annual general meeting (AGM) was halted by activists accusing the bank of backtracking on climate commitments.

Campaign group Boycott Bloody Insurance claimed to be behind 12 people with shares in [Aviva](#) disrupting its [AGM](#) on Wednesday.

Several protesters shouting and chanting outside a boardroom were escorted or carried out of the building, delaying the start of the meeting.

The group claims Aviva underwrites or invests in companies profiting from immigration detention and surveillance, fossil fuel giants and weapons firms.

Andrew Taylor, a campaigner at Boycott Bloody Insurance said: "Aviva likes to present itself as an ethical business, but when you look at the companies it supports, that turns out to be a sham."

Aviva declined to comment on the protests.

Meanwhile, following a shareholder vote at the AGM, some 8.4% of votes were cast against the motion to approve Aviva's climate-related financial disclosures for 2025, while 5.5% of votes were against approving the pay policy for directors.

Aviva's chief executive Amanda Blanc took home a pay packet of £9.76 million last year.

The disruption comes a week after [NatWest](#) was forced to stop its AGM for about half-an-hour amid disruption during its chairman's opening speech.

[Protesters](#) were singing and making statements about NatWest's climate policies, while shareholder activists called on the banking group to address claims it had "reduced the ambition of its fossil fuel policy and climate targets".

Rick Haythornthwaite, NatWest's chairman, defended its policies and said the financing of oil and gas comprises 0.6% of the group's total lending.

Meanwhile, Barclays is expected to be targeted at its AGM in London on Thursday, with activist groups including the Palestine Solidarity Campaign and Campaign Against Arms Trade organising a protest outside the meeting.



Fossil Free London pours fake blood outside Shell offices as it 'makes a killing' from the Iran war



Fossil Free London campaigners protest outside Shell's London headquarters against its giant profits from the Iran war [Pic: Fossil Free London]

FOSSIL Free London activists covered themselves in fake blood as they sat outside Shell's London headquarters wrapped in a fuel pump today.

They erected a banner that read "BLOOD MONEY: No new oil & gas" amid expectations the fossil fuel giant will announce bumper quarterly profits today thanks to the Iran war.

Fossil Free London spokesperson Robin Wells said: "In these past few years, as our world becomes more unstable and the realities of climate breakdown set in, it's never been clearer: Big Oil profits from, and locks in, mass death.

"And we're feeling this so rawly right now. As we see thousands slaughtered in Iran and weep alongside those mothers who will never hold their children again, Shell is making a killing."

More than 2,000 people have been killed by the US and Israel's war in Iran, which has sent oil prices soaring due to a blockade on the Strait of Hormuz.

Barclays shareholder meeting targeted by Palestine and climate activists

Disruption broke out at the beginning of the shareholder meeting in Westminster on Thursday.



Protesters outside the Barclays AGM in Westminster (Rebecca Speare-Cole/PA) (PA Wire)

Barclays faced a chaotic annual shareholder meeting as Palestine and climate activists repeatedly confronted the lender's board over its ties to Israel and fossil fuel financing.

The UK's biggest bank has come under fire in recent years for its links to Israeli government bonds and defence firms producing equipment used in attacks in the Gaza Strip, as well as companies driving large amounts of planet-heating emissions.

Disruption broke out at the beginning of the shareholder meeting in Westminster on Thursday, with groups of people being pulled out by security.

Chairman Nigel Higgins' opening remarks were repeatedly interrupted as protesters stood up holding Palestinian flags and shouting comments such as "Free, free Palestine" and "Everyone here is profiting from genocide".

Mr Higgins responded that the board had “heard your point” and would take questions on the topic during the meeting’s Q&A section.

A few minutes later, climate protesters rose from their seats and started singing: “Stop, in the name of love, before you break this Earth.”

One shouted: “This bank is financing the climate and nature crisis that we have to stop. Softly-softly, slowly-slowly is not good enough. You are endangering life on Earth.”

As the meeting moved to shareholder questions, the board was repeatedly quizzed about its recent fossil fuel financing.

Shareholders accused executives of failing to act with enough urgency over the climate crisis and criticised the board for leaving a key industry climate group, the Net Zero Banking Alliance.

A representative from [ShareAction](#), which campaigns for responsible investment, called on the board to affirm that it will stick to its climate goals in light of its continued lending to oil and gas firms.

Mr Higgins said Barclays has “no intention of backtracking on its commitments” and remains on track to meet climate targets that it says are aligned with the UN Paris climate agreement to limit the worst impacts of global warming.

“I know this sometimes frustrates people who would like to see us move further, but we have got a big emphasis on consistency, not chopping, changing, going backwards, sideways,” he said.

On its oil and gas lending, Mr Higgins said the bank hit “quite demanding” targets for reducing financed emissions in the energy field and power sector early, although he also acknowledged that progress is “not going to be linear”.

In light of growing global energy demand and price shocks driven by the US-Israeli conflict with Iran, he said: “We feel we have to balance the planet with energy security, energy affordability and also ramping up our transition and sustainable financing activities.”

The board was also challenged about Barclays’ ties to the Israeli government after a UN report last year identified the bank as one of several firms implicated in profiting from a “genocidal economy” in Gaza.

Mr Higgins said the bank does not understand the “report”.

“We’ve read it and we don’t agree with the characterisation of the financial sector in it,” he said.

On its dealings with foreign governments, the chairman said the bank “tries to follow the policies set out by the British Government”, which continues to support Israel’s right to defend itself.

“These are deeply political and complicated questions and at one level, certainly, we take a steer from where our country’s Government is,” he said.

He added: "We do provide finance to a number of international defence companies who provide arms for the defence of this country, for the defence of Ukraine, and that is what the bank does."

Asked if the bank will commit to supporting the sovereignty of the Palestinian people in any future dealings with Israel and its associated companies, Mr Higgins said: "The thing we all wish and pray for is peace in the region and reconciliation and an end to the appalling human cost on all sides of whichever frontiers you're looking at."

"And all of the discussions around our policy, we shouldn't lose sight of that fact – that is by far and away the most important thing to wish for."

"But I'm afraid I'm not going to go into our financing policies on specific clients."

One shareholder shouted: "That's not going to happen, Mr Chairman, unless commercial companies and banks stop financing Israel."

City firms continue to face protests over their impact on people and planet, with NatWest's [AGM](#) halted last week by activists accusing the bank of backtracking on climate commitments.

Wednesday also saw the London offices of insurance giant Aviva targeted by activists claiming the company underwrites or invests in companies profiting from immigration detention and surveillance, fossil fuel giants and weapons firms.



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW16

This is the exhibit marked "AJW16" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



About us

Just Stop Oil was a nonviolent civil resistance group in the UK. In 2022 we started taking action to demand the UK Government stop licensing all new oil, gas and coal projects. We have won on this. **Civil resistance works.**

Just Stop Oil ended its street campaign in 2025, whilst we continue to support our action takers through the courts and in prison.



Two Just Stop Oil supporters found guilty for Heathrow paint spraying following retrial

Court & Prison, Press / May 14, 2026

Two Just Stop Oil Supporters who sprayed Heathrow departure boards with orange paint during the Oil Kills, international uprising to end fossil fuels in July 2024 have been found guilty in a retrial after the jury in an earlier trial failed to reach a majority decision. [1]

Phoebe Plummer and Jane Touil were appearing before Her Honour Judge Duncan at Isleworth Crown Court for the second time accused of criminal damage over £5,000 for their action on 30 July 2024 to demand a fossil fuel treaty to end oil and gas by 2030. [2] [3]

Following the verdict Jane Touil said:

"Since I took action, global fossil fuel use and emissions have continued to rise. More than ever, we need a global fossil fuel treaty to help governments rapidly phase out fossil fuels."

"What we do at this moment in history matters. But there is a difference between laws and morality. The courts apply the law made by powerful people. Morals come from within. It is our morals that give us our conscience. I have always tried to live according to my conscience."

Phoebe Plummer said:

"The climate crisis is the greatest injustice that humanity has ever faced. We should all consider what to do at this time. No individual caused this crisis and no one is solely responsible for stopping it. But we can choose what we do to alleviate suffering. I feel compelled to act to be a responsible citizen, a loving aunt and a good person. It compels me to hope for a better future and one where my nephew grows up. I didn't think the action would change government policy. But non violent civil resistance is a necessary part of tackling the climate crisis and I'm grateful and proud to have been part of that. "

Phoebe was remanded for 58 days and Jane for 14 days following the 2024 action in which the pair used fire extinguishers to spray diluted water-based paint in Terminal 5 including at the departure boards. The Crown alleged that the action caused £8,000 worth of damages and that three of the display screens needed to be replaced. [4]

At trial, Judge Duncan ruled out several legal defences for the action including those of 'reasonable excuse' under Articles 10 and 11 of the ECHR, 'necessity' and 'self defence' on the grounds that the threat from climate change was not proximate enough and the actions too far removed from the threat. The defendants were allowed to argue belief in consent : that they honestly believed the owners of Terminal 5 would have consented to the damage if they knew of its circumstances. However, evidence of the relevant circumstances was to be limited to the fact that it was a climate protest with all evidence about the scale and urgency of the climate crisis ruled *'irrelevant and therefore inadmissible'*.

In giving evidence, Jane Touil said:

"I genuinely and sincerely believed that if the shareholders [of Heathrow] had a full understanding of the situation we are in they would have given their consent to our action.

"Most people believe there is something that is wrong with climate but not many people have access to the full situation because the fossil fuel industry has used their immense wealth to ensure that governments do not act and it is not reported in the mainstream media.

"So I don't know if shareholders have a full understanding, but I know that if they did, they would be doing all in their power to stop fossil fuels because there will be no business as usual, no functioning society,

In her evidence Phoebe Plummer said:

"I want to make it very clear that this was not a protest against Heathrow, or anyone flying through Heathrow that day. It's true that the aviation industry is especially harmful to the climate in terms of emissions, though it is a small number of frequent fliers and private jet users who cause the vast majority of this harm, not families who save up for a holiday once a year.

"But this wasn't about getting people to stop flying...I made this individual change to live in line with my values, but honestly I know that it's pretty inconsequential. Even if we all woke up tomorrow and stopped flying and went vegan, it would be like mopping up a spill from an overflowing bath whilst leaving the tap on. All individual changes are like this when we are facing a systemic issue. If fossil fuels are extracted from the ground, then they will all be burnt, even if it's not on a flight that you're on. We need systemic change, that has always been Just Stop Oil's demand."

"My intention was not to cause damage. My intention was to take part in an act of nonviolent civil resistance, raising a serious alarm bell to the catastrophic future in store for us if we persist in our addiction to fossil fuels."

In 2024 Just Stop Oil successfully won its original demand of 'no new oil and gas' and on March 27th 2025 announced an end to the campaign of action. However, our supporters will continue to tell the truth in court, to speak out for our political prisoners and to help build what comes next.

ENDS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW17

This is the exhibit marked "AJW17" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

!! NEW PROJECT ALERT !!

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



**Take back
POWER**

[Join us at: takebackpower.net](https://takebackpower.net)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-


PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW18

This is the exhibit marked "AJW18" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



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

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

It's time to **Take Back Power.**

SIGN UP TO OUR NEXT CAMPAIGN

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW19

This is the exhibit marked "AJW19" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Posts
just.stopoil

Follow



just.stopoil and defendourjuries



973

92

47

48



just.stopoil SLOW MARCHERS FOUND NOT GUILTY BY A JURY... more

17 April



17 April



just.stopoil



341 19 6 8

just.stopoil BREAKING: JANE IS FREE!

Jane Touil, 60, has just been released from prison... more
7 April



takeback.power and 4 others



15 arrested last night at Wesminster Quaker meeting house



During a
nonviolence training.



takeback.power Imagine being so deep in the pockets of CEOs and billionaires that you'd go to a Quaker Meeting House and arrest everyone at a nonviolence training.

[@metpolice_uk](#) really demonstrating the state's fear of peaceful resistance.

6 March



rogernallamcs21 and 3 others
Wales, UK



REVOLUTION IN THE 21ST CENTURY



Roger Hallam
@RogerHallamCS21



I spent twenty years growing vegetables commercially for the good people of this country.

The weather got exponentially worse, e.g., 7 weeks of rain everyday; 12 weeks with no rain, and so on. I know what is going to happen - not because of these particularly bad years, but because of the speed at which things are getting worse now.

The reason is obvious - we are standing by and letting the elites put carbon into the air between 8 and 30 times faster than at any time in the last four billion years of this planet's history.

So what is going to happen to the good people of this country? If you are still asking that question you just haven't yet understood what is going on here.




298 18 28 31



rogernallamcs21 With these numbers it's clear that revolution is inevitable. Sign up for it at rev21.earth.

3 March



in our Justice Secretary

❤️ 69 💬 3 ↻ 2 🗑️ 3



takeback.power Another Just Stop Oil jury trial has just been adjourned to 2027.

Fact 1. All Section 7 jury trials bar one for nonviolent civil resistance have been adjourned in the 2 years since the Public Order Act came into law.

Fact 2. Lammy is planning to try and rush through scrapping jury trials.

There is no justice in our "Justice" Secretary.

23 February



Just Stop Oil

11.9K posts

Follow

Posts

Replies

Highlights


Videos

Photos



Just Stop Oil  @JustSt... · 17/04/2026



 **SLOW MARCHERS FOUND NOT GUILTY BY A JURY**

Hey @SuellaBraverman, turns out juries don't like when you invent anti-protest laws designed to imprison people for 12 months just for marching.

Six Just Stop Oil supporters were a [Show more](#)



40 569 1K 25K





Just Stop Oil

11.9K posts

Follow

Posts

Replies

Highlights

Videos

Photos



Just Stop Oil @JustSt... · 07/04/2026



BREAKING: JANE IS FREE!

Jane Touil, 60, has just been released from prison after serving 4 months of a 20 month sentence for climbing a gantry over the M25 in 2022 to demand an end to new oil and gas. She is partially sighted.

She will serve the rest of her sente [Show more](#)



21 ↑ 105 ♡ 294 ↓ 5.5K 📄 ↑





Just Stop Oil
11.9K posts

Follow

Posts Replies Highlights Videos Photos



Just Stop Oil @JustSt... · 20/02/2026



BREAKING: NO PRISON FOR CAR DEALERSHIP SPRAYERS

In October 2022, Carmen and Emma sprayed orange paint over high end car dealerships including HR Owen, Jack Barclay and Ferrari Mayfair, demanding an end to new oil and gas licences [Show more](#)

NO PRISON



FOR CAR DEALERSHIP SPRAYERS!

13

10

24

4.1K





Just Stop Oil

17 Apr · 🌐



🚩 SLOW MARCHERS FOUND NOT GUILTY BY A JURY... See more



Southwark Crown Court today, two and a half years after slow marching on Waterloo Bridge to demand an end to new oil and gas licensing.

On 8th November 2023, Sheila Shatford, Julia Mercer, David Kilroy, Geraldine James, Rosalind Bird and Gregory Sculthorpe were among approximately 50 supporters who joined a slow march around the IMAX roundabout before heading north over Waterloo Bridge. They were arrested and charged with Section 7 of the Public Order Act 2023: interference with key national infrastructure: an offence which was used for the first time only two days beforehand, and which carries a maximum penalty of 12 months imprisonment, an unlimited fine, or both.

The six appeared before Judge Hiddleston at Southwark Crown Court this week in a trial which had been restarted after one of the original jury fell ill. The jury delivered their

During the five day trial, the Judge denied the defendants all legal defences including reasonable excuse and necessity, and ruled that agreed facts on climate were "irrelevant". The defendants were, however, given around 20 minutes each to talk about their motivations for taking action.

The jury were asked to consider whether the defendants had caused a significant delay to other road users, and if so whether that was their intention or they were reckless as to whether that would have been the result.

The police produced a compilation of video evidence showing the march which demonstrated some traffic buildup, but no evidence of a normal traffic flow at that location. Laura Stockdale, acting for Greg Sculthorpe, questioned whether the jury could be sure that this buildup was more than would normally occur on a weekday in central London.

She also suggested that the delays would have been less if the police had let the march continue to the other end of the Bridge and if they had not themselves closed the Southbound carriageway. DI Keven Pender for the Metropolitan Police responded that they could not be sure what the marchers were planning to do.

The defendants each emphasised their desire to draw attention to the climate crisis and the care and careful planning that was involved in undertaking a march. All denied that there was any intention to cause anything more than minor slowing of traffic.

In her defence evidence, Sheila Shatford spoke movingly of what inspired her to take action, including a childhood teacher whose family had been affected by the Aberfan disaster in which 116 children were killed. She said: "Only later did I understand that the slag heap belonged to the National Coal Board, and that warnings were given before the disaster, but

She went on to recount how she had learned about the climate emergency and said: "I realised that it's always the poorest and most vulnerable that are most affected and have the smallest voice. I read and found out the climate emergency was real - there is overwhelming evidence that it's happening now, and very soon we won't be able to stop it."

The 2023 Public Order Act was introduced specifically to target climate protest, and named groups such as Extinction Rebellion, Just Stop Oil and Insulate Britain as the reason for its introduction. Although hundreds of Just Stop Oil supporters have been charged with the Section 7 offence and are awaiting trial, as a result of the backlog in courts, this was only the second case to be heard since May 2024.

The first person to be convicted of the offence was Stephen Giggell who was jailed for 6 months after pleading guilty in December 2023.



61 comments 75 shares

Like

Comment

Share

All

Photos

Reels

More ▾



Just Stop Oil

20 Feb · 🌐



 **BREAKING: NO PRISON FOR CAR DEALERSHIP SPRAYERS...** See more

NO PRISON



FOR CAR DEALERSHIP

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW20

This is the exhibit marked "AJW20" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Taking back power or taking the mickey?

The activists 'liberating' food from big stores

A new UK civil resistance group has called for 'mass shoplifting' to focus attention on inequality, but recent stunts have led to arrests



Eve Middleton was sitting on a picnic blanket in a park, sharing out vegan biscuits with six fellow activists, when she saw a squad of police bearing down on them. About 30 officers, she said, surrounded the seven young people, and one officer told them: "Don't run or you'll be cuffed."

Another officer focused on gathering evidence. "Whose Oreos are these?" they asked, seizing the biscuits.

"It was pretty farcical, but it's still frightening when you see that amount of officers running towards you. It's pretty scary," said student Bridie Leggatt, another of the seven.

The seven activists had gathered for a "nonviolence training event" – meeting in the park to enjoy the sunny weather.

Leggatt, 22, and Middleton, 25, were among 13 people arrested last weekend in Salford and London as part of a national police crackdown on a new civil resistance group called [Take Back Power](#).

A further 15 arrests had been made in March when police raided a "nonviolence training" event, this time at the Grade II-listed Quaker House in Westminster.

They were all held on suspicion of conspiracy to commit theft, police said, linked to Take Back Power's campaign of "mass shoplifting" in supermarkets across Britain in a protest against inequality.

On TikTok, the group's videos show activists of all ages "liberating" rice, pasta, beans, nappies, stock cubes and tinned fruit from supermarkets including Cornwall, London and Manchester.

They pile the goods into cardboard boxes branded with the message: "These things are going to those who need them." The items are then distributed at local food banks – if they manage to get past security.

Even by today's standards of shoplifting, when supermarket thefts have reached [record highs](#), the mass looting is quite brazen.

Steph Parker, an assistant chief constable at [Greater Manchester](#) police, said forces would take "robust action to disrupt this type of organised criminality and it will not be tolerated".

Middleton and her six comrades were held in custody for 24 hours before being released on Monday. For Middleton, like many of the activists, this is not her first encounter with the law.

Many of those involved with the group are seasoned activists – despite being in their early 20s – having taking part in actions with Extinction Rebellion, Just Stop Oil, Animal Rising and other groups in recent years. Neither Middleton or Leggatt wanted to say how many times they had been arrested as they feared a telling off from their parents.

Take Back Power announced itself in December when activists [threw custard and apple crumble](#) at a case containing the crown jewels at the Tower of London.



Eight people were charged with criminal damage over the stunts, with four due to appear before Westminster magistrates court on Monday. The group said a total of 50 people had been arrested since December, with the majority detained while taking part in "nonviolence training" events.

On its website, activists are invited to join upcoming action in London "targeting the luxury lifestyle of the super-rich" by "occupying where they play and shop".

A spokesperson for Take Back Power, who would only give his name as James due to the risk of arrest, said the group planned further headline-grabbing stunts this year with the aim of focusing attention on Britain's deepening inequality.

James said the organisation, which wants to see higher taxes levied on the rich and a legally binding citizens' assembly, had no leader "as such". It has raised more than £65,000

in donations in the past four months, according to a fundraising page.

Another of those arrested last weekend, who would only give his name as Mark, said mass shoplifting would have “no real effect” on supermarkets who make billions of pounds in profit.

“Supermarkets are profiting off other people’s misery and we can’t put up with that,” said Middleton, pointing out that Tesco’s chief executive, Ken Murphy, was paid £9.2m last year, about 400 times that of the shop’s typical worker.

What about the effect on low-paid staff? Will they not risk losing their jobs if mass shoplifting has an effect on company profits?

“It shouldn’t be staff that get cut,” said Mark, 44, who works in education. “What should get cut are the obscene profits and salaries of the chief executives.”

The vegan picnic raided by police last weekend was in Salford’s Peel Park – named after Sir Robert Peel, the founder of modern law enforcement whose philosophy of “policing by consent” is a guiding principle of forces today, recognising that those in uniform operate on the basis of public trust rather than fear or force.



Yet the arrests of activists at a training event – rather than for a specific act – appears to run counter to that principle, said Middleton.

Parliament’s joint committee on human rights has condemned legislative changes in recent years that [it said \(pdf\)](#) have had “a chilling effect” on the right to protest in England and Wales.

Middleton said the arrests on suspicion of being involved in a conspiracy was part of a wider “repression” of civil resistance in Britain.

“Other groups were able to take part in training without everyone getting arrested,” she said. “For doing not as much, the risk of prison is a lot higher.”

James, the Take Back Power spokesperson, said the group planned to build up its action with the aim of pushing inequality to the top of the agenda by the next general election, which has to be held by August 2029.

Middleton believes the police crackdown is a sign that the authorities are scared.

"They can see that Take Back Power does speak to a lot of this country's people [who are] fed up with inequality. They are scared of what it could become."



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW21

This is the exhibit marked "AJW21" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Four taken into custody as Take Back Power 'crumble and custard' the Crown Jewels



Two supporters of Take Back Power have smothered dessert over the crown jewels. Take Back Power is a new nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a permanent citizen's assembly- a House of the People, which has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain. [1]

At around 09:50 this morning, two Take Back Power supporters covered the glass containing the crown jewels in custard and apple crumble. They then held a sign which read 'DEMOCRACY HAS CRUMBLLED- TAX THE RICH'. By around 10:30, the two action takers and two others had been taken into custody by police.

Today's action comes as all donations to Take Back Power will be doubled until midnight on Sunday the 7th December! You can donate and have your donation doubled [here](#). [2]

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

"Since 2011, the poorest 10% of households have paid a combined tax rate of 44% on their income and wealth gains, while the richest paid 22%. Our political class, be it this government, Reform or Tory, serve the super-rich; they do not care about working people. That's why we must demand real democracy, with ordinary people at the heart of decision making, through a citizen-led assembly that has the power to tax the rich." [3]

One of those taking action today is Miriam Cranch, 21, a retail worker from Leeds, who said:

"Britain is broken because the super rich are pocketing billions, whilst working people struggle to get by."

"This wealth inequality is leading us towards civil unrest, and it doesn't have to be this way. Billionaires should not pay a lower tax rate on wealth they generate doing nothing, than those of us working jobs. It's time ordinary people get a say on how to tax wealth with a permanent House of the People."

Also taking action today is Zahra Ali, 19, a student from London, who said:

"Our country is crumbling before our eyes! We have homeless people dying on the very streets that King Charles passed on his way to the coronation, whilst there are more empty homes than unhoused people in this country."

"It's time the ultra rich pay their fair share. We demand a permanent House of the People. It's time to take back power, tax the rich and fix Britain! Join us at takebackpower.net."

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen's assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at TakeBackPower.net.

ENDS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW22

This is the exhibit marked "AJW22" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Wed, 04 Jul 2020, 8:00 pm
8:00 pm

Welcome event

Condone by
5QJ



Follow us on social media.

—

Take Back Power is a nonviolent civil resistance group in the UK. We aim to put the 99% in charge through citizen's assemblies. We are ordinary people from all walks of life who believe that in order to fix Britain, we have to tax the rich. And we don't think the rich should get a veto. We want the people to decide how we tax the rich through a legally-binding citizen's assembly — a House of the People. **It's time for the 99% to have 99% of a say!**

—

Contact us

General: info@takebackpower.net

Press: press@takebackpower.net

Fundraising: giving@takebackpower.net

Get the newsletter

First name *

Email *

Postcode

Country

I agree to the [privacy policy](#) *

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW23

This is the exhibit marked "AJW23" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

What is Take Back Power and what does it want?



- What is Take Back Power?

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

+ What is Take Back Power's demand?

+ What is the House of the People?

+ What would the House of the People do?

+ Has an institution like this existed before?

+ Don't the super-rich already pay too much tax?

+ How rich are we talking about here?

+ How bad is inequality in the UK?

+ What sort of tax would you like to see?

+ Even if you tax the rich it won't be enough to fix Britain will it?

+ How would you spend the money raised?

+ Why does Take Back Power engage in disruptive direct action?

+ How is Take Back Power funded?

+ How can I get involved?

What is Take Back Power and what does it want?



+ What is Take Back Power?

+ What is Take Back Power's demand?

+ What is the House of the People?

+ What would the House of the People do?

+ Has an institution like this existed before?

+ Don't the super-rich already pay too much tax?

+ How rich are we talking about here?

+ How bad is inequality in the UK?

+ What sort of tax would you like to see?

+ Even if you tax the rich it won't be enough to fix Britain will it?

+ How would you spend the money raised?

- Why does Take Back Power engage in disruptive direct action?

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

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW24

This is the exhibit marked "AJW24" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

‘Inequality is shit’ — Take Back Power deliver crappy Christmas for the Ritz

[December 3, 2025\(https://takebackpower.net/2025/12/03/\)](https://takebackpower.net/2025/12/03/)



Three supporters of Take Back Power have delivered a pile of shit to the Ritz. Take Back Power is a new nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a permanent citizen’s assembly- a House of the People, which has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain. [1]

At around 12:05 today, three Take Back Power supporters deposited a pile of manure below the Christmas tree at the iconic luxury hotel. The three were quickly removed from the lobby and then held signs outside the entrance which read: ‘INEQUALITY IS SHIT’ & ‘TAX THE RICH’.

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“The super-rich have more than doubled their wealth since the pandemic, while this Christmas, a third of UK children suffer and grow up in poverty. It’s time ordinary people – those most affected by inequality, get a say in deciding how to tax wealth through the means of a legally binding citizen’s assembly- a House of the People.” [2][3] (<https://takebackpower.net>)

One of those taking action today, Ellen Redwood-Brown, 23, an NHS worker, said:

“The billionaires, corporations, and corrupt politicians running Britain don’t care about us. While working in the NHS I’ve seen people dying because they couldn’t get appointments whilst doctors are working 15 hour shifts.”

“The UK has 156 billionaires. We could take away 75% of that wealth to fix Britain and we’d still have 156 billionaires. We must let ordinary people decide how to tax the rich.” [4]



Also taking action today is Tom Barber, 65, a former doctor, journalist and community worker from Nottingham, who said:

“Power is concentrated in the hands of a small group of obscenely wealthy and ruthless individuals. They are hell-bent on enriching themselves, forcing the gap between the haves and the have-nots ever wider.”

“Everyday people must Take Back Power, compelling our government to create a permanent citizens’ assembly- a House of the People. Only then can we start making decisions for everyone’s benefit- taxing the rich, creating a fairer society and restoring our faith in our democracy.”

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net) (<https://takebackpower.net>).



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Four taken into custody as Take Back Power ‘crumble and custard’ the Crown Jewels

December 6, 2025(<https://takebackpower.net/2025/12/06/>)



Two supporters of Take Back Power have smothered dessert over the crown jewels. Take Back Power is a new nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a permanent citizen's assembly- a House of the People, which has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain. [1]

At around 09:50 this morning, two Take Back Power supporters covered the glass containing the crown jewels in custard and apple crumble. They then held a sign which read 'DEMOCRACY HAS CRUMBLLED- TAX THE RICH'. By around 10:30, the two action takers and two others had been taken into custody by police.

Today's action comes as all donations to Take Back Power will be doubled until midnight on Sunday the 7th December! You can donate and have your donation doubled [here](https://charity.org/project/take-back-power?utm_source=tbpn&utm_medium=website&utm_content=tbphome&utm_term=doubletop) (https://charity.org/project/take-back-power?utm_source=tbpn&utm_medium=website&utm_content=tbphome&utm_term=doubletop) (<https://takebackpower.net>)

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“Since 2011, the poorest 10% of households have paid a combined tax rate of 44% on their income and wealth gains, while the richest paid 22%. Our political class, be it this government, Reform or Tory, serve the super-rich; they do not care about working people. That's why we must demand real democracy, with ordinary people at the heart of decision making, through a citizen-led assembly that has the power to tax the rich.” [3]

One of those taking action today is Miriam Cranch, 21, a retail worker from Leeds, who said:

“Britain is broken because the super rich are pocketing billions, whilst working people struggle to get by.”

“This wealth inequality is leading us towards civil unrest, and it doesn't have to be this way. Billionaires should not pay a lower tax rate on wealth they generate doing nothing, than those of us working jobs. It's time ordinary people get a say on how to tax wealth with a permanent House of the People.”

Also taking action today is Zahra Ali, 19, a student from London, who said:

“Our country is crumbling before our eyes! We have homeless people dying on the very streets that King Charles passed on his way to the coronation, whilst there are more empty homes than unhoused people in this country.”

“It's time the ultra rich pay their fair share. We demand a permanent House of the People. It's time to take back power, tax the rich and fix Britain! Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen's assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net) (<https://takebackpower.net>).

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Take Back Power supporters call on Starmer to cut the corruption and resign by ‘locking-on’ at Parliament

February 6, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/02/06/>)



Two young people have called on Keir Starmer to cut out corruption and resign by ‘locking-on’ outside Parliament. They are supporters of Take Back Power, a nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a ‘House of the People’- a permanent citizen-led assembly with the power to tax extreme wealth. [1]

At 9am this morning, two young people carrying a giant Keir Starmer papier mache head locked themselves in front of Carriage Gate, blocking access to Parliament. They could be seen holding placards which read “Cut the Corruption”. By around 10am police arrived at the scene and had cut through the papier mache head.

A spokesperson for Take Back Power said:

“We’re calling on Keir Starmer to resign. While Lord Mandelson is gone, the system that protected and empowered him remains. It’s time to cut out the corruption at the heart of our democracy. While corporations and the super rich are splashing their cash to buy access to ministers and seats in the House of Lords, ordinary people are struggling to afford basic necessities.”

“We need a radical overhaul so that democracy works for all of us, not just the privileged few. We have politicians in the pockets of billionaire pedophiles, they don’t work for us. We need ordinary people in charge through a House of the People.”

One of those taking action today is Alice Jones, 20, a student from Manchester, who said:

“It is absurd that we live in a country where 156 billionaires hoard wealth, splashing out on private jets, whilst ordinary people have to choose between heating their homes, or feeding their children; all while our country quickly descends into fascism.”

“The politicians in our country are failing us. Ordinary people are being left to survive with the scraps: a crumbling NHS, extortionate food prices, and ever rising bills. The UK needs a permanent House of the People. It’s time to take back power, tax the rich and fix Britain! Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”



(Left image credit to Jamie Lowe. Right image and main image credit to Will Colebourne.)

Also taking action is Bridie Leggatt, 22, who is also a student from Manchester, who said:

“Spiralling wealth inequality is leading us to societal collapse. Our country is the sixth richest nation and yet it is home to 4 million children living in poverty. Our political system doesn’t function fairly. We need ordinary people in the decision making seats deciding how to fix this; not corrupt politicians in the pockets of the super rich.”

“There IS a solution to inequality, but our government simply won’t do what’s necessary. We cannot let political parties use scapegoated minorities to distract us from what is needed: a tax on the super rich.”

(<https://takebackpower.net>).



(Image credit to Will Colebourne.)

Today’s action comes just days after the MET police began criminal investigations into Peter Mandelson, Starmer’s former ambassador to the US, over allegations that he passed market-sensitive information to the pedophile financier Jeffrey Epstein.

New allegations from recently released Epstein files also allege that Peter Mandelson’s husband accepted money from Jeffrey Epstein after his prison sentence over child sexual offences. [2]

But the corruption doesn’t end there, recent research by the Guardian showed that almost a third (266 out of 800) members of the House of Lords have given donations to political parties, some 115 of them before they were given peerages. [3]

Recent media reports have revealed that Labour government ministers have met with the arms industry, banks and big oil hundreds of times, while half the cabinet have taken cash from pro-Israel lobbyists. The Party even offered sponsorship deals for £55,000 to allow businesses to host lunches for ministers at the Labour conference. [4][5][6]

Meanwhile, inequality is spiralling out of control. Student nurses say they are sleeping in their cars, going to food banks and relying on lecturers to buy them food, while nearly half of Brits would struggle to pay for basic necessities if they lost their jobs. Given this, it is not surprising that faith in political institutions has collapsed, with 87 per cent of Britons across all parties having either not very much trust in politicians or none at all. [7][8][9]

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net):
(<https://takebackpower.net>)
(<https://takebackpower.net>)

ENDS



[.https://takebackpower.net](https://takebackpower.net)

Police arrest 15 Take Back Power supporters at a nonviolence training event

March 5, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/03/05/>)



15 Take Back Power supporters were arrested during a nonviolence training this evening being held in the Westminster Quaker Meeting House. Take Back Power is a nonviolent campaign demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a 'House of the People.' [1]

At around 18:35 a number of police officers forced entry into the Westminster Quakers meeting house. They proceeded to arrest 15 people on suspicion of conspiracy to commit theft. Two of those arrested were acting as legal observers. During the raid an ambulance had to be called as one person

suffered a panic attack after being arrested. Those arrested were sent to Brixton and Walworth police stations where one person was subsequently bailed. 14 remain in custody. [2]

(<https://takebackpower.net>)

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“The police arrested fifteen ordinary people in a place of worship for discussing nonviolent civil disobedience. This draconian overreach shows what the state is willing to do to protect corporate profits and billionaires, while ordinary people struggle to put food on the table.

The state is scared of civil disobedience because it works. But when the super-rich have captured our politics, nonviolent civil disobedience is the only choice we have to take back our power. Now more than ever, we need everyone to join us: sign up at takebackpower.net.”

In their statement, the MET police referenced last year’s unprecedented raid on Westminster Quakers and the arrests of Youth Demand supporters meeting about the genocide in Gaza, which drew widespread condemnation from faith groups. One of the people arrested this evening had also been previously arrested during last year’s raid on Westminster Quakers. [3]

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Take Back Power supporters redistribute food from supermarkets to those most in need

March 14, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/03/14/>)



Take Back Power supporters have been redistributing food from supermarkets to local foodbanks across the country this morning. Take Back Power is a nonviolent civil-resistance group, demanding that the UK government establish a 'House of the People'- a permanent citizen-led assembly with the power to tax extreme wealth. [1]

From around 8:30 this morning, teams across four UK cities- Manchester, London, Exeter and Truro, entered supermarkets and began putting food and necessities into boxes emblazoned with 'These things are going to those that need them'. The Take Back Power supporters left the shops without paying for the produce and then redistributed these items to local food-bank drop off points.

In Exeter, a team of five supporters took five boxes of produce from Morrison's supermarket in Prince Charles Road, however were stopped by security who took away two of five boxes. The remaining three boxes were successfully

benefit parasitic billionaires instead of the masses. It's time for ordinary people to be put at the heart of decision making, through a House of the People with powers to tax the rich and fix Britain."

<https://takebackpower.net>



(Credit for image to The Canary)

Also taking action is Ruth Cook, 74, a company director from Somerset, who said:

"I'm taking this action and risking arrest because we have a terrible situation in this country. Families are struggling and children are going hungry, while the profits some companies make are obscene. The answer is to tax the super-rich. I'm taking this food and delivering it to a food bank collection point because we need to do something about this. We need to tax the super rich and give ordinary people a say in how our taxes are spent. Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>)."



Today's action comes in the wake of the raid of a Quakers meeting house and the arrest of 15 people during a nonviolence training last week. One other was arrested at their home on Thursday and the houses of seven supporters have been raided by police in connection with these actions so far.
(<https://takebackpower.net>)

This occurs as the UK remains in crisis. Last year, 14 million people in the UK faced the prospect of going hungry due to a lack of money. Whilst in 2024, 6.5 million people turned to food banks. [2]

Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen's assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net \(https://takebackpower.net\)](https://takebackpower.net).

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Seven arrested at Nonviolence training event as Take Back Power supporters homes raided

April 19, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/04/19/>)



Seven people have been arrested at a nonviolence training event held in London. The training was held by Take Back Power, a nonviolent campaign demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a 'House of the People.' [1]

At around 12:30 yesterday, dozens of officers raided Millman Street Community Centre in London. Officers arrived in three vans, arresting six people under suspicion of 'conspiracy to commit theft.' One of those arrested was an undercover Daily Mail journalist.

At around 15:20 on Saturday the home of Take Back Power supporter was also raided. The supporter wasn't home and on learning there was a warrant for their arrest they handed themselves in. The police subsequently raided their home for a second time at around 2am this morning.

This weekend's raids occur as Take Back Power supporters joined a counter demonstration in Manchester yesterday, opposing Britain First, a far-right demonstration which was marching in the city. Groups opposing fascist demonstrators were kettled, beaten with truncheons and pepper-sprayed by police.

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

Once again the police are raiding homes and community centres, arresting people for simply learning about nonviolence. Meanwhile, police protect fascists marching in Manchester and kettle and beat counter-protestors instead. Such is the state of civil liberties in the UK in 2026. The government and police care more about protecting the interests of corporations and billionaires than protecting the people of this country. We've got to make politics work for ordinary people. We need a House of the People with powers to tax the billionaires destroying this country. If you want to help us make it happen sign up at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>)."



On Saturday, police also attended and shut down a nonviolence training being held in Falmouth, no arrests were made, however the event was cancelled.

Today's raids continue the escalating repression being imposed on nonviolent campaigns. Police have so far shut down four nonviolence trainings held by Take Back Power, in some instances raiding places of worship.

These raids echo the widely unpopular and unprecedented raid in 2025 on Westminster Quakers where Youth Demand supporters were meeting to discuss the genocide in Gaza, which drew widespread condemnation from faith groups.

[2]

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

“Nigel for Sale”- Take Back Power takes action at Sotheby’s

April 27, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/04/27/>)



Two Take Back Power supporters have taken action at Sotheby’s auction house. Take Back Power is a nonviolent campaign demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a ‘House of the People.’ [1]

At around 11:15 this morning, two Take Back Power supporters covered a painting at Sotheby’s Orientalist art pre-auction exhibition, with a picture of Nigel Farage’s face. The image read “*Nigel for sale: £100,000- bought by Sotheby’s*”. The painting covered is King Wilhelm I’s Arabian Stallion ‘Tursi’ by Friedrich Nerly, which is expected to sell for between £80,000- £120,000.

By around 11:35 the action takers had been removed from the building by security, however police didn’t arrive on the scene. At around mid-day, the action takers attempted to hand themselves in at Charing Cross police station. Thus far, no arrests have been made.

Sotheby's describes itself as *the 'world's premier destination for art and luxury'*. Best known for its fine art auctions, it also has a luxury real estate company — Sotheby's realty which has donated £100,000 to Reform. [2]

(<https://takebackpower.net>)

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“Reform claims to be on the side of working people. If that were true, why would the ‘world’s premier destination for art and luxury’, be giving them a donation of £100,000 in exchange for yet more tax breaks on the super rich if they get into power?”

“Reform is another party of the same corrupt corporations and super-rich who are destroying our country, putting the burden of fixing Britain onto working people. In order to fix Britain we need a mass redistribution of wealth and power away from the 1%, back to working people. Help us fix Britain at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”



One of those taking action today is Elvis, a delivery driver from Bolton, who said:

“I’m taking action with Take Back Power in order to highlight corruption and inequality in the UK. Sotheby’s have donated 100,000 to Reform plc, in exchange for more tax breaks for the super wealthy if they get elected.”

“Meanwhile millions of families still struggle to put food on the table every single day. We can make a change if we all come together and build a system that’s fairer and more representative of the British people. To find out more go to takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”

Also taking action today is Jimmy, 74, a retired NGO worker, from London who said:

“There was a time when the super-rich would be taxed at a much higher rate than ordinary working people, and we had a functioning health system and affordable housing. Nowadays corporations and billionaires pay next to no tax through using loopholes and offshore accounts.”

*“Reform wants to give even more tax breaks to the super wealthy who are already breaking Britain. We need ordinary people at the heart of deciding how to tax extreme wealth to begin fixing Britain. This is why we are calling for a permanent citizen’s assembly, with the power to tax extreme wealth- a **House of the People.**”*
(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Reform is backed primarily by the super-rich and corporations. This includes donations from crypto-billionaire Christopher Harborne, Claudia Harmsworth, wife of the owner of the Daily Mail- Lord Rothermere, and London’s leading luxury interior designers- Interior Architecture Landscape. [2]

We need to Take Back our Power from the super-rich, which is why Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent House of the People- a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net) (<https://takebackpower.net>).

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Take Back Power ‘take over’ the playgrounds of the super-rich

April 30, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/04/30/>)



Take Back Power supporters have been ‘taking over’ the playgrounds of the super-rich this morning. Take Back Power is a nonviolent campaign, demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a ‘House of the People.’ [1]

At around 10 this morning, 22 Take Back Power supporters occupied a Ferrari dealership in Berkeley Square, they could be heard chanting “WE DEMAND EQUALITY!” and “THE BILLIONAIRES HAVE GOT TO GO!”. By around 10:30 the group left the store.

At around 11:30, the group reconvened at Burlington Arcade- the world’s first modern shopping mall, which positions itself as an ‘elegant and exclusive upmarket shopping venue’. The group could be seen holding signs which read “HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE” and “4 MILLION KIDS IN POVERTY”, which were quickly seized by door staff.

By around 12:20, the group had moved on to the food hall at the luxury department store, Harrod's. Security was much more reactive, dragging Take Back Power supporters from the building.

(<https://takebackpower.net>)

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

“This country is in crisis and everyone knows it! The people to blame are the corporations and super-rich who are extracting every last penny from working people, and then using their ownership of the media to distract people into blaming the poor and migrants. Nothing short of a massive transfer of wealth and power away from the 1% and back to working people can hope to fix Britain. Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”



One of those taking action today is Robert Pembroke, 43, a builder and dad from Devon, who said:

It's time ordinary people take back our power from the super-rich. Inequality is spiralling out of control, 50 families in the UK hold more wealth than 50% of the country. Around the world, it's even worse with eight men holding more wealth than 50% of the world's population!”

*“It is obscene to allow this, people are dying. We need ordinary people, taking part in a permanent citizens' assembly- a **House of the People** deciding how to tackle this. To find out more go to takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>).”*



Also taking action today is Ana Heyatawin, 63, a grandmother from Somerset, who said:



“Inequality, which is being imposed on ordinary people by big business, billionaires and the politicians who work for them, is killing people right now. More than a third of people in the UK now don’t earn enough to buy life’s essentials.”

*“We need ordinary people at the heart of deciding how to tax extreme wealth to begin fixing this mess. This is why we are calling for a permanent citizen’s assembly, with the power to tax extreme wealth- a **House of the People.**”*

It’s time working people take back our power from the super-rich. This is why Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish a permanent **House of the People**— a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net) (<https://takebackpower.net>).

ENDS



(<https://takebackpower.net>)

Take Back Power supporters redistribute essential items whilst occupying high-end stores and hotels

May 1, 2026(<https://takebackpower.net/2026/05/01/>)



Take Back Power supporters have been occupying the playgrounds of the wealthy this morning, and have liberated items from a superstore to redistribute them back to the communities that need them. Take Back Power is a nonviolent campaign, demanding a tax on extreme wealth, to be decided by a **'House of the People.'** [1]

At around 9 this morning, three Take Back Power supporters entered the Tesco Extra on Acre Lane in Brixton, and took essential items from the shelves and left without paying. The action takers then donated the items at a local food-bank

drop-off point. At around 10am, all three attempted to hand themselves in at Brixton Police Station. So far none have been arrested.

At 11:45, around a further 18 Take Back Power supporters occupied the luxury department store Liberty, on Regent Street in London. They could be seen holding signs which read '3 MILLION HOUSEHOLDS SKIPPING MEALS' and 'TAX THE SUPER-RICH NOW.'

At around 1pm, this group then reconvened, disrupting access to the luxury hotel, Claridges. The group could be heard chanting "WE DEMAND EQUALITY!" and 'HOW DO WE TAX THE SUPER RICH?- A HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE!' as security attempted to move the supporters away from the door.

A Take Back Power spokesperson said:

*"Take Back Power is calling for an emergency '**House of the People**' to deal with the cost of living crisis. When politicians are too busy lining their pockets to fix our problems, we need the people most impacted to have a seat at the table. A **House of the People** selected by democratic lottery, like a jury, is a no-brainer solution to cut out the corruption and decide how to redistribute wealth."*



One of those taking action redistributing food today is Moshe Dixon, 25, from Dundee said:

"My mother came from poverty and fought tooth and nail to give me a better future. Like so many mothers she was promised that hard work would be rewarded, yet we are living in a country where so many families can't make ends meet despite working multiple jobs."

"6.5 million people had to turn to foodbanks in 2024. Meanwhile the CEO of Tesco is taking home 430 times the pay of the average Tesco employee, and the rich are paying a smaller share of tax than working people. We need an assembly of ordinary people coming together to decide how to tax extreme wealth in order to fix our broken country. Join us at takebackpower.net (<https://takebackpower.net>)."



Also taking action today occupying high-end stores and hotels, is Hannah McDonald, 20, a student from Liverpool, who said:

“Fourteen million people last year were faced with the prospect of going hungry, in this, the 6th richest nation on earth! Now we have a cost of living tsunami on the way and the government is nowhere to be seen.”

*“This is broken Britain. We need a **House of the People**— an assembly with real power, where ordinary mums, nurses, posties & cleaners, get a real say in how to take back our power from the super rich, and redistribute that wealth and power back to working people.”*

Today’s actions come as the UK braces for food shortages and soaring prices as a result of the war in Iran, as rising fuel, fertiliser and commodity prices begin to feed into business costs. [2]

It’s time we take on the super-rich who are profiteering from a world in crisis. This is why Take Back Power is demanding that the UK government establish an emergency **House of the People**— a citizen’s assembly chosen by democratic lottery, that has the power to tax extreme wealth and fix Britain.

Until the government makes a meaningful statement in response to our demand, we will undertake nonviolent action to resist the super-rich, who are driving us towards social collapse. Donate or sign up to take action at [TakeBackPower.net](https://takebackpower.net) (<https://takebackpower.net>).

ENDS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW25

This is the exhibit marked "AJW25" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Look what you made me do.



Two young people received suspended sentences today for spray-painting two private jets at Stansted Airport in June 2024 to demand the UK government negotiate a treaty to phase out oil and gas by 2030. [1]

They were found guilty of criminal damage at Chelmsford Crown Court in September. Jennifer Kowalski, 29, from Dumbarton received a 5 month custodial sentence suspended for 12 months, Cole Macdonald, 23, from Brighton was handed a six week custodial sentence suspended for 8 months plus 20 days rehabilitative activity. The two had cut through the wire perimeter fence at Stansted and sprayed paint from a fire extinguisher onto two private jets parked at Stansted Airport, just hours after Taylor Swift's plane had landed. [2]

At trial, the prosecution claimed the planes required extensive professional cleaning costing about £12,000. Judge Mill ruled the damage too serious for the defendants to rely on their rights to free expression and assembly under Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The jury was therefore not allowed to consider whether restricting those rights was a proportionate response to the alleged damage. [3]

After their arrest both were held for 11 days on remand, until released on bail. Cole then spent 39 weeks on curfewed tag (this equals a four month custodial sentence) While tagged Cole was arrested five times for breach of bail, approximately once every two months. Once she was being held in police custody, another time she was in hospital seeking treatment for back pain after informing the monitoring service. None of the five arrests resulted in breaching bail being proven.

Before sentencing Jennifer Kowalski, 29, a former sustainability manager from Dumbarton, said:

"Whilst Taylor and her fans have been celebrating her eras, we have entered a new one – the era of global boiling. This is an era that will not end with a rebrand; it will end all others. As a former Swiftie, I know what Taylor stands to lose, because there is no folklore without human culture, no music on a dead planet."

"The court system can take our freedom, our autonomy, our dignity, and deny us basic rights. But they can never take my convictions, to fight for a future for us all. Whatever happens in a court room, that is who I am today, and they can never change that."

A Just Stop Oil spokesperson said

This trial, the saga of mismanaged draconian bail conditions and the sentences demonstrates, again, the establishment will protect the wealthy and privileged while punishing those seeking to protect us and defend our freedoms and natural justice.

In just seven months of 2022, Taylor Swift's private jet logged 170 flights – 15.9 full days in the air, averaging 80 minutes and 139 miles per trip. Yard, the sustainability marketing firm that compiled the data, estimated her total carbon emissions at 8,293.54 tonnes of CO₂, more than 1,100 times that of an ordinary person over an entire year. [4]

A study published in Nature and reported by National Geographic found that private aviation generated at least 15.6 million tonnes of CO₂ in 2023, with an average of 3.6 tonnes emitted per flight. Almost half of all private-jet journeys were under 500 kilometres,

and around one in five covered less than 200 kilometres, distances that could often be travelled by rail or road. The researchers noted that some aircraft models can emit more carbon in a single hour than an average person produces in an entire year. [5] [6]

The music industry, and even artists of Taylor Swift's stature, are not shielded from the accelerating climate collapse. In November 2023, 23-year-old Ana Clara Benevides collapsed and later died from heat exhaustion while attending Swift's concert in Rio de Janeiro during a record-breaking heatwave that pushed temperatures above 40°C. [7]

In recent months, the musician Steve Miller cancelled his entire North American tour citing the growing threat of extreme weather, describing the decision as unavoidable in light of intensifying heat, floods and wildfires. Artists and organisers are already facing rising costs, cancellations and safety risks as performances are disrupted by record temperatures and severe storms. Extreme weather, driven by fossil fuel combustion, is already endangering lives and reshaping the conditions in which global entertainment operates. [8]

ENDS

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW26

This is the exhibit marked "AJW26" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

FØSSIL FREE LONDON



Fossil Free London is a climate justice organisation dedicated to disrupting the fossil fuel industry here in our city.

Through direct action, strategic campaigning, and movement building, we challenge the social licence of elites and corporate polluters. We advocate for a rapid and just transition towards a sustainable and equitable society.

In London? **[Sign up to a welcome talk.](#)**

Or join our **[mailing list](#)** and follow us on social media.



[Powered by WordPress.com.](#)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW27

This is the exhibit marked "AJW27" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

! NEW PROJECT ALERT !

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



Take back POWER

Join us at: takebackpower.net

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW28

This is the exhibit marked "AJW28" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



Two Just Stop Oil supporters found guilty for Heathrow paint spraying following retrial

by The Canary — 14 May 2026 in News, UK Reading Time: 4 mins read

202 10 AA 0

Home > UK > News

Share on Facebook

Share on Twitter

Share on Bluesky

Share via WhatsApp


Share via Telegram

Share on Threads

Two [Just Stop Oil supporters](#) who [sprayed Heathrow departure boards with orange paint](#) during the Oil Kills international uprising to end fossil fuels in July 2024 have been found guilty in a retrial after the jury in an earlier trial failed to reach a majority decision.

Phoebe Plummer and Jane Touil were appearing before Judge Duncan at Isleworth Crown Court for the second time on a charge of criminal damage over £5,000 for [their action on 30 July 2024 to demand a fossil fuel treaty to end oil and gas by 2030](#).

The jury took four-and-a-half hours to reach a majority verdict of 10-2. Following the verdict, Touil said:



Since I took action, global fossil fuel use and emissions have continued to rise. More than ever, we need a global fossil fuel treaty to help governments rapidly phase out fossil fuels.

What we do at this moment in history matters. But there is a difference between laws and morality. The courts apply the law made by powerful people. Morals come from within. It is our morals that give us our conscience. I have always tried to live according to my conscience.

Plummer said:

The climate crisis is the greatest injustice that humanity has ever faced. We should all consider what to do at this time. No individual caused this crisis and no one is solely responsible for stopping it. But we can choose what we do to alleviate suffering.

I feel compelled to act to be a responsible citizen, a loving aunt and a good person. It compels me to hope for a better future and one where my nephew grows up.

I didn't think the action would change government policy. But non violent civil resistance is a necessary part of tackling the climate crisis and I'm grateful and proud to have been part of that.

Plummer was remanded for 58 days and Touil for 14 days following the 2024 action in which the pair used fire extinguishers to spray diluted water-based paint in Heathrow Terminal 5 including at the departure boards. The Crown alleged that the action caused £8,000 worth of damages and that three of the display screens needed to be replaced.

Judge ruled out various defences for Heathrow action

At trial, Judge Duncan ruled out several legal defences for the action including those of 'reasonable excuse' under Articles 10 and 11 of the ECHR, 'necessity' and 'self defence' on the grounds that the threat from climate change was not proximate enough and the actions too far removed from the threat.

The defendants were allowed to argue belief in consent: that they honestly believed the owners of Heathrow would have consented to the damage if they knew of its circumstances. However, evidence of the relevant circumstances was to be limited to the fact that it was a climate protest with all evidence about the scale and urgency of the climate crisis ruled 'irrelevant and therefore inadmissible'.

Discover more

[Coatings & Adhesives](#)

[Art & Craft Supplies](#)

[House Painting & Finishing](#)

[Newspapers](#)

[Politics](#)

[Science news features](#)

[Journalism training resources](#)

In giving evidence, Touil said:

I genuinely and sincerely believed that if the shareholders [of Heathrow] had a full understanding of the situation we are in they would have given their consent to our action.

Most people believe there is something that is wrong with climate but not many people have access to the full situation because the fossil fuel industry has used their immense wealth to ensure that governments do not act and it is not reported in the mainstream media.

So I don't know if shareholders have a full understanding, but I know that if they did, they would be doing all in their power to stop fossil fuels because there will be no business as usual, no functioning society, half the population could be wiped out along with 50% of global GDP. I think shareholders want to protect their investment but they also want a future for their kids.

In her evidence Plummer said:

I want to make it very clear that this was not a protest against Heathrow, or anyone flying through Heathrow that day. It's true that the aviation industry is especially harmful to the climate in terms of emissions, though it is a small number of frequent fliers and private jet users who cause the vast majority of this harm, not families who save up for a holiday once a year.

But this wasn't about getting people to stop flying. I made this individual change to live in line with my values, but honestly I know that it's pretty inconsequential. Even if we all woke up tomorrow and stopped flying and went vegan, it would be like mopping up a spill from an overflowing bath whilst leaving the tap on.

All individual changes are like this when we are facing a systemic issue. If fossil fuels are extracted from the ground, then they will all be burnt, even if it's not on a flight that you're on. We need

systemic change, that has always been Just Stop Oil's demand.

My intention was not to cause damage. My intention was to take part in an act of nonviolent civil resistance, raising a serious alarm bell to the catastrophic future in store for us if we persist in our addiction to fossil fuels.

Featured image via Just Stop Oil

Tags: [climate crisis](#) [fossil fuels](#) [Just Stop Oil](#) [protest](#)

Share 158

Tweet 99

 Share

 Send

 Share

 Share

Previous Post

[How medical misogyny stole my life for 20 years](#)

Next Post

[Israeli troops murder 16yo for objecting to settlers stealing his dad's sheep](#)

Leave a Reply

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

Comment *

Name *

Email *

Website

POST COMMENT

News > UK > Crime

Just Stop Oil activists who sprayed Stonehenge with orange powder cleared of criminal damage

They cited human rights law in their defence

Rod Minchin

Friday 31 October 2025 17:12 GMT



Prosecutors release videos played in trial of Just Stop Oil activists accused of damaging Stonehenge



For free real time breaking news alerts sent straight to your inbox sign up to our breaking news emails

SIGN UP

I would like to be emailed about offers, events and updates from The Independent. Read our [Privacy notice](#)

Three **Just Stop Oil activists** who took part in a protest in which **Stonehenge** was sprayed with orange powder have been found not guilty of criminal damage and causing a public nuisance.

It follows a trial at **Salisbury Crown Court** where they cited **human rights law** in their defence.

Then-Oxford University student Niamh Lynch, 23, and Rajan Naidu, 74, had been accused of using two colour blasters filled with cornflour, talc and an orange dye to spray the monument.

Salisbury Crown Court was told the pair – along with a third activist, Luke Watson, 36 – targeted Stonehenge as part of an ongoing fossil fuel protest by the Just Stop Oil group the day before the 2024 summer solstice.

About 15,000 people were due to gather and celebrate at the monument.

Naidu and Lynch had crossed the boundary ropes and trespassed into the area around the monument before launching the attack.



Just Stop Oil protesters sit down after an orange substance was sprayed on Stonehenge (PA Media)

Watson had bought the equipment used in the attack and had driven his co-accused to Stonehenge that morning.

Prosecutors alleged the protest had been “carefully planned” and was filmed by other Just Stop Oil supporters with footage released publicly afterwards.

Simon Jones, prosecuting, said: “Putting it simply, we say they were all in it together.

“The prosecution say that this is an act of blatant and clear vandalism. The intention is undoubtedly to make a statement.”


After the attack, Naidu and Lynch, who were both wearing white Just Stop Oil T-shirts, sat down in silence in front of the stones until they were arrested.

The court heard the stones were promptly cleaned. The costs of removing the powder totalled £620.

Mr Jones added: “Stonehenge is arguably the best recognised and architecturally sophisticated prehistoric stone circle in the world, built around 5,000 years ago.

“The site in Wiltshire is visited by members of the public from all over the world, providing both an education and spiritual experience.

“The stones are a protected ancient monument.”





Judge Paul Dugdale told the jury in his legal directions they had to assess where the “balance lies” in the case and whether a conviction would be a “proportionate interference” with the defendants’ rights.

RECOMMENDED

- [Footage shows moment Just Stop Oil protesters spray orange paint on Stonehenge, court hears](#)
- [Just Stop Oil to end disruptive protests with final demonstration date announced](#)
- [Two deny charges over Just Stop Oil protest at Stonehenge](#)
- [Two people charged by police after orange paint was thrown at Stonehenge in Just Stop Oil protest](#)

“In any society there will be those whose opinions we agree with and those whose opinions we disagree,” he said.

“The essence of a free society and freedom of speech is that everyone’s entitled to express their opinion even when we disagree with what they say.

“If individuals disagree with what our government is doing on certain matters, they are entitled to protest about the government’s actions or inactions.

“All of this is the essence of our free society. It’s how our society has developed over the centuries, and the reality is we are very fortunate to live in a free society.

“There are times when protecting the right to freedom of speech and freedom to protest can mean that activity that would otherwise be unlawful would be regarded as lawful by the court to protect those rights.”

The jury found Naidu, of Gosford Street, Birmingham; Lynch, of Norfolk Road, Turvey, Bedford; and Watson, of The Street, Manuden, Essex, each not guilty of the two charges after deliberating for six hours.

More about: [Stonehenge](#) [Just Stop Oil](#) [Salisbury Crown Court](#) [Human rights law](#) [Activists](#)

Promoted Links

by Taboola

Aldi Shoppers Say This £15 Cloth Beats £2,000 Bodyshop Repairs

TOP.US.ORG

[Read More](#)

London Bodyshop Owner Reveals The £15 Cloth He Was Selling As £2,000 Repairs

TOP.US.ORG

[Read More](#)



Three Just Stop Oil supporters walk free after trial for M25 gantry action

Court & Prison, Press / September 11, 2025

Three Just Stop Oil supporters were found not guilty of public nuisance at Guildford Crown Court today, after peacefully climbing gantries on the M25 in 2022, to demand an end to new fossil fuel projects.[1]

Sam Holland, Rachel Payne and Isabel Rock took action on the M25 on 9th November 2022. They were

We use cookies on our website to give you the most relevant experience by remembering your preferences and repeat visits. By clicking "Accept All", you consent to the use of ALL the cookies. However, you may visit "Cookie Settings" to provide a controlled consent.

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accept All](#)

During the trial the prosecution emphasised that this was a planned and coordinated action that resulted in significant delays to the travelling public, that all three defendants were trespassing in a place that was forbidden to the public and that they had taken considerable risks with public safety. Giving evidence National Highways Ltd claimed that traffic was delayed by between 4 and 5 hours and that between 9,000 and 30,000 vehicles were impacted. None of the defendants denied the indictment, but they argued that they had a reasonable excuse for their actions.

Sam Holland argued that he had wanted to prevent harm. He had read academic papers which pointed to catastrophic consequences for humanity from burning fossil fuels, including food system collapse.

Rachel Payne explained that she took action because she was fearful for her children and grandchildren about government inaction on the climate crisis. She highlighted the government breaking its 2015 climate agreements by offering new fossil fuel licences.

Isabel Rock said that she felt a duty to look after people younger than herself and that the climate crisis is going to touch every single part of their lives. Taking action was something she weighed up very seriously and that as a self employed person, she knew how hard it was for people to earn money and to get by. However she felt that if they could see some of these agreed facts about the seriousness of the climate crisis, she hoped they would understand.

The Judge, Recorder L Harris, ruled that it was for the jury to decide whether or not the supporters had a reasonable excuse for their actions.

In their closing speeches, all the defendants were able to refer to the agreed facts in the case, which included several key facts relating to the climate crisis.

In his closing speech, Sam Holland said:

"We brought evidence on the largest evil committed in human history: the continued drilling and burning of oil and gas in full knowledge that large parts of humanity will be killed. The prosecution has said that these are beliefs. They are not beliefs. This is not a cause. This is not another 'issue'. This is billions of deaths. Not according to me, according to the world's leading scientists. These are the facts. If we hit 3C of warming by 2050, there could be four billion human deaths. Half of the world's current population.

"What was the UK government doing? It was issuing over 100 new licences for companies to explore and drill oil and gas in the North Sea. In the knowledge of everything I've just said, which is public knowledge and has been known for decades, the government was still wanting to drill. Unimaginable evil. We all talked about how we had extensively tried other methods for making change. Signing petitions, emailing MPs, going on conventional marches... So we had to turn to disruptive action.'

We use cookies on our website to give you the most relevant experience by remembering your preferences and repeat visits. By clicking "Accept All", you consent to the use of ALL the cookies. However, you may visit "Cookie Settings" to provide a controlled consent.

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accept All](#)

"I thank the members of the Jury deeply for their 'common sense' verdict – they were actually permitted to hear the several climate related agreed facts, which were read out to them, about the severe threats the present emergency poses to our world and they listened!

I thank the prosecution for agreeing to those facts following earlier trials I attended in which the 'whole truth' was repeatedly denied to the Jury. I thank the Judge for allowing them to decide that we "more likely than not" had a reasonable excuse for what we did.

In my statement to the police, I urgently expressed my fears for my family and world and my hopes for an 'eco-U- turn'. With this acquittal, I feel this may be closer to being made possible. The tide may well be turning if the agreed facts on climate, allowed in this trial, can become widely known and acted upon internationally."

In 2024 Just Stop Oil successfully won its original demand of 'no new oil and gas' and on March 27th 2025 announced an end to the campaign of action. However, our supporters will continue to tell the truth in court, to speak out for our political prisoners and to help build what comes next.

ENDS

Press contact: 07762 987334

Press email: juststopoilpress@protonmail.com

High quality images & video here: <https://juststopoil.org/press-media>

Heathrow 10 images here:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1mByhU4LBPB6t5pMAP_-5dJOkhvsxwTNX?usp=sharing

Website: <https://juststopoil.org/>

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/JustStopOil/>

Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/just.stopoil/>

Twitter: https://twitter.com/JustStop_Oil

Youtube: <https://juststopoil.org/youtube>

TikTok: <https://www.tiktok.com/@juststopoil>

We use cookies on our website to give you the most relevant experience by remembering your preferences and repeat visits. By clicking "Accept All", you consent to the use of ALL the cookies. However, you may visit "Cookie Settings" to provide a controlled consent.

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accept All](#)



Britain / 29 August 2025

Eight JSO supporters acquitted of public nuisance after petrol station action



M JSO activists blocking a service station on the M25 in August 2022. Photo: Just Stop Oil



EIGHT Just Stop Oil activists have been cleared of causing a public nuisance after disrupting Britain's largest petrol station.

Michael Davies, Charles Laurie, Phoebe Frewer, Sophie Sharples, Tez Burns, Peter Lay, Gareth Harper and Emma Ireland took action at Cobham motorway services in Surrey in August 2022.

As part of a wider campaign targeting petrol stations along the M25, the activists were among a group of 35 who also took action at Clacket Lane services in Kent and Thurrock services in Essex.

At Guildford Crown Court on Wednesday, all eight defendants were found not guilty of intentionally or recklessly causing a public nuisance by blocking the entrance to Cobham services.

However, Mx Burns and Mr Lay were found guilty of causing criminal damage, while Mr Laurie was found guilty of possession of a hammer with intent to damage property after two petrol pumps were damaged.

Following the verdict, Ms Ireland said: "I am grateful to the judge and the prosecution for allowing the agreed facts on the climate crisis to have played a part in this trial and for allowing us to speak to our motivations without fear of being found in contempt of court.

"The prosecution spoke about common sense and I was reminded that, in 2022, I felt that common sense would have been for the Conservative government to stop issuing new oil and gas licences, to show a commitment to reducing carbon emissions and, in turn, to offer some protection to humanity from the gravest predictions of climate collapse."



**Donate to the 95th
Anniversary Appeal**

Elizabeth Short

Owned by Our Readers

We're a reader-owned co-operative, which means you can become part of the paper too by buying shares in the People's Press Printing Society.

[Subscribe](#)

[Support us](#)

Sections

[Britain](#)
[World](#)
[Editorial](#)
[Features](#)
[Culture](#)
[Sport](#)

Topics

[Climate Crisis](#)
[Workers' Rights](#)
[Middle East](#)
[Labour Party](#)
[Red Star Talks](#)
[Scotland](#)
[Iran](#)
[Latin America](#)

Services

[Advertise](#)
[Contact us](#)
[Shop](#)
[Subscribe](#)
[Support us](#)
[Daily Alert](#)





Hung jury in latest Just Stop Oil gantry case

Court & Prison, Press / July 21, 2025

A Just Stop Oil supporter faces retrial after a jury was unable to reach a verdict in relation to her participation in the M25 gantry climbing actions in November 2022 demanding an end to new oil and gas licencing. [1]

A 12-member jury at Southwark Crown Court was unable to reach a verdict in the case of a Just Stop Oil supporter charged with the new statutory offence of 'causing a public nuisance' under the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022, following more than 9 hours of deliberations over three days.

Theresa Norton, 66, a former councillor and carer, took part in a Just Stop Oil action on the M25 in November 2022, during which she climbed a gantry near junction 1b on 7 November, to demand an end to all new oil and gas projects – a demand that has since been adopted as official government policy. She did

The CPS has now been allowed 7 days by Judge Tomlinson to determine whether it will pursue a retrial.

In her evidence to the Jury, Norton said:

"I acted on my conscience. My despair turned into action into hope. Sadly, conscience is not a legal defence. Therefore, you'll be directed to ignore this evidence, all that I've said, and come to your verdict only on the evidence as presented by the prosecution. This leaves you with no choice, no agency, you have become part of the machinery of state. Accepting of the cognitive dissonance that can happily see a government declare such statements as seen in the Agreed Facts, whilst simultaneously issuing 130 new oil and gas licences, planning for extra runways at airports, building more roads, refusing to implement plans to insulate our badly designed cold and draughty homes, continuing with subsidies to fossil fuel companies to the tune of millions of pounds a week and delaying investment for sustainable green energy, because the fossil fuel lobby is powerful and generous with donations to influential think tanks.

The climate crisis was only getting worse in 2021. Talks by eminent climate scientists were telling us to act, do something. In 2022, a third of Pakistan was under flood water- 1700 dead, 13,000 injured, 8 million displaced. Portugal, Germany and France had rampant wildfires. In July there were wildfires in UK and 40 degrees in London for the first time. London Fire Brigade had its busiest day since WW2.

Civil resistance is a communicative act. It communicates that something is very wrong and needs to change. It is not trying to seize power in a violent armed revolution. It is nonviolent and peaceful. Facts, information and science do not motivate people to change. Tell a smoker that smoking kills and they'll carry on. Facts are not what powers the human heart. That's why just talking about science will not save us and quoting all the statistics in the world will not move us to change. You have to bring emotions into it. Nonviolent direct action has a history of effecting change. We've been vindicated. That oil and gas will stay in the sea. But I stand here because I maintain the courage of my convictions. I believe that when we see clearly through that state machinery, it is only our collective conscience that can truly be relied upon."

During the trial, the Crown prosecution acknowledged the findings of the 2020 Net Zero Interim report, which stated:

"Climate change is an existential threat to humanity. Without global action to limit greenhouse gas emissions, the climate will change catastrophically with almost unimaginable consequences for societies across the world." [3]

Additionally, the prosecution agreed upon the established scientific consensus that warming exceeding 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels poses 'catastrophic' and 'irreversible' risks to humanity. It was further accepted that the average global temperature rise for the year ending 2024 was 1.65 degrees Celsius, with projections indicating that warming would permanently surpass 1.5 degrees Celsius before 2030.

Just Stop Oil continues to stand by those prosecuted for peaceful resistance against fossil fuel expansion in the face of rapidly accelerating climate collapse.

Press contact: 07762 987334

Press email: juststopoilpress@protonmail.com

High quality images & video here: <https://juststopoil.org/press-media>

Website: <https://juststopoil.org/>

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/JustStopOil/>

Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/just.stopoil/>

Twitter: https://twitter.com/JustStop_Oil

Youtube: <https://juststopoil.org/youtube>

TikTok: <https://www.tiktok.com/@juststopoil>

Notes to Editors

[1] Just Stop Oil is a member of the A22 Network of civil resistance projects.

April 26th 2025 was the last Just Stop Oil action, but our supporters will continue to tell the truth in the courts, speak out for our political prisoners, and call out the UK's oppressive anti-protest laws.

Just Stop Oil continues to rely on small donations from the public to make this happen.

[2] <https://juststopoil.org/2023/10/30/no-prison-for-m25-injunction-breakers/>

[3]
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1004025/210615_NZR_interim_report_Master_v4.pdf

← Previous Post

Next Post →

Support
Just Stop Oil



Palestine Action

● This article is more than **4 months** old

Palestine Action activists cleared of aggravated burglary at Israeli defence firm site

None of the six activists were convicted of any offence over break-in at Elbit Systems factory near Bristol in 2024

Haroon Siddique *Legal affairs correspondent*

Wed 4 Feb 2026 13.54 GMT

 Prefer the Guardian on Google

Six [Palestine Action](#) activists have been cleared of committing aggravated burglary over a break-in at an Israeli defence firm's UK site.

Charlotte Head, Samuel Corner, Leona Kamio, Fatema Rajwani, Zoe Rogers and Jordan Devlin were accused of threatening unlawful violence and [using sledgehammers](#) as weapons after a prison van was driven into Elbit Systems' factory in Filton, near Bristol, on 6 August 2024.

But after a trial at Woolwich crown court, south London, none were convicted of any offence.

All six were acquitted of aggravated burglary, which carries a maximum sentence of life imprisonment, and jurors found Rajwani, Rogers and Devlin not guilty of violent disorder.

The jury deliberated for 36 hours and 34 minutes but could not reach verdicts for charges of criminal damage against any of the six defendants. This was in spite of all of the defendants, except Devlin, telling jurors they had entered the factory without permission and damaged Elbit's equipment including computers and drones.

Additionally, no verdict was reached in the allegation that Corner, 23, inflicted grievous bodily harm on police sergeant Kate Evans, or on the charges of violent disorder against Head, Corner and Kamio.

Before the verdicts on Wednesday, Mr Justice Johnson told the jurors he was not going to ask them to deliberate further, because “you believe that you can go no further than you have got to already”.

The activists hugged one another in the dock as a dozen of their supporters cheered from the public gallery above.

Deanna Heer KC, prosecuting, had told the jury that the defendants were all armed with sledgehammers, which she said were not only intended to be used to damage property but also as weapons “to be used if necessary to threaten and damage people”.


Heer alleged security guards were sworn at, had sledgehammers swung at them and were whipped, while one was sprayed with a foam fire extinguisher.

Rajiv Menon KC, representing Head, said any violence by the defendants was clearly unplanned, that the defendants had not expected security guards to enter the factory and were “completely out of their depth”.

He compared Head to the suffragettes, while describing Elbit Systems, of which Elbit Systems UK is a subsidiary, as a “dreadful company [that] has played a critical role in the killing of tens of thousands of Palestinians”.

The defence also argued that the security team had used excessive force and pointed to missing CCTV footage.

Sign up to **First Edition**

 **Free daily newsletter**

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

Enter your email address

Sign up

Get updates about our journalism and ways to support and enjoy our work.

Privacy Notice: Newsletters may contain information about charities, online ads, and content funded by outside parties. If you do not have an account, we will create a guest account for you on [theguardian.com](https://www.theguardian.com) to send you this newsletter. You can complete full registration at any time. For more information about how we use your data see our [Privacy Policy](#).

During the trial one juror asked the judge whether it would count as a lawful excuse if a defendant believed they were performing a life-saving action by destroying weapons used to kill civilians in an illegal genocide. Johnson said it would not, but Menon reminded the jurors of their absolute right to acquit.

Heer and Johnson both told the jurors, before they began deliberating, that they should disregard their views on the conflict in the Middle East.

After the verdicts, Rogers’ mother, Clare, said: “Our loved one’s action against Elbit Systems and the state’s brutal response have exposed the true values of the government. The government is determined to do business with Israel and protect its weapons industry at any cost.

“Our loved ones dared to poke this beast - and no expense has been spared in policing, prosecuting and imprisoning them without trial. Imagine if the government had put the same amount of money, resources and political will into preventing a genocide.”

A spokesperson for Defend Our Juries, which has organised rallies opposing the ban on Palestine Action, **which took effect on 5 July last year**, said the verdicts were “a huge blow to government ministers” who had “tried to portray Palestine Action as a violent group to justify banning it under badly drafted terrorism legislation”.

Amnesty International also said it showed how disproportionate the proscription decision was.

More on this story

Palestine Action trial lawyer wins appeal against contempt of court charge

12 May 2026



Palestine Action ban created 'culture of fear', UK appeal court hears

28 Apr 2026



Greta Thunberg, Sally Rooney and Brian Eno defy Palestine Action ban in letter to judges

24 Apr 2026



Palestine Action activist who hit officer with sledgehammer 'panicked', court told

22 Apr 2026



Palestine Action wanted to sue Elbit Systems' pro told

15 Apr 2026



Most viewed

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW29

This is the exhibit marked "AJW29" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.



BREAKING Its • Leeds United's strongest XI and bench with pair departing • Beauty salon dealing with staff issue 'internally' after viral video

Traffic and Travel

Climate campaigners react to 'mixed' CLUED outcome as Leeds Bradford Airport night flights debate rumbles on



By Alex Grant
Senior Reporter



Published 15th May 2026, 16:30 BST

BLUEGROUND

No Setup. All-Inclusive Rent

No broker fees. No furniture run. Just a monthly rent for your London stay.

Leeds City Council are being urged to reconsider part of the ruling

Climate campaigners have reacted to a "mixed decision" on the future of Leeds Bradford Airport's night flights restrictions.

The Group for Action on Leeds Bradford Airport (GALBA) say they are pleased that Leeds City Council has ruled that Leeds Bradford Airport cannot fly an unlimited number of planes at night. This is the result of the council's decision to award a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use or Development (CLEUD) to the airport.

However, the climate campaigners say they strongly disagree with the City Council's view that LBA is allowed to fly an additional 941 planes per year at night.

Urging them to reconsider that part of the ruling, GALBA has sent a legal letter to the council and is exploring options to potentially challenge the ruling.



GALBA are unhappy that LBA is allowed to fly an additional 941 planes per year at night. | Simon Hulme

“Obviously, it’s disappointing that the council has allowed the CLEUD but it’s a mixed decision,” said Nick Hodgkinson, Chair of GALBA. “The good news is that they did not allow unlimited night time flying at LBA. That’s what the airport wanted and they failed.

“However, the council has allowed the airport to fly an additional 941 planes at night every year. We believe that part of the decision is legally incorrect and our lawyers have written to the council today, asking them to put it right.

“In practice, LBA will try to fly all of those additional planes during the summer months, causing a big increase in noise and pollution. That would be bad news for local people, the air we breathe and the climate we all depend on.”

GALBA has called into question Leeds City Council’s interpretation of the way that planning conditions 6 and 7 work after receiving updated legal advice.

Condition 6 lists all the types of aircraft that are lawfully allowed to fly at night. The council’s decision has ruled that the aircraft covered by the CLEUD are now lawfully allowed to fly at night, and therefore they are part of Condition 6.

Meanwhile, Condition 7 places limits on the total number of night flights that can be made by all the types of aircraft listed in Condition 6. The limits are 2,800 in summer and 1,200 in winter. These limits apply to all the aircraft covered by Condition 6, including those now approved by the CLEUD.

Leeds City Council approved and confirmed as lawful up to 941 additional night-time aircraft movements per year by quieter aircraft, a figure which is in line with movement numbers previously operated by the airport.

A spokesperson for the local authority explained: "The council, acting as the local planning authority for Leeds, has determined a CLEUD application submitted by Leeds Bradford Airport. This provides increased clarity on the airport's operation regarding night-time flight numbers, which we are aware is a matter of local interest.

"Leeds Bradford Airport had asked the council to confirm that unlimited flights by these quieter aircraft during the night-time were lawful. The council did not agree to this.

"The 941 newly confirmed movements are in addition to the existing limits on night-time flights at the airport, which were established in a 2007 planning permission and are capped at 2,800 movements during British Summer Time and 1,200 during the winter season. Any additional night-time movements above the 941 figure will count towards these caps."

Local residents previously joined GALBA members to protest in front of Leeds Civic Hall. | Gerard Binks

The CLEUD application, which sought to establish the lawfulness of take-offs and landings at the airport at night by certain types of aircraft, was **determined following a formal call for evidence by Leeds City Council.**

All flight data submitted by third parties was independently verified by the council and external sources. It is based on UK planning law and an assessment of the airport's flight records over a 10-year period.

Under a condition of Leeds Bradford Airport's planning permission in 2007, the night-time period is defined as running between 11pm and 7am each night. Any aircraft movements above the total capped movements would constitute a breach of planning permission and could be subject to enforcement action.

As part of the CLUED outcome, it was confirmed that the Yeadon-based airport **did not breach the movement limits governing night flights** during the 2023, 2024, and 2025 periods.

A spokesperson for Leeds Bradford Airport said: "We are pleased with the decision by Leeds City Council, which confirms our long-held position that LBA has operated responsibly and in full compliance with night flight regulations over the last three years. This decision provides much-needed certainty for our partners, our passengers, and the local community.

"LBA remains committed to being a responsible neighbour while continuing to serve as a vital economic gateway for the region.

"We look forward to continuing our constructive work with Leeds City Council to develop a sustainable long-term framework for flights that balances the region's connectivity needs with our environmental and local commitments."

It comes as LBA has embarked on LBA:REGEN, its most transformative period in decades including a **fundamental transformation and extension of the terminal building** and the launch of its new Together for Tomorrow sustainability strategy.

As part of its **Together for Tomorrow strategy**, LBA continues to work with airlines to deploy the latest generation of quieter, more fuel-efficient aircraft as part of its ongoing effort to modernise operations and reduce the noise footprint of its flight schedule.

City Council previously issued the airport with an **enforcement notice in September 2024** after they were found to have breached noise rules. Two of three subsequent appeals were dismissed.



REGION

Home > Business

The people v Leeds Bradford Airport – a new chapter begins

Night flights ruled illegal by a public enquiry continue to operate but Leeds City Council could now take action to restore control



by [Nick Hodgkinson](#) — 30-04-2026 06:57 in **Business, Region** Reading Time: 6 mins read

AA





Group for Action on Leeds Bradford Airport (GALBA) protest outside Leeds Civic Hall calling on Leeds City Council to immediately stop unlimited, unauthorised night flights. Credit: Neil Terry Photography/ Alamy News Live



Share on Bluesky



Leeds Bradford Airport (LBA) has submitted yet another planning application to increase nighttime flying. They want the airport's most frequently flown aircraft to be exempt from the cap on night flights. [The Group for Action on Leeds Bradford Airport \(GALBA\)](#) is opposing the application and thinks there's a simple way for Leeds City Council to put an end to the merry-go-round of planning applications.

Long term readers will be familiar with the ongoing struggle between local campaigners, GALBA, and LBA. Since 2020, the airport has been looking for ways to increase its annual passenger numbers from 4.5 million to 7 million by 2030 and 10 million by 2045. And since 2020, GALBA has successfully stopped them.

LBA specifically wants to increase nighttime flying to maximise the number of return flights that can be made to the Med and back in the same day by airlines using LBA. Why? Because a plane on the ground isn't making money.

GALBA wants to protect local people, air quality and the climate

GALBA strongly opposes expansion for three reasons: the [health risks](#) that additional night flights would pose to people who live (and try to sleep) under the flight path; the damage that would be done to local [air quality](#) from the rise in ultra-fine particles released by jet engines; and the increase in [greenhouse gas emissions](#) from extra flights, at a time when scientists warn that humanity is in the last chance saloon to prevent catastrophic climate breakdown.

As the Chair of GALBA, I feel the need to restate our aims because, over the years, these have been misunderstood – or even misrepresented – by some people. To be clear, GALBA does not say the airport should be closed down; nor do we say that people should never fly. We do say that LBA should not be allowed to expand, because the harms that would result far outweigh any benefit that might accrue.

Consistent with our stand on LBA, we also oppose all other proposed airport expansions, following the advice of the government’s expert advisers on the [Climate Change Committee](#).



ECONOMY

The People v Leeds Bradford Airport – the conflict continues

BY NICK HODGKINSON ⌚ 1 OCTOBER 2025 - UPDATED ON 19 APRIL 2026

A public enquiry on night flights and its bizarre consequences

So what’s been happening? In July last year, LBA’s appeal against Leeds City Council’s rejection of the airport’s applications for Certificates of Lawful Existing Use or Development (CLEUDs) was heard at a public inquiry. LBA wanted to exempt its most commonly used planes from the

cap on night flights forever. [The planning inspector ruled against LBA's two most important CLEUDs.](#)

Although LBA's applications were rejected, the bizarre consequence of the public inquiry decision left LBA flying hundreds of aircraft at night that are not lawfully allowed to fly at night at all. However, precisely because they're not lawful, Leeds City Council hasn't counted them towards the limit on the number of flights allowed at night and, because LBA has appealed against the planning inspector's decision, the council hasn't taken any action to stop them.

Now LBA has come back with yet another CLEUD application that seeks to achieve the same result that it wanted previously – exemption from the night flight rules for its most frequently flown aircraft. Yes, it does sound odd, but LBA can keep on applying even though they lost last time.

What's even more frustrating is that a CLEUD is not decided by elected councillors on a planning committee but by an unelected council officer who can only consider the law and the figures. LBA say that if they can prove that the aircraft which are not allowed to fly at night at all have actually been flying at night for 10 continuous years, then those aircraft can fly as often as they want at night – forever – and no one can do anything about it.



A simple way to restore the council's control

Obviously, in GALBA's view that just looks like rewarding bad behaviour. We've submitted our legal and factual arguments to Leeds City Council and will wait for the decision. Our guess is that if LBA loses (again), the airport's managers will appeal (again) and the whole merry-go-

round will continue. But ... there is something the council can do to restore control and stop LBA's rule breaking.

There are operating conditions in LBA's existing planning permission, which were set by, and can be used by, Leeds City Council. One of those conditions gives the council a power to approve (i.e. make lawful) nighttime flying by any aircraft that meet certain basic requirements. The aircraft that are the subject of LBA's CLEUD application meet those requirements, so it is within the council's power to approve them.

By doing that, the currently unlawful aircraft would become lawful and therefore have to be counted towards the cap on night flights. Moreover if – or more likely when – LBA next exceeds the night flight cap, Leeds City Council can take enforcement action to force the airport to stay within the limit on flight numbers set by the cap.

Legal support for GALBA's position

Last year, GALBA asked the council to use such powers but we were told that it wasn't possible without an application from LBA. Of course, LBA won't do that because they want no restriction on their aircraft. To confirm whether waiting for an application from LBA was truly necessary, GALBA consulted a leading planning and environment barrister. This barrister, [Estelle Dehon KC](#), said no – the Council can just do it. You can read her legal opinion on [GALBA's website](#). So, we asked the Council again to use their power and now we've been told that the current CLEUD application means they can't. Strange, that's not what they said the first time.

We really need to get to the bottom of this, so we've asked to meet soon with the council's lead elected member for LBA, along with the lawyers advising both GALBA and the council. As the regulator for LBA, we want to work with Leeds City Council to resolve what is frankly an absurd situation.

Hopefully, a meeting of lawyers will lead to a meeting of minds and better protection for local people and the planet.



Friends of Bylines Network

FRIEND OF BYLINES NETWORK

Sign up for the Yorkshire Bylines newsletter

Email Address * **STAND WITH US**

First Name *

Last Name *

There has never been a greater need for grassroots journalism that investigates the stories that really matter, holds power to account and champions the voices of everyday citizens. We are proudly powered by volunteers but what

STAND WITH US for independent, citizen-led journalism that makes you will even get some exclusive benefits.

Tags: [Bradford](#) [Environment](#) [Health](#) [Leeds](#)

Consent for having Bylines Network store my submitted information

Agree

You can unsubscribe at any time by clicking the link in the footer of our emails. For information about our privacy practices, please visit our website.

[Home](#) | [UK](#) | [World](#) | [Business](#) | [Culture](#) | [Politics](#) | [Health](#) | [Tech](#) | [InDepth](#) |

[More](#)

[BBC Verify](#) | [Climate](#)

[England](#) | [Local News](#)

Airport seeking night exemption for quieter planes



DANNY LAWSON/PA WIRE

| Leeds Bradford Airport wants quieter aircraft to be exempt from a night time flying cap

Spencer Stokes >

Yorkshire business correspondent

13 March 2026 · 52 Comments

Leeds Bradford Airport has defended its decision to apply for immunity from prosecution when it flies certain types of aircraft overnight.

The airport is currently limited to 2,920 aircraft movements between 23:00 and 07:00 BST annually.

But the Group for Action on Leeds Bradford Airport (GALBA) claimed the limit has been breached for four successive years between 2022 and 2025, with more than 500 additional flights each summer season.

GALBA's data is disputed by Leeds Bradford Airport, with chief executive Vincent Hodder suggesting that new aircraft that have a noise level of 87 dB or less shouldn't be included in the summertime night cap figures.

The airport's legal submission to Leeds City Council argued that aircraft below 87 dB operated continuously between 2010 and 2019 without enforcement and should, therefore, remain exempt now and in the future.

The airport is applying to the council for a certificate of lawful existing use or development (CLEUD) that would allow the quieter aircraft to remain outside the night quota.

Hodder said: "UK planning law lays out that if a breach of planning has existed continuously for a long period of time and that everybody has adjusted to the way restrictions on the airport apply, then those things become immune from enforcement.

"Our argument is for 10 years the airport continuously operated quieter aircraft during the night period that were in breach of the planning conditions in place at that time - we would argue that because that has happened it should be allowed to continue."



REUTERS

| A growing number quieter aircraft like the Boeing 737 MAX have come into service in recent years

GALBA described the airport's application as "irresponsible and cowardly".

Ian Coatman, from the group, said: "LBA's argument is like a burglar being able to say, 'I've been stealing for 10 years and I haven't been caught, so now I can steal as often as I like forever and there's nothing anyone can do to stop me!'"

He added: "To be clear, no one is saying people should never take holidays abroad, but frequent night noise is harmful to the many thousands of people who live under the flight path."

Horsforth resident Susan Ditchfield lives close the runway and moved into her home before night flying had been permitted.

"It's relentless, one after another after another, just in a short space of time during the night, then there's a lull and then it starts again, it's just dreadful and such a nuisance," she said.



GALBA campaigners have protested against night flights at Leeds Bradford Airport

The airport said in the longer term it wanted to fly more than the summer night limit and hoped to change the regulations to a noise-based system, rather than one that counts individual aircraft movements.

Hodder added: "What we want to do is to change the rules around the way that the night flights are counted to provide a foundation for monitoring and controlling the level of noise which is produced by the airport and which causes discomfort for people who live around the airport."

Leeds City Council is asking for third parties to submit relevant factual evidence, such as flight data, flight times, flight frequency and size of aircraft – relating to the specific operations at Leeds Bradford so that they can be considered as part of the CLEUD application.

A council spokesperson said: "A call for evidence from third parties is currently ongoing in relation to the flying of certain types of aircraft during the nighttime period at Leeds Bradford Airport between 1 January 2010 to 31 December 2019.

"This began earlier this month and ends on 26 March, so it would be inappropriate to comment further until this process has been concluded and the evidence provided has been assessed."

Get in touch

Your Voice

Contact form

Listen to highlights from [West Yorkshire on BBC Sounds](#), catch up with the latest [episode of Look North](#).

Related topics

[Leeds](#) [Air travel](#) [Leeds Bradford International Airport](#)
[Bradford](#) [Horsforth](#) [Leeds City Council](#)

Related stories



Airport to revisit plan for night flight changes

28 October 2025



Campaigners' night flights claim denied by airport

20 November 2025

[View comments | 52](#)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
KING'S BENCH DIVISION
B E T W E E N

- (1) LEEDS BRADFORD AIRPORT LIMITED
- (2) LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED
- (3) NEWCASTLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LIMITED
- (4) NIAL SERVICES LIMITED

Claimants

-and-

PERSONS UNKNOWN

AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE AMENDED CLAIM FORM

Defendants

AJW30

This is the exhibit marked "AJW30" in the witness statement of Alexander James Wright.

Briefing Note Incident London Southend Airport 08/06/2026

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

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

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

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

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