

CLAIM NO: KB – 2024 -002473

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

B E T W E E N

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

Claimants

- v -

- (1) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT **WHO ENTER OR REMAIN** ON THE PREMISES AT BIRMINGHAM AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1 TO THE 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 FUEL OR THE ENVIRONMENT ON THOSE PREMISES (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE)~~
- (2) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT **WHO ENTER OR REMAIN** ON THE PREMISES AT LIVERPOOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 2 TO THE 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 FUEL OR THE ENVIRONMENT ON THOSE PREMISES (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE)~~
- (3) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHOSE PURPOSE IS OR INCLUDES PROTESTING ABOUT FOSSIL FUELS OR THE ENVIRONMENT **WHO ENTER OR REMAIN** ON THE PREMISES AT BRISTOL AIRPORT SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 3 TO THE 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 FUEL OR THE ENVIRONMENT ON THOSE PREMISES (WHETHER IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUST STOP OIL CAMPAIGN OR EXTINCTION REBELLION CAMPAIGN OR OTHERWISE)~~

Defendants

AMENDED PARTICULARS OF CLAIM

Birmingham Airport

1. The First Claimant is the operator of Birmingham Airport, located in Airport Way, Birmingham B26 3QJ, shown edged in red on Plan 1 ("**BHX**"). BHX serves around 11.8 million travelling passengers each year with an annual revenue of approximately £152 million.
2. With the exception of the parcels of land referred to in paragraph 9, the First Claimant is the registered proprietor of all of the land on which BHX is situated as shown in red on Plan 1, through the interests shown in the Title Schedule and on Plan 1A attached hereto - but subject to the interests referred to in paragraph 4.
3. Subject to the aforesaid interests, the First Claimant is entitled to an immediate right of possession occupation and control of BHX by virtue of its titles as shown in the Title Schedule and on Plan 1A.
4. Plan 1B identifies the areas within BHX over which the First Claimant lacks (or does not in these proceedings assert) a full right of possession or control, by reason of the presence or existence thereon or thereover of third party interests ("**the BHX Third Party Areas**"). In relation to all such areas, to an extent which might vary depending on the exact arrangement, the First Claimant does not assert that it is the person with an immediate right of occupation or possession.
5. The BHX Third Party Areas are coloured blue and green on Plan 1B. The blue colouring indicates areas within BHX which are the subject of leases. The green colouring indicates parts of BHX which include such areas. By way of example, the blue and green land includes the whole or part(s) of aircraft hangars, airline and ground handler offices, general offices, storage units, engineering buildings, vehicle depots and warehouses.
6. There are five areas coloured blue on Plan 1B (numbered 1-5) each of which directly abuts the red line boundary of BHX. In each of those locations, the boundary of BHX is not in the possession or control of the First Claimant.
7. With those exceptions, access to or from the BHX Third Party Areas by the public from outside the airport, necessarily involves the use of areas of BHX which remain unencumbered by any such arrangement and in relation to which, accordingly, the First Claimant remains entitled to possession occupation and control by virtue of their interests shown in the Title Schedule and on Plan 1A.

8. Within the BHX red line boundary, there are 3 parcels in respect of which the First Claimant is not the registered proprietor:-
- a. although the land on which the northern landing lights (coloured orange on Plan 1B) are situated is registered in the name of a third party company, the First Claimant asserts that it is entitled to the immediate right of occupation or possession of those lights and the structure which supports them. Some of the lights and some parts of the structure have been in place since around 1967 and others since 2008. All of the lights and structures have been maintained by the First Claimant or its predecessors throughout that period;
 - b. on the south western boundary is an unregistered strip of land (coloured bright green on Plan 1A but omitted from the key on that plan) in respect of which the First Claimant asserts that it is entitled to the immediate right of occupation or possession; and
 - c. on the eastern boundary is an Air Rail Link and an associated platform and station. By an agreement for lease dated 1 April 2013, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited agreed to grant and the First Claimant (then known as Birmingham International Airport Limited) agreed to take a lease of the land coloured purple on Plan 1B for a term of 199 years. The lease has not been completed but the First Claimant asserts that it is entitled to the immediate right of occupation or possession of the land coloured purple.
9. By virtue of s 63 of the Airports Act 1996, the First Claimant has power to make byelaws with respect to BHX. Pursuant to the Birmingham Airport Limited Byelaws 2021, byelaw 3.32, no person has a right to use any part of BHX as defined therein for demonstrations or public assemble which is likely to obstruct or interfere with the proper use of the airport or the safety or security of passengers or persons using the airport. The plan which defines BHX for the purposes of the byelaws does not extend to the landing lights. Apart from that, it includes all the land edged in red on Plan 1.

Liverpool Airport

10. The Second Claimant is the operator of Liverpool Airport, located in Speke Hall Avenue, Speke, Liverpool L24 1YD, shown edged in red on Plan 2 ("**LJLA**"). LJLA serves around 5 million travelling passengers each year with an annual revenue of approximately £35 million.

11. The Second Claimant is the proprietor of the land on which LJLA is situated as shown in red on Plan 2, through the interests shown in the Title Schedule and Plan 2A attached hereto - but subject to the interests referred to in paragraph 14.
12. The Third Claimant has been joined to the proceedings as it is the registered proprietor of the land on which the western landing lights (coloured brown on Plan 2B) are situated, which is registered under Title Number MS575438.
13. Subject to the aforesaid interests, the Second Claimant (and the Third Claimant in respect of the western landing lights) is entitled to an immediate right of possession occupation and control of LJLA, by virtue of its titles as shown in the Title Schedule and Plan 2A.
14. Plan 2B identifies the areas within LJLA over which the Second Claimant lacks (or does not in these proceedings assert) a full right of possession of control, by reason of the presence or existence thereon or thereover of third party interests ("**the LJLA Third Party Areas**") or public rights of way ("**the LJLA Highways**"). In relation to all such areas, to an extent which might vary depending on the exact arrangement, the Second Claimant does not assert that it is the person with an immediate right of occupation or possession.
15. The LJLA Third Party Areas are coloured blue and green on Plan 2B. The blue colouring indicates areas within LJLA which are the subject of leases. The green colouring indicates parts of LJLA which include such areas. By way of example, the blue and green land includes the whole or part(s) of aircraft hangars, airline and ground handler offices, general offices, storage units, engineering buildings, vehicle depots and warehouses.
16. The LJLA Highways are indicated in pink on Plan 2B. These provide access to LJLA to the Second Claimant and its licensees (including members of the public).
17. Access to or from the LJLA Third Party Areas by the public from outside the airport, necessarily involves the use of areas of LJLA which remain unencumbered by any such arrangement and in relation to which, accordingly, the Second Claimant remains entitled to possession occupation and control by virtue of its interests shown in the Title Schedule and on Plan 2A.
18. All except 2 of the eastern landing lights (coloured orange on Plan 2B) are situated on title numbers CH596568 and CH384543 in respect of which the Second Claimant is the registered proprietor. The Second Claimant asserts that it is entitled to the

immediate right of occupation or possession of the other 2 landing lights and the structure which supports them which are situated on unregistered land. The lights and the structure which supports them have been in this location since around 1960 and they have been maintained by the Second Claimant or its predecessors throughout that period.

19. By virtue of s 63 of the Airports Act 1996, the Second Claimant has power to make byelaws with respect to LJLA. Pursuant to the Liverpool John Lennon Airport Byelaws 2022, byelaw 2.18, no person has a right to use any part of LJLA for protest which is likely to obstruct or interfere with the proper use of the airport or the comfort or convenience or safety of passengers or persons using the airport. Save for the landing lights, the plan which defines LJLA for the purposes of the byelaws includes all of the land edged in red on Plan 2.

Bristol Airport

20. The Fourth Claimant is the operator of Bristol Airport, located in Bristol BS48 3DY, shown edged in red on Plan 3 ("**BRS**"). BRS serves around 10 million travelling passengers each year with an annual revenue of approximately £179 million.
21. The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants are the proprietors of the land on which BRS is situated as shown in red on Plan 3, through the interests shown in the Title Schedule and Plan 3A hereto - but subject to the interests referred to in paragraph 23.
22. Subject to the aforesaid interests, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants are entitled to an immediate right of possession occupation and control of BRS, by virtue of its titles as shown in the Title Schedule and Plan 3A.
23. Plan 3B identifies the areas within BRS over which the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants lack (or do not in these proceedings assert) a full right of possession of control, by reason of the presence or existence thereon or thereover of third party interests ("**the BRS Third Party Areas**"). In relation to all such areas, to an extent which might vary depending on the exact arrangement, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants do not assert that they are the person with an immediate right of occupation or possession.
24. The BRS Third Party Areas are coloured blue and green on Plan 3B. The blue colouring indicates areas within BRS which are the subject of leases. The green colouring indicates parts of BRS which include such areas. By way of example, the

blue and green land includes the whole or part(s) of aircraft hangars, airline and ground handler offices, general offices, storage units, engineering buildings, vehicle depots and warehouses.

25. Access to or from the BRS Third Party Areas by the public from outside the airport, necessarily involves the use of areas of BRS which remain unencumbered by any such arrangement and in relation to which, accordingly, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants remain entitled to possession occupation and control by virtue of its interests shown in the Title Schedule and on Plan 3A.
26. Although the land on which the western landing lights (coloured brown on Plan 3B) are situated is registered in the name of a third party individual, the Fourth Claimant asserts that it is entitled to the immediate right of occupation or possession of those lights and the structure which supports them. The lights and structure have been in place since around 2004 and have been maintained by the Fourth Claimant or its predecessors throughout that period.
27. By virtue of s63 of the Airports Act 1996, the Fourth Claimant has power to make byelaws with respect to BRS. Pursuant to the Bristol Airport Byelaws 2012, byelaw 4.17, no person has a right to organise or take part in any protest which is likely to obstruct or interfere with the proper use of the airport or the comfort or convenience or safety of passengers or persons using the airport. Save for the landing lights, the plan which defines BRS for the purposes of the byelaws includes all the land outlined in red on Plan 3.

The Claimants' claims

28. Each of the airports described above consists of many facilities which (without attempting an exhaustive list) include car parks, terminal buildings with facilities for the processing of passenger and other freight traffic, retail areas, lounge/ café/ refreshment areas, border control facilities, security points, customs and excise facilities, runways and taxiways, fuel facilities, management / airline facilities and (in the case of BHX) the Air Rail Link railway.
29. In relation to each airport:
 - a. Members of the public have implied consent to enter for normal air-travel and directly related purposes (principally dropping-off and picking-up passengers). Others with lawful business at the airports also have implied or actual consent (principally those whose ordinary work duties involve them in being present at

the airport, or who are present as the contractors and/or lawful licensees/invitees/agents of such persons).

- b. No wider consent subsists; and (subject to the highways described above) no public right of access, or way, subsists over the airports.
- c. In particular, nobody has the Claimants' consent to enter, remain on or occupy the airports for the purposes of protest (whether by taking part in any demonstration, procession or public assembly or otherwise within the perimeter of the airport, or on any onward flight). No person has the consent of the Claimants to enter the airports for any of the purposes intimated by Just Stop Oil or for variations of those protest activities.
- d. Accordingly, any person entering the airports for any such purpose is a trespasser; as is any person who, being on the airports (whether or not having entered with any such purpose) in fact protests.

30. In relation to the Third Party Areas at each airport:

- a. The Claimants are not (or do not seek to show that they are) entitled to possession sufficient to support a claim in trespass. However, in order for their rights in relation to the other parts of the airports (in relation to which they are entitled to possession) to be effectively vindicated and protected, it is necessary and (or alternatively) proportionate and appropriate for the Court to make an order which does not distinguish between the airports generally (as shown outlined in red on the various plans) and the Third Party Areas within them; and
- b. Further or alternatively, protest which occurs on the Third Party Areas interferes and/or threatens to interfere substantially and unreasonably with the ordinary use and enjoyment of the Claimants' retained land.
- a. The like considerations apply in relation to those of the landing lights not in the outright possession of the Claimants.

31. Further, in respect of the LJLA Highways described above: protest which occurs on these highways interferes and/or threatens to interfere:

- b. Unreasonably and substantially, with the Second and Third Claimants' right of access to their land via the highway for themselves and their licensees including members of the travelling public;
- c. Unreasonably and substantially, with (and/or to obstruct or hinder) the free passage along the highway, occasioning particular damage to the Second and Third Claimants; and
- d. In any event, protest (at least, any protest causing disruption) is unlawful by reason of the byelaws.

The threats

32. The Claimants' airports have become explicit targets for environmental protest. The situation is dynamic and may be particularised further in the evidence: but as at the date of drafting these Particulars of Claim the Claimants identify and rely on the following non-exhaustive PARTICULARS:
33. In a tweet, dated 13 September 2023, the Just Stop Oil account stated, in relation to protests on highways: "Disruption is frustrating, but we have no other choice. Fossil fuel companies have taken out private injunctions that makes protests impossible at oil refineries, oil depots and even petrol stations..."
34. On 9 March 2024, at a meeting in Birmingham, supporters of the campaigning movement called "Just Stop Oil" discussed a new campaign to undertake direct action at airports across the UK in the summer of 2024 (the "**Airports Campaign**").
35. At this meeting, a co-founder of Just Stop Oil was reported to have advocated:
 - Cutting through fences and gluing themselves to runway tarmac;
 - Cycling in circles on runways;
 - Climbing on to planes to prevent them from taking off;
 - Staging sit-ins at terminals 'day after day' to stop passengers getting inside airports.
36. Since that meeting, Just Stop Oil has announced the following on its website:

"SO WHAT'S THE PLAN?"

*Our Government doesn't give a f*** about its responsibilities. The country is in ruins. You know it, I know, they know it. That means it's up to us to come together and be the change we need.*

We need bold, un-ignorable action that confronts the fossil fuel elites. We refuse to comply with a system which is killing millions around the world, and that's why we have declared airports a site of nonviolent civil resistance."

We can't do this alone, we have a plan for this Summer, are you willing help make this happen?"

37. It says, further:

"This summer, Just Stop Oil will be taking action at airports.

As the grass becomes scorched, hosepipe bans kick in and the heat of the climate crisis enters peoples' minds, our resistance will put the spotlight on the heaviest users of fossil fuels and call everyone into action with us.

We'll work in teams of between 10-14 people willing to risk arrest from all over the UK. We need to be a minimum of 200 people to make this happen, but we'll be prepared to scale in size as our numbers increase. Exact dates and more details are coming.

Our plan can send shockwaves around the world and finish oil and gas. But we need each other to make it happen. Are you ready to join the team?"

38. Just Stop Oil has also organised a fundraising page on the website <https://chuffed.org/project/just-stop-oil-resisting-against-new-oil-and-gas>, which says the following:¹

"Cat's out the bag. Just Stop Oil will take action at airports

The secret is out — and our new actions are going to be big.

*We're going so big that we can't even tell you the full plan, but know this — Just Stop Oil will be taking our most radical action yet this summer. We'll be taking action at sites of key importance to the fossil fuel industry; **super-polluting airports.***

..."

39. On 6 June 2024, an email was sent from info@juststopoil.org to a subscriber list stating:

"This is the most exciting email I've ever sent.

As many of you already know, this summer Just Stop Oil is taking action at airports.

That's exciting right? Well, there's more.

¹ As of 29 July 2024, £24,519 had been raised on this website.

43. On 25 June 2024, six JSO activists were arrested at Gatwick Airport and were found to be carrying luggage containing a large number of bandages thought to have been intended to interfere with jet engines or to block lavatories.
44. On 27 June 2024, six JSO activists were arrested by the Metropolitan Police whilst attending an event organised by JSO.
45. On 29 June 2024, JSO sent an email to subscribers in the following terms:-

"Since Tuesday, 31 supporters of Just Stop Oil have now been arrested for possessing the strong convictions that governments and corporations do not have the right to prioritise oil profits over the safety and wellbeing of our loved-ones, communities and the many millions already suffering the effects of runaway climate breakdown.

In a sane society, it would be those who are setting the stage for an end to ordered society that would be having their doors barged down and dragged into the back of a police van to be interrogated about the catastrophic criminal damages they are imposing on every living thing and on every future generation. Instead, it is ordinary people- mothers, grandparents and young people who are having their futures stolen from them, that the police come for.

The incoherent pattern of arrests we have seen over the last 24 hours suggests a rattled system. They know that as climate breakdown intensifies, civil unrest will increase and one day there will not be enough police to cope with the millions stepping into action, as the full betrayal of the political establishment becomes clearer.

We will not be intimidated by the death throes of a broken system. Nothing the state can throw at us is worse than the realities that will be imposed on all of us if the breakdown of our climate carries on unabated. We WILL be stepping into action in the summer because when the lives of your family are at risk, there is no other choice than to protect them..."

46. On 24 July 2024, a further ten JSO activists were arrested at Heathrow Airport following an intelligence led operation. According to media reports, some of those arrested were found to be carrying cutting gear and glue.
47. On 28 July 2024, a further eight JSO activists were arrested at Gatwick Airport on suspicion of interfering with national infrastructure.
48. On 29 July 2024, a further two JSO activists were arrested at Heathrow Airport after spraying orange paint around the entrance hall to Terminal 5.

49. In view of the circumstances described above, unless restrained by the Court, there is a strong probability that Persons Unknown will, for BHX, LJLA and/or BRS:
- c. trespass on the airports and/or
 - d. by protest conducted on or from the Third Party Areas and/or on or from the land on which the landing lights (which are not within the Byelaw plans) are situate, substantially interfere with the ordinary use and enjoyment of the airports so as to cause a nuisance actionable by the Claimants; and/or
 - e. by protest conducted on or from the highways, obstruct those occasioning particular damage to the Claimants and/or interfere with the Claimants' right of access to the airports via those highways, so as to cause a nuisance actionable by the Claimants.
50. The Claimants seek injunctive relief to prevent the apprehended trespasses and public and/or private nuisances.
51. There is a compelling need for such relief which in outline (but not exhaustively) includes these matters:
52. Airports are particularly vulnerable, because of the potential for even relatively slight disruption to produce significant adverse consequences for large numbers of innocent members of the travelling public. Even when all that a protester achieves is relatively modest delay to a flight, the knock-on effects can be significant for the travelling public, not only because of the multitude of individual travel plans thereby immediately disturbed but also because of the risks (by way of example only) of aeroplanes missing take-off and/or landing slots, leading to flights failing to reach their intended destinations in timely fashion with knock-on effects for other flights, or because the delays might exhaust the time allowable before flight/cabin crews must be relieved, but with the relief crews in the wrong places and no alternatives readily to be found.
53. Non-disruptive forms of protest might at any moment escalate into forms of protest which are disruptive — by which point harm may already have occurred.
54. Even normal operations at airports include matters which are potentially dangerous, especially to untrained persons such as protesters who might be unaware of the extent of the hazards to which their activities expose themselves and others.

55. The assets normally present at airports include, notably, aeroplanes: each passenger jet of the kind typically used by the travelling public at these airports is worth many millions of £GBP. Each aircraft has multiple vulnerabilities and because of the risk that any unauthorised activity on or near an aircraft might have caused damage (perhaps unobserved at the time, even by the person causing it: such as ingestion of material into an engine) there is an enhanced risk that even the entirely passive presence of unauthorised persons near an aircraft may require the flight to be delayed and/or the aircraft to be taken out of service for inspection.
56. The airports in the present case are all the subject of byelaws. These include prohibitions which would have the effect of prohibiting the protest of which the Claimants are fearful. The general criminal law (offences of aggravated trespass under s68 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 and/or interference with use or operation of key national infrastructure under s7 of the Public Order Act 2023) would also embrace some of what is intimated by the protest campaigns summarised above. But breach of the Byelaws attracts a modest penalty (a fine) and neither the byelaws nor the general law were sufficient to deter the activities which have already taken place at Stansted Airport. The explicit threats mentioned above indicate that breaching the general criminal law is regarded more as a goal, than as a deterrent, by at least some campaigners. By comparison, bespoke relief in the form of an injunction responding to the particular threats which have emerged, appears to be viewed differently by potential protesters in comparable matters and has shown itself to be an effective way of vindicating the private law rights of those whose lawful interests are threatened by unlawful acts.
57. Airports operate under heightened security for a mixture of reasons including counter-terrorism. They are also environments in which stress levels tend to be high. This combination makes protest activity, and any activity which is out of the normal, especially dangerous. It might have an ambiguous appearance and carries the risk of being mis-interpreted as an outright security threat, potentially provoking a response from the police or security forces which would be disproportionate if the purposes of the protesters were to be taken at face value.
58. Additionally, there is a risk of protest activity being used as cover for actual terrorist attacks.

AND THE FIRST CLAIMANT CLAIMS AGAINST THE FIRST DEFENDANT:

- (1) Subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the First Claimant at intervals not exceeding 12 months or such other period as the Court may determine,

an order that the First Defendants must not, without the consent of the First Claimant enter, occupy or remain upon the land outlined in red on Plan 1.

AND THE SECOND AND THIRD CLAIMANTS CLAIM AS AGAINST THE SECOND DEFENDANT:

- (2) Subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the Second and Third Claimants at intervals not exceeding 12 months or such other period as the Court may determine, an order that the Second Defendants must not, without the consent of the Second and Third Claimant, enter, occupy or remain upon the land outlined in red on Plan 2.

AND THE FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH CLAIMANTS CLAIM AGAINST THE THIRD DEFENDANT:

- (3) Subject to periodic review by the Court on application by the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants at intervals not exceeding 12 months or such other period as the Court may determine, an order that the Third Defendants must not, without the consent of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Claimants (or either of them), enter, occupy or remain upon the land outlined in red on Plan 3.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

The Claimants believe that the facts stated in these particulars of claim are true. The Claimants understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

I am duly authorised by the Claimants to sign this statement.



Stuart Sherbrooke Wortley

Partner

Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP

Dated: 31 July 2024