

**Elwira Kelly
Claimant
Fourth Statement
28 July 2026
Exhibit "EK4"**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

CLAIM No. PT-2025-000910

CHANCERY DIVISION

BETWEEN

(1) MOOG WOLVERHAMPTON LIMITED

(2) MOOG FERNAU LIMITED

(3) MOOG READING LIMITED

(4) MOOG CONTROLS LIMITED

Claimants

- and -

- (1) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1 BEING MOOG AIRCRAFT GROUP WOLVERHAMPTON, VALIANT WAY, PENDEFORD, WOLVERHAMPTON WV9 5GB, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES**
- (2) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 2 BEING MOOG CONTROLS LTD LUTON, UNITS C AND J AIRPORT EXECUTIVE PARK, PRESIDENT WAY, LUTON LU2 9NY, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES**
- (3) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 3 BEING MOOG READING LIMITED, 30 SUTTONS BUSINESS PARK, READING, BERKSHIRE RG6 1AW, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR**

**INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR
INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND
AND PREMISES**

(4) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 4 BEING MOOG AIRCRAFT GROUP TEWKESBURY, ASHCHURCH, TEWKESBURY, GLOUCESTERSHIRE GL20 8NA, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES

(5) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 5 BEING MOOG INDUSTRIAL GROUP, ASHCHURCH PARKWAY, TEWKESBURY, GLOUCESTERSHIRE GL20 8TU, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES

Defendants

FOURTH WITNESS STATEMENT OF ELWIRA KELLY

INTRODUCTION

1. I am Senior Vice President, General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary at Moog, Inc (**"Moog"**). I am authorised to make this witness statement on behalf of the Claimants. I have previously given three witness statements in these proceedings, the first dated 4 September 2025 (**"Kelly 1"**), the second dated 5 September 2025 (**"Kelly 2"**), and the third dated 1 October 2025 (**"Kelly 3"**). For the avoidance of doubt, capitalised terms in this statement continue to adopt the definitions in Kelly 1.
2. On 6 October 2025, Moog was granted an injunction over the Sites on the terms set out in the order of the Honourable Mr Justice Thompsell of 6 October 2025 (pp. 1 – 27) (the **"Injunction Order"**). The Injunction Order provides that the injunction will be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Injunction Order (or as close to that date as is convenient). The Injunction Order was granted against 'Persons Unknown' as more particularly described on the Claim Form and in the Injunction Order itself.

3. Moog intends to apply to court to review the injunction in accordance with paragraph 7 of the Injunction Order (the “**Review Application**”), which provides for the injunction to be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Injunction Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court’s list) and for the injunction to lapse at 4pm on the anniversary of the Injunction Order / the last annual review if Moog has not before that date applied for a review to take place. At the review hearing, Moog intends to ask the Court to join four named defendants to the injunction granted by the Injunction Order, being:

 - (a) Hanah Yun Stevens;
 - (b) Bea Sherman (also known as Frank Sherman);
 - (c) Iain Evans; and
 - (d) Hisham Alkhamesi,
(together, the “**Named Defendants**”).
4. Alongside its Review Application, Moog will also be applying to join the Named Defendants to the proceedings and to re-amend the Re-Amended Claim Form and Re-Amended Particulars of Claim to reflect that proposed joinder (“the **Proposed Application**”), and will be asking for the Proposed Application to be considered at the review hearing. I will provide a full explanation for the reasons why Moog seeks to join the Named Defendants to the injunction in my witness statement in support of the Proposed Application and the Review Application in due course. I make this current witness statement in support of Moog’s application for service of the Proposed Application and the Review Application, together with documents previously filed by the Claimants in this claim on the Named Defendants by an alternative method or at an alternative place pursuant to CPR 6.15.
5. As previously, I avoid in this statement mentioning my colleagues at Moog and others by name in the interests of protecting their personal safety, given the nature of the Defendants and previous reprisals against other individuals as outlined in Kelly 1.

THE NAMED DEFENDANTS

6. I have explained the background to the Incident of 26 August 2025 in paragraphs 54 to 64 of Kelly 1.
7. The Perpetrators of the Incident were the Named Defendants. I understand from Moog’s solicitors that, following the recent High Court decision in *Hanson Quarry Products Europe Ltd v Davies (and others)* [2026] EWHC 118, the Named Defendants – whose identities are known to Moog - should be individually joined to the injunction granted by the Injunction Order. I will set out the reasons why Moog considers the Named Defendants should be

joined to this claim in my witness statement in support of the Proposed Application and/or the Review Application.

MEANS OF SERVICE

8. I understand that, before Moog can apply to join the Named Defendants to the proceedings, it requires the court's permission to serve the Proposed Application on the Named Defendants by alternate means. Moog does not have addresses provided by the Named Defendants as addresses at which they may be served in these proceedings, and Moog wishes to ensure that the Proposed Application is effectively served on the Named Defendants in the event that the addresses that Moog has identified in respect of each of the Named Defendants (which I explain further below) are not in fact the usual or last known residences of the Named Defendants, which I understand from Moog's solicitors is the requirement under the Civil Procedure Rules.
9. Moog has made efforts to identify the residential addresses of the Named Defendants. Moog did not have a relationship with the Named Defendants prior to these proceedings and so does not hold their contact details. It is also not possible to obtain this information from the Police.
10. In light of that, Moog instructed a professional company to trace the residential addresses of each of the Named Defendants. I exhibit a copy of the prepared report at (pp. 28 – 35) (the "**Report**").
11. As is clear from the Report, residential addresses for each of the Named Defendants have been identified. However, as the addresses set out in the Report are linked to family members of some of the Named Defendants (pp. 32 and 34 – 35) (as opposed to the Named Defendants directly), Moog cannot be certain from the Report that each of the Named Defendants currently reside at the addresses detailed in the Report. Moog also cannot be certain that these addresses are the usual or last known residences of the Named Defendants.
12. Nonetheless, I believe service of the proceedings at the addresses identified in the Report will mean that these are likely to come to the attention of the Named Defendants, because:
 - (a) With regards to Iain Evans and Hana Yun Stevens, the Report gave a 'high-confidence' association between those Named Defendants and the residential addresses provided;
 - (b) With regards to Bea Sherman (now known as Frank Sherman) and Hisham Alkhamesi, the Report has concluded that the addresses identified in the Report are those of the parents of each of the Named Defendants. It is feasible that these

Named Defendants, who I understand from public reporting are both 23 years old, reside with their families.

13. The addresses identified in the Report also corroborate the information as to the reported places of residence for each of the Named Defendants in the media in July 2026 (pp. 36 – 37).
14. With that in mind, in order to take steps to bring the documents relevant to these proceedings to the attention of the Named Defendants, Moog seeks an order permitting Moog to serve the Proposed Application, the Review Application and any documents previously filed in these proceedings on the Named Defendants by:
 - (a) Uploading a copy of those documents to the website www.moog.co.uk/injunction (the “**Website**”);
 - (b) Posting a copy of those documents to the addresses of each of the Named Defendants as identified in the Report;
 - (c) Upon making the Review Application, by placing signs at prominent locations on the perimeter of each of the Sites (the “**Signs**”). The Signs will contain a QR code to the Website and will inform the Named Defendants that the Proposed Application and the Review Application has been made.
 - (d) Alternatively, where requested by a Named Defendant, sending the document by email to an email address provided by the Named Defendant; and
 - (e) Alternatively, by serving those documents on any solicitor acting for one or all of the Named Defendants who has filed a notice of acting in these proceedings.
15. I have explained above why I believe service at the addresses of each of the Named Defendants (as identified in the Report) is likely to bring the proceedings to the attention of the Named Defendants. In addition to this, Moog intends to adopt the other means of service set out above, because:

The Website and the Signs

- (a) Uploading documents to the Website and affixing signs around the perimeters of the Sites were methods that were accepted by the court as a means of service on Persons Unknown when the Injunction Order was granted.

As I explained in paragraphs 69 and 116 of Kelly 1, there is a link between the Named Defendants and Persons Unknown comprising the Defendants in the Injunction Order. There is evidence that the Named Defendants have participated

in, and/or are sympathetic to, direct-action protest groups of which Moog is a target, and in relation to which Moog issued proceedings against Persons Unknown. For that reason, we intend to serve the proceedings on the Named Defendants via the same means as we have previously served Persons Unknown.


With regards to the timing of service, paragraph 10 of the Injunction Order provided for notification of any further applications in the proceedings to Persons Unknown to be carried out by erecting notices at a prominent locations at each Site. Moog therefore proposes that, by erecting the Signs referring to both the Proposed Application and the Review Application, these are treated as a further means of service of both applications (as well as notification to Persons Unknown in accordance with the Injunction Order).

Further alternative means

- (b) Alternatively, to the extent that any solicitor has filed a Notice of Acting on behalf of the Named Defendants in these proceedings, Moog will effect service on that solicitor directly so that the documents reach the Named Defendants via their legal representatives.
- (c) Similarly, service on an email address provided by a Named Defendant, where requested by that Named Defendant, will also be carried out to ensure that the proceedings stand the best chance of reaching the relevant Named Defendant(s) directly.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

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

Signed by: 
Signed
92C7F87347624E7...
Elwira Kelly


DATED this 28th day of July 2026.

On behalf of Claimant
E Kelly: 4th
Date: 28 July 2026
Exhibit "EK4"

Claim no: PT-2025-000910

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
CHANCERY DIVISION

EXHIBIT EK4

Signed by:
Signed: 
92C7F87347624E7...

Name: Elwira Kelly
Position: Senior Vice President, General
Counsel and Corporate Secretary
Date: 28 July 2026

EXHIBIT EK4



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
CHANCERY DIVISION

Claim No: PT-2025-000910

PT-2025-000910

BETWEEN:

(1) MOOG WOLVERHAMPTON LIMITED
(Company number 07008386)

(2) MOOG FERNAU LIMITED
(Company number 989895)

(3) MOOG READING LIMITED
(Company number 00586505)

(4) MOOG CONTROLS LIMITED
(Company number 01171948)

Claimants

and

(1) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1 BEING MOOG AIRCRAFT GROUP WOLVERHAMPTON, VALIANT WAY, PENDEFORD, WOLVERHAMPTON WV9 5GB, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES (FIRST DEFENDANT)

(2) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 2 BEING MOOG CONTROLS LTD LUTON, UNITS C AND J AIRPORT EXECUTIVE PARK, PRESIDENT WAY, LUTON LU2 9NY, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES (SECOND DEFENDANT)

(3) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 3 BEING MOOG READING LIMITED, 30 SUTTONS BUSINESS PARK, READING,

**BERKSHIRE RG6 1AW, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH
OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO
OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES (THIRD DEFENDANT)**

**(4) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR
SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND
AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 4 BEING MOOG
AIRCRAFT GROUP TEWKSBURY, ASHCHURCH, TEWKESBURY,
GLOUCESTERSHIRE GL20 8NA, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR
INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE
WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES
(FOURTH DEFENDANT)**

**(5) PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR
SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON, OR DAMAGE, THE LAND
AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 5 BEING MOOG
INDUSTRIAL GROUP, ASHCHURCH PARKWAY, TEWKESBURY,
GLOUCESTERSHIRE GL20 8TU, OR WHO OBSTRUCT AND/OR
INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT AND/OR INTERFERE
WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THAT LAND AND PREMISES
(FIFTH DEFENDANT)**

Defendants

ORDER

PENAL NOTICE

**IF YOU ARE A PERSON WITHIN THE CATEGORIES OF DEFENDANTS
MENTIONED ABOVE (“DEFENDANTS”) AND DISOBEY THIS ORDER OR
INSTRUCT 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 TO BREACH THE TERMS OF**

THIS ORDER MAY ALSO BE HELD 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 the acts set out in this Order. You should read it carefully. You are advised to consult a solicitor as soon as possible. You have the right to ask the Court to vary or discharge this Order.

BEFORE the Honourable Mr Justice Thompsell on 6 October 2025

UPON the Claimants having issued this Claim by a Claim Form dated 4 September 2025

AND UPON hearing the Claimants having applied for an ex parte interim injunction by Application Notice dated 4 September 2025

AND UPON interim injunctive relief having been granted in part by the Honourable Mr Justice Meade on 5 September 2025

AND UPON the Claimants seeking continuation of the interim injunctive relief granted on 5 September 2025 and further injunctive relief preventing the obstruction of or interference with access, as detailed in its application for injunctive relief of 4 September 2025 and draft Order provided therewith

AND UPON READING the Witness Statement of Elwira Kelly dated 4 September 2025, the Second Witness Statement of Elwira Kelly dated 5 September 2025, and the Third Witness Statement of Elwira Kelly dated 1 October 2025, permission to rely on that Third Witness Statement having been granted at the hearing on 6 October 2025

AND UPON HEARING Timothy Morshead KC for the Claimants

AND UPON the Claimants giving and the Court accepting the undertakings set out in Schedule 1 to this Order

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

INJUNCTION

1. The First Defendants must not:
 - (i) without the consent of the First Claimant, enter, occupy or remain on any part of the land and premises shown edged red on the first plan annexed to

this Order at Schedule 2 (“Plan 1”) being Moog Aircraft Group Wolverhampton, Valiant Way, Pendeford, Wolverhampton, WV9 5GB, which for the avoidance of doubt includes the perimeter gates and fencing, including by climbing, breaking windows or external equipment, spray-painting, pouring, depositing, throwing or affixing anything, or ‘locking on’ to any part thereof by whatever means;

- (ii) deliberately and with knowledge of this Order obstruct or interfere with or attempt to obstruct or interfere with access to or egress from the land and premises shown edged red on Plan 1 with or without vehicles by the First Claimant, its agents, employees, contractors, customers, suppliers or other licencees;
- (iii) interfere or attempt to interfere with any of the services serving the land and premises shown edged red on Plan 1, including but not limited to water and/or sewerage pipes.

2. The Second Defendants must not:

- (i) without the consent of the Second Claimant, enter, occupy or remain on any part of the land and premises shown edged yellow on the second plan annexed to this Order at Schedule 2 (“Plan 2”) being Moog Controls Ltd, Units C and J Airport Executive Park, President Way, Luton, LU2 9NY, including by climbing, breaking windows or external equipment, spray-painting, pouring, depositing, throwing or affixing anything, or ‘locking on’ to any part thereof by whatever means;
- (ii) deliberately and with knowledge of this Order obstruct or interfere with or attempt to obstruct or interfere with access to or egress from the land and premises shown edged yellow on Plan 2 with or without vehicles by the Second Claimant, its agents, employees, contractors, customers, suppliers, or other licencees;

(iii) interfere or attempt to interfere with any of the services serving the land and premises shown edged yellow on Plan 2, including but not limited to water and/or sewerage pipes.

3. The Third Defendants must not:

- (i) without the consent of the Third Claimant, enter, occupy or remain on any part of the land and premises shown edged yellow on the third plan annexed to this Order at Schedule 2 ("Plan 3") being Moog Reading Limited, 30 Suttons Business Park, Reading, Berkshire, RG6 1AW, including by climbing, breaking windows or external equipment, spray-painting, pouring, depositing, throwing or affixing anything, or 'locking on' to any part thereof by whatever means);
- (ii) deliberately and with knowledge of this Order obstruct or interfere with or attempt to obstruct or interfere with access to or egress from the land and premises shown edged yellow on Plan 3 with or without vehicles by the Third Claimant, its agents, employees, contractors, customers, suppliers, or other licencees;
- (iii) interfere or attempt to interfere with any of the services serving the land and premises shown edged yellow on Plan 3, including but not limited to water and/or sewerage pipes.

4. The Fourth Defendants must not:

- (i) without the consent of the Fourth Claimant, enter, occupy or remain on any part of the land and premises shown edged red on the fourth plan annexed to this Order at Schedule 2 ("Plan 4") being Moog Aircraft Group Tewkesbury, Ashchurch, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, GL20 8NA, which for the avoidance of doubt includes the perimeter gates and fencing, including by climbing, breaking windows or external equipment, spray-painting, pouring, depositing, throwing or affixing anything, or 'locking on' to any part thereof by whatever means;

- (ii) deliberately and with knowledge of this Order obstruct or interfere with or attempt to obstruct or interfere with access to or egress from the land and premises shown edged red on Plan 4 with or without vehicles by the Fourth Claimant, its agents, employees, contractors, customers, suppliers, or other licencees;
 - (iii) interfere or attempt to interfere with any of the services serving the land and premises shown edged red on Plan 4, including but not limited to water and/or sewerage pipes.
- 5. The Fifth Defendants must not:
 - (i) without the consent of the Fourth Claimant, enter, occupy or remain on any part of the land and premises shown edged red on the fifth plan annexed to this Order at Schedule 2 ("Plan 5") being Moog Industrial Group, Ashchurch Parkway, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, GL20 8TU, including by climbing, breaking windows or external equipment, spray-painting, pouring, depositing, throwing or affixing anything, or 'locking on' to any part thereof by whatever means;
 - (ii) deliberately and with knowledge of this Order obstruct or interfere with or attempt to obstruct or interfere with access to or egress from the land and premises shown edged red on Plan 5 with or without vehicles by the Fourth Claimant, its agents, employees, contractors, customers, suppliers, or other licencees;
 - (iii) interfere or attempt to interfere with any of the services serving the land and premises shown edged red on Plan 5, including but not limited to water and/or sewerage pipes
- 6. In respect of paragraphs 1 to 5, the Defendants must not (a) do it himself/herself/themselves in any other way or (b) do it by means of another person acting on his/her/their behalf, or acting on his/her/their instructions.

REVIEW

7. The injunction set out at paragraphs 1 to 6 of this Order shall be reviewed annually on each anniversary of the Order (or as close to this date as is convenient having regard to the Court's list) with a time estimate of 2 ½ hours. The Claimants are permitted to file and serve any evidence in support 14 days before the review hearing. Skeleton Arguments shall be filed at Court, with a bundle of authorities, not less than 2 days before the hearing. The injunction set out at paragraphs 1 to 6 of this Order shall lapse at 4pm on the anniversary of the order (or as the case may be the latest annual review) unless, before then, the Claimants have applied for the review to take place.

SERVICE AND NOTIFICATION

8. Service of this Order is dispensed with, pursuant to CPR 6.28 and 81.4(2)(c).
9. This Order shall be notified to the Defendants by the Claimants carrying out each of the following steps:
 - (i) Uploading a copy of the Order on to the following website:
www.moog.co.uk/injunction.
 - (ii) Affixing a copy of the Order in A4 size in a clear plastic envelope at prominent locations at each of the Sites shown edged red on Plans 1, 4 and 5 and edged yellow on Plans 2 and 3.
 - (iii) Affixing warning notices of A3 or A2 size at those locations at each of the Sites shown edged red on Plans 1, 4 and 5, and edged yellow on Plans 2 and 3, substantially in the form of the notice at Schedule 3 including a QR code linking to the website in paragraph 9(i) above. Any such notices which may initially be affixed in A3 size (which will, for the avoidance of doubt, be effective notification for the purposes of paragraph 12 below) shall be replaced with notices in A2 size as soon as reasonably practicable.

10. Notification to the Defendants of any further applications shall be effected by the Claimants carrying out each of the following steps:
 - (i) Uploading a copy of the application on to the following website:
www.moog.co.uk/injunction
 - (ii) Affixing a notice at a prominent location at the relevant Site/s shown edged red on Plans 1, 4 and 5 and edged yellow on Plans 2 and 3 stating that the application has been made and where it can be accessed in hard copy and online.
11. Notification of any further documents to the Defendants may be effected by carrying out the steps set out in paragraphs 10(i) and 10(ii) only.
12. In respect of paragraphs 9 and 10 above, effective notification will be deemed to have taken place on the date for each of the Defendants on which all the relevant steps have been carried out.
13. For the avoidance of doubt, in respect of the steps referred to at paragraphs 9(ii), 9(iii), and 10(ii), effective notification will be deemed to have taken place when the documents have all been first affixed regardless of whether they are subsequently removed.
14. For the purposes of paragraphs 9(ii), 9(iii) and 10(ii), “prominent location” in relation to each Site means:
 - (i) All of the locations shown marked on the Plans exhibited to the Third Witness Statement of Elwira Kelly including, for the avoidance of doubt, those locations at the sites shown edged yellow on Plan 2 (“the Luton Site”) and edged yellow on Plan 3 (“the Reading Site”) where additional notices were proposed to be erected as detailed at paragraph 4(e) of the Third Witness Statement of Elwira Kelly;
 - (ii) At either side of all entrances to the perimeter of each of the Sites;
 - (iii) On the perimeter fencing for those Sites which are in whole or in part enclosed by a perimeter fence;

- (iv) At the Reading Site, to the extent not already provided pursuant to paragraph 14(i) to (iii), at the entrance points at the south-east, south-west, north-east and north-west of the boundary of the Site shown edged yellow on Plan 3;
- (v) At the Luton Site, to the extent not already provided pursuant to paragraph 14(i) to (iii) above, at the entrance to the parking area and loading bay to Unit J at the north-west of the Site, the western end of the walkway between Units C and J and at the entrance to the car parking area to the south of Unit C, each of which are shown hatched blue on Plan 2.
- (vi) In the event that the Second Claimant is unable to display copies of the Order and/or warning notices at each of the locations at the Luton Site as provided for by this paragraph of this Order, the Claimants may apply to Court for directions and/or variation of these requirements (but any such application may be made without notice / notification pursuant to paragraph 10).

VARIATION

- 15. The Claimants have permission to amend the Claim Form and Amended Particulars of Claim to amend the description of the Defendants in each case by adding after the words “Persons unknown who for the purpose of protest” the words “or sabotage”. The Claimants shall notify any persons who may be affected by this amendment by:
 - (i) Uploading a copy of the amended Claim Form and re-amended Particulars of Claim on to the following website: www.moog.co.uk/injunction; and
 - (ii) Including reference to this amendment and a link to the website where the amended documents can be found in the warning notices referred to at paragraph 9(iii) above.
- 16. Anyone served with or notified of this Order 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 Claimants 72 hours’ notice of such application. If any evidence is to be relied upon in support of the application the substance of it must be

communicated in writing to the Claimants at least 48 hours in advance of any hearing.

17. Any person applying to vary or discharge this Order must provide their full name, address and address for service.
18. The Claimants have liberty to apply to vary this Order.

FURTHER EVIDENCE

19. The Claimants have permission to rely on the Third Witness Statement of Elwira Kelly dated 1 October 2025.

COSTS

20. Costs reserved.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE CLAIMANTS

21. The Claimants' contact details are:
 - (1) Moog Aircraft Group Wolverhampton, Valiant Way, Wolverhampton, West Midlands WV9 5GB.
 - (2) mooglegal@moog.com.

Dated: 6 October 2025

SCHEDULE 1 – UNDERTAKINGS


1. The 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 paragraphs 1 to 6 of this Order has caused loss to a future Defendant and the Court finds that the future Defendant ought to be compensated for that loss.


SCHEDULE 2 – PLANS

08/08/2025, 17:22

M O O G Vallant Way, Wolverhampton, WV9 5GB

Plan 1






This official copy is incomplete without the preceding notes page.


HM Land Registry
Official copy of
title plan

Title number **BK501808**
Ordnance Survey map reference **SU7473NW**
Scale **1:1250**
Administrative area **Wokingham**




© Crown copyright and database rights 2009 Ordnance Survey 10000951502.
You are not permitted to copy, distribute, or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Plan 3




This official copy is incomplete without the preceding notes page.



This official copy is incomplete without the associated index map.


HM Land Registry
Official copy of
title plan

Title number **GR395822**
Ordnance Survey map reference **SO9233SW**
Scale **1:1250 enlarged from 1:2500**
Administrative area **Gloucestershire :**
Tewkesbury



© Crown copyright and database right 2024 Ordnance Survey 10005081902.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Plan 5



This official copy is incomplete without the preceding notes page.

SCHEDULE 3– WARNING NOTICE

WARNING NOTICE OF COURT INJUNCTION

A HIGH COURT INJUNCTION granted by the High Court in Claim No PT-2025-000910 on 6 October 2025 exists relating to the land and premises known as Moog Aircraft Group Wolverhampton, Valiant Way, Pendeford, Wolverhampton, WV9 5GB.

The injunction means you may not:

- 1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1, INCLUDING THE PERIMETER GATES AND FENCING, BEING MOOG AIRCRAFT GROUP WOLVERHAMPTON, VALIANT WAY, WOLVERHAMPTON, WV9 5GB**
- 2. DELIBERATELY AND WITH KNOWLEDGE OF THE ORDER OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1**
- 3. INTERFERE OR ATTEMPT TO INTERFERE WITH ANY OF THE SERVICES SERVING THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 1**

ANYONE BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS COURT ORDER OR ASSISTING ANY OTHER PERSON IN BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE SENT TO PRISON, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED

A copy of the Order and the legal proceedings to which it relates (including the amendments made to the description of the persons subject to the Order to include reference to sabotage as well as protest) can be viewed at www.moog.co.uk/injunction (accessible via the QR Code below) or obtained by e-mailing mooglegal@moog.com



08/09/2025, 17:22

M O O G Valiant Way, Wolverhampton, WV9 5GB

Plan 1



WARNING NOTICE OF COURT INJUNCTION

A HIGH COURT INJUNCTION granted by the High Court in Claim No PT-2025-000910 on 6 October 2025 exists relating to the land and premises known as Moog Controls Ltd, Units C and J Airport Executive Park, President Way, Luton, LU2 9NY


The injunction means you may not:

- 1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 2 BEING MOOG CONTROLS LTD, UNITS C AND J AIRPORT EXECUTIVE PARK, PRESIDENT WAY, LUTON, LU2 9NY**
- 2. DELIBERATELY AND WITH KNOWLEDGE OF THE ORDER OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 2**
- 3. INTERFERE OR ATTEMPT TO INTERFERE WITH ANY OF THE SERVICES SERVING THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 2**

ANYONE BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS COURT ORDER OR ASSISTING ANY OTHER PERSON IN BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE SENT TO PRISON, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED

A copy of the Order and the legal proceedings to which it relates (including the amendments made to the description of the persons subject to the Order to include reference to sabotage as well as protest) can be viewed at www.moog.co.uk/injunction (accessible via the QR Code below) or obtained by e-mailing mooglegal@moog.com





This official copy is incomplete without the preceding notes page.

WARNING NOTICE OF COURT INJUNCTION

A HIGH COURT INJUNCTION granted by the High Court in Claim No PT-2025-000910 on 6 October 2025 exists relating to the land and premises known as Moog Reading Limited, 30 Suttons Business Park, Reading, Berkshire, RG6 1AW

The injunction means you may not:

- 1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 3 BEING MOOG READING LIMITED, 30 SUTTONS BUSINESS PARK, READING, BERKSHIRE, RG6 1AW**
- 2. DELIBERATELY AND WITH KNOWLEGDE OF THE ORDER OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED YELLOW ON PLAN 3**
- 3. INTERFERE OR ATTEMPT TO INTERFERE WITH ANY OF THE SERVICES SERVING THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EGDED YELLOW ON PLAN 3**


ANYONE BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS COURT ORDER OR ASSISTING ANY OTHER PERSON IN BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE SENT TO PRISON, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED

A copy of the Order and the legal proceedings to which it relates (including the amendments made to the description of the persons subject to the Order to include reference to sabotage as well as protest) can be viewed at www.moog.co.uk/injunction (accessible via the QR Code below) or obtained by e-mailing mooglegal@moog.com




HM Land Registry
Official copy of
title plan

Title number **BK501808**
Ordnance Survey map reference **SU7473NW**
Scale **1:1250**
Administrative area **Wokingham**



© Crown copyright and database right 2020 Ordnance Survey 100009051 800.
You are not permitted to copy, re-use, disseminate, distribute or sell any of this data or third parties in any form.

Plan 3



This official copy is incomplete without the preceding notes page.

WARNING NOTICE OF COURT INJUNCTION

A HIGH COURT INJUNCTION granted by the High Court in Claim No PT-2025-000910 on 6 October 2025 exists relating to the land and premises known as Moog Aircraft Group Tewkesbury, Ashchurch, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, GL20 8NA.


The injunction means you may not:

- 1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 4, INCLUDING THE PERIMETER GATES AND FENCING, BEING MOOG AIRCRAFT GROUP TEWKESBURY, ASHCURCH, TEWKESBURY, GLOUCESTERSHIRE, GL20 8NA**
- 2. DELIBERATELY AND WITH KNOWLEGDE OF THE ORDER OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 4**
- 3. INTERFERE OR ATTEMPT TO INTERFERE WITH ANY OF THE SERVICES SERVING THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EGDED RED ON PLAN 4**

ANYONE BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS COURT ORDER OR ASSISTING ANY OTHER PERSON IN BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE SENT TO PRISON, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED

A copy of the Order and the legal proceedings to which it relates (including the amendments made to the description of the persons subject to the Order to include reference to sabotage as well as protest) can be viewed at www.moog.co.uk/injunction (accessible via the QR Code below) or obtained by e-mailing mooglegal@moog.com.





This official copy is incomplete without the associated index page.

WARNING NOTICE OF COURT INJUNCTION

A HIGH COURT INJUNCTION granted by the High Court in Claim No PT-2025-000910 on 6 October 2025 exists relating to the land and premises known as Moog Industrial Group, Ashchurch Parkway, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, GL20 8TU

The injunction means you may not:

- 1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTEST OR SABOTAGE ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN ON THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 5 BEING MOOG INDUSTRIAL GROUP, ASHCHURCH PARKWAY, TEWKESBURY, GLOUCESTERSHIRE, GL20 8TU**
- 2. DELIBERATELY AND WITH KNOWLEDGE OF THE ORDER OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH OR ATTEMPT TO OBSTRUCT OR INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO OR EGRESS FROM THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 5**
- 3. INTERFERE OR ATTEMPT TO INTERFERE WITH ANY OF THE SERVICES SERVING THE LAND AND PREMISES SHOWN EDGED RED ON PLAN 5**


ANYONE BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS COURT ORDER OR ASSISTING ANY OTHER PERSON IN BREACHING THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY BE HELD TO BE IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND MAY BE SENT TO PRISON, FINED OR HAVE THEIR ASSETS SEIZED

A copy of the Order and the legal proceedings to which it relates (including the amendments made to the description of the persons subject to the Order to include reference to sabotage as well as protest) can be viewed at www.moog.co.uk/injunction (accessible via the QR Code below) or obtained by e-mailing mooglegal@moog.com:





HM Land Registry
Official copy of
title plan

Title number **GR395822**
Ordnance Survey map reference **SO92335W**
Scale **1:1250 enlarged from 1:2500**
Administrative area **Gloucestershire :**
Tewkesbury



© Crown copyright and database rights 2020 Ordnance Survey. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without permission in writing from Ordnance Survey.


Plan 5



This official copy is incomplete without the preceding notes page.

05 May 26

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL



OPEN-SOURCE INVESTIGATION

'Moog 4' Associated Address Search

Prepared for: MOOG

Prepared by: 

Date: 5 May 26

Reference: 

Classification: CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

Version: 1.0



CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

05 May 26

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL



CONTENTS

- 1. Purpose and Scope
- 2. Methodology
- 3. Intelligence Limitations
- 4. Executive Summary
- 5. Findings
 - 6.1 Iain Evans
 - 6.2 Hana Yun Stevens
 - 6.3 Bea Sherman
 - 6.4 Hisham Alkhamesi
- 6. Sources

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Version	Date	Author	Summary of Changes
1.0	5 May 2026		Initial issue

DISTRIBUTION

This document is intended solely for:

- Moog and associated legal representatives

Further dissemination without permission is not advised.

CLASSIFICATION

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

This document contains analytical assessment derived from open-source information and observations. It is intended for internal risk assessment purposes only.



CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

05 May 26

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This report assesses publicly available information relating to identified subjects and evaluates the extent to which residential address information can be identified through lawful open-source research techniques.

The report is restricted to open-source information and does not constitute confirmation of residency or ownership beyond the evidence identified.

2. METHODOLOGY

Online searches were conducted across publicly available sources including:

- Electoral roll records
- Property ownership records
- Public reporting
- Open social media
- Publicly accessible people-search and directory services

Targeted Boolean search techniques were employed.

Where possible, social media and public reporting were used to assess attribution and identify potential familial associations.

No covert methods or protected datasets were utilised.

3. INTELLIGENCE LIMITATIONS

This assessment is subject to limitations inherent within open-source investigations and the datasets available at the time of research:

- Information obtained from publicly available sources may be incomplete, outdated, inaccurate or subsequently amended.
- Electoral roll records do not represent a comprehensive record of residency. Individuals may be omitted from publicly accessible electoral roll datasets, have opted out of edited registers, or may not appear due to the limitations of individual data providers.
- Property ownership records do not necessarily indicate current residency. Individuals may own property whilst residing elsewhere, and occupiers may not have a legal ownership interest in the property in which they reside.
- Public reporting and media articles may contain inaccuracies or information that cannot be independently verified within the scope of this investigation.
- Familial associations identified through open-source research are based on publicly available information and, unless otherwise stated, should not be regarded as conclusively verified.
- Where multiple sources indicate an association between an individual and an address, confidence in attribution increases. However, definitive confirmation of residency would require access to information beyond the scope of this investigation.
- Absence of information should not be interpreted as evidence that no relevant information exists. It may instead reflect privacy settings, data retention practices, source availability or limitations in publicly accessible records.

Analytical judgements contained within this report should therefore be interpreted proportionately and within the context of the stated intelligence limitations.

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

05 May 26

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of Moog, an open-source investigation was conducted to identify residential address information associated with the subjects of interest through publicly accessible legal, regulatory and other online records.

The investigation identified several records linking the subjects to current and/or historical residential addresses and, in some cases, associated family members. Open-source research identified current or historic address information for three of the four subjects. In the case of Iain Evans and Hana Yun-Stevens, records identified addresses assessed to be their current residences. In the cases of Bea Sherman and Hisham Alkhamesi, direct address attribution could not be established; however, addresses associated with individuals assessed to be close family members were identified.

The findings demonstrate that varying degrees of residential information relating to the subjects remain accessible through lawful open-source research techniques. Such information may contribute to wider profiling efforts when combined with information obtained from additional sources.

This report is based exclusively on information obtained from publicly available open sources. Whilst reasonable efforts have been made to assess the credibility and relevance of identified information, open-source material cannot always be independently verified, corroborated or confirmed as current. Where possible, additional sources, including social media and publicly available reporting, were used to assess attribution and familial associations. Findings should therefore be considered indicative rather than definitive and interpreted within the context of the report's stated limitations.

5. FINDINGS

5.1 Iain Evans

- Public reporting relating to the proceedings states that Iain Evans resides in Shipley, West Yorkshire.
- Property ownership records identify Iain Evans as the registered owner of **13 Fanny Street, Shipley, West Yorkshire, BD18 4QB**, since October 2019.
- Electoral roll records indicate that Iain Evans is currently registered at this address.
- Historic electoral roll records identify Iain Evans as previously registered between 2012 and 2018 at 7 West Lea Grove, Yeadon, Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS19 7EF.
- Iain Evans remains listed as a co-owner of the Yeadon property.
- The property is currently occupied by Claire Evans and Leah Evans, who may be related to Iain Evans.

Assessment: Multiple independent sources identify both current and historic address information associated with Iain Evans. Property ownership records and electoral roll data provide high-confidence attribution.

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

05 May 26

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

5.2 Hana Yun-Stevens

- Public reporting relating to the proceedings states that Hana Yun-Stevens resides in London.
- Electoral roll records identify Hana Yun-Stevens as registered at **Flat 139, Queen Alexandra Mansions, Bidborough Street, London, WC1H 9DL**.
- Records indicate registration at this address for approximately four years.
- No evidence was identified indicating ownership of the property by Hana Yun-Stevens.

Assessment: *Electoral roll information provides a high-confidence association between Hana Yun-Stevens and the identified address.*

5.3 Bea Sherman

- Public reporting relating to the proceedings states that Bea Sherman, also referred to as Frank Sherman, resides in Hassocks, Sussex.
- Searches did not identify electoral roll or property ownership records directly attributable to either Bea Sherman or Frank Sherman.
- Open-source enquiries identified one address within Hassocks currently occupied by individuals with the Sherman surname.
- Kate Sherman and Martin Sherman have been listed as residents of **4 Clayton Road, Ditchling, Hassocks, East Sussex, BN6 8UY** since May 2004.
- Public reporting suggests that Kate and Martin Sherman are the parents of Bea Sherman.

Assessment: *No direct residential address attribution was identified for Bea Sherman. However, an address associated with individuals assessed to be close family members was identified through open-source research. Confidence is assessed as medium due to reliance on inferred familial association.*

5.4 Hisham Alkhamesi


- Public reporting relating to the proceedings states that Hisham Alkhamesi resides in Hinckley, Leicestershire.
- No electoral roll records directly attributable to Hisham Alkhamesi were identified.
- A historic electoral roll entry was identified for Zubair A Alkhamesi at **61 Holt Road, Burbage, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 2PZ**.
- The records identified Zubair A Alkhamesi as registered at the address during 2005 and 2013.
- Mary Hall is identified as a resident and owner of the property.
- Public reporting suggests that Mary Hall and Zubair Alkhamesi are the parents of Hisham Alkhamesi.
- Subsequent electoral roll records indicate that other individuals have since been registered at the address.

Assessment: *No direct residential information relating to Hisham Alkhamesi was identified. Open-source research identified an address associated with individuals assessed to be his parents. Confidence is assessed as medium due to the indirect nature of the attribution.*

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

05 May 26

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL



6. SOURCES

[1] <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2016/oct/02/modernist-romance-an-artistic-couple-and-their-modernist-house>

[2] <https://www.gseller.co.uk/obituaries/peter-anthony-stuart-hall>

Additional sources:

- Electoral roll records
- Land Registry ownership records
- Public reporting relating to the proceedings
- Publicly accessible social media profiles

Iain Evans

192.com
People | Businesses | Places

WHO: PEOPLE Iain Evans

WHERE: Shipley

SEARCH

Home

People

Businesses

Places

Home » People » Your results for Iain Evans in Shipley » Iain Evans in BD18

Iain Evans in BD18 4QB

13 Fanny Street,
Shipley, West Yorkshire, [BD18 4QB](#)
No telephone numbers found
Source(s): 2020-26 Electoral Roll , Land Registry

Length of Occupancy: 7 years

Latest Purchase Price: £165,000 (18 Oct 2019)

Hana Yun-Stevens

192.com
People | Businesses | Places

WHO: PEOPLE Hana Yun-stevens

WHERE: e.g. London or SW6

SEARCH

Home

People

Businesses

Places

2 Results for Hana Yun-stevens
The results below are the closest to the location specified, but may not be in that exact location

Download and save results

CSV PDF

Filter by:

Location Forename Surname

1 Hana Yun-Stevens ER 2023-26	Flat 139, Queen Alexandra Mansions, Bidborough Street, London, WC1H 9DL		View
2 Hana Yun-Stevens ER 2021-22	Schafer House 168-182, Drummond Street, London, NW1 3HZ	Eve Juliette Bolland, Rebecca Anya Kesteven ...	View



CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

05 May 26

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL



192.com

People | Businesses | Places

WHO:

PEOPLE ▾ Hana Yun-stevens

WHERE:

Bidborough Street, Holborn, Lor

SEARCH

Home

People

Businesses

Places

Home

»

People

»

Your results for Hana Yun-stevens

»

Hana Yun-Stevens in WC1H

Hana Yun-Stevens in WC1H 9DL

Flat 139, Queen Alexandra Mansions, Bidborough Street,
London,

WC1H 9DL

No telephone numbers found

Source(s): 2023-26 Electoral Roll , Land Registry

Length of Occupancy: 4 years
Latest Purchase Price: £138,000 (02 Nov 1998)

Bea Sherman

192.com

People | Businesses | Places

WHO:

PEOPLE ▾ Sherman

WHERE:

Hassocks

SEARCH

Home

People

Businesses

Places

Home

»

People

»

Your results for Sherman in Hassocks

»

Kate Sherman in BN6

Kate Sherman in BN6 8UY

4 Clayton Road, Ditchling,
Hassocks, East Sussex,

BN6 8UY

No telephone numbers found

Source(s): 2005-26 Electoral Roll , Land Registry

Length of Occupancy: 22 years
Latest Purchase Price: £450,000 (10 May 2004)

Hisham Alkhamesi

192.com

People | Businesses | Places

WHO:

PEOPLE ▾ Alkhamesi

WHERE:

Hinckley

SEARCH

Home

People

Businesses

Places

1 Results for

Alkhamesi in or near Hinckley

The results below are the closest to the location specified, but may not be in that exact location

Download and save results

CSV

PDF

Filter by:

Location ▾

Forename ▾

Surname ▾

1

Zubair A Alkhamesi

ER 2005, 2013

61, Holt Road, Burbage, Hinckley,
Leicestershire, LE10 2PZ

Mary L Hall

View

192.com

People | Businesses | Places

WHO:

PEOPLE ▾ Alkhamesi

WHERE:

Hinckley

SEARCH

Home

People

Businesses

Places

Home

»

People

»

Your results for Alkhamesi in Hinckley

»

Zubair A Alkhamesi in LE10

Zubair A Alkhamesi in LE10 2PZ

61 Holt Road, Burbage,
Hinckley, Leicestershire,

LE10 2PZ

No telephone numbers found

Source(s): 2005, 2013 Electoral Roll , Land Registry


Length of Occupancy: 9 years
Latest Purchase Price: £34,500 (10 Mar 1997)

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

34

05 May 26

CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL



Mary L Hall in LE10 2PZ

61 Holt Road, Burbage,
Hinckley, Leicestershire, [LE10 2PZ](#)
Phone number: 01455 447 790
Source(s): 2002, 2013 Electoral Roll , Directory Enquiries ,
Land Registry

[View Length of Occupancy](#)
Latest Purchase Price: £34,500 (10 Mar 1997)

Peter Anthony Stuart Hall

15th Aug 1934 — 22nd Jan 2020

Parish councillor for Burbage, passed away peacefully, surrounded by his family, after a short illness, at the George Eliot Hospital on the 22nd January 2020, aged 85 years. He is survived by beloved wife Ann, children Martin, Sue, Mary and Robert, grandsons Atticus, Reuben, Hisham and Faris, wider family and a large circle of friends. The family would particularly like to thank medical and nursing staff at the George Eliot Hospital, AMU, CCU, A&E, Cardiac Rehab team and the ambulance crew from EMAS for their expertise and support during Peter's last illness. All are welcome to attend a celebration

Funeral Service

Date:
Wednesday 5th February 2020

Location:
Burbage Millennium Hall

ENDS



CLIENT CONFIDENTIAL

[Home](#) | [UK](#) | [World](#) | [Business](#) | [Culture](#) | [Politics](#) | [Health](#) | [Tech](#) | [InDepth](#) |[More](#)[BBC Verify](#) | [Climate](#)[England](#) | [Local News](#)

Pro-Palestine protesters face retrial over damage



Prosecutors confirmed they intend to re-try four people who deny acting unlawfully in connection with damage caused at Moog Wolverhampton Ltd

3 July 2026

Four pro-Palestine protesters accused of causing criminal damage to an aerospace factory are to face a retrial next year.

Iain Evans, 33, Hisham Alkhamesi, 23, Hana Yun-Stevens, 24, and Frank Sherman, 23, also known as Bea Sherman, all deny acting unlawfully when damage was caused to Moog Wolverhampton Ltd in August last year.

Prosecutors allege the defendants, who believed the business was involved in the supply chain to Israel, had no lawful excuse to act as they did.

Last month, a jury failed to reach a verdict and earlier on Friday, judge Mr Justice Wall said a trial would start on 8 March "or very shortly thereafter".

Evans, of Saltaire in Shipley, West Yorkshire, Alkhamesi, of Burbage, near Hinckley, Leicestershire, Yun-Stevens, from south-west London, and Sherman, of Ditchling, East Sussex, have pleaded not guilty to a single count of causing criminal damage to property.

The defendants, who spoke only to confirm their identities, all appeared at Birmingham Crown Court via video-link, to hear prosecutor Rupert Jones apply for the case to be re-tried.

The Crown alleges the four caused criminal damage at the factory in the Pendeford area of Wolverhampton by cutting away sections of roofing using power tools and smashing hundreds of solar panels.

Setting a date for a re-trial expected to last for about five days at a court venue which has yet to be finalised, the High Court judge said: "In the case of each of the four defendants I will extend bail on the same terms as they have been up until today."

The jury at Birmingham Crown Court failed to reach any verdicts on the defendants in June.

Get in touch

Tell us which stories we should cover in Wolverhampton

Contact form

Follow BBC Wolverhampton & Black Country on [**BBC Sounds**](#), [**Facebook**](#), [**X**](#) and [**Instagram**](#).

Related topics

Shipley

Burbage

Wolverhampton

Ditchling

Related internet links