

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
KING'S BENCH DIVISION**

**Claim No: KB-2025-000497**

**BETWEEN:**

**THE CHANCELLOR, MASTERS AND SCHOLARS  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE**

**Claimant**

**- and -**

**PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO, IN CONNECTION WITH CAMBRIDGE FOR  
PALESTINE OR OTHERWISE FOR A PURPOSE CONNECTED WITH THE  
PALESTINE-ISRAEL CONFLICT, WITHOUT THE CLAIMANT'S CONSENT (I)  
ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN UPON (II) BLOCK, PREVENT, SLOW DOWN,  
OBSTRUCT OR OTHERWISE INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO (III) ERECT ANY  
STRUCTURE (INCLUDING TENTS) ON, THE FOLLOWING SITES (AS SHOWN  
FOR IDENTIFICATION EDGED RED ON THE PLANS 1 AND 2 ATTACHED TO  
THE CLAIM FORM):**

- (A) GREENWICH HOUSE MADINGLEY RISE, CAMBRIDGE, CB3 0TX**
- (B) SENATE HOUSE AND SENATE HOUSE YARD, TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE, CB2  
1TA**
- (C) THE OLD SCHOOLS, TRINITY LANE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 1TN**

**Defendants**

**- and -**

**EUROPEAN LEGAL SUPPORT CENTRE**

**Proposed Intervener**

---

**FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF ANNA OST**

---

I, Anna Ost, of European Legal Support Centre Ltd ("ELSC"), 44-48 Shepherdess Walk, London, England, N1 7JP will say as follows:

1. I am the Senior Legal Officer of ELSC, of the above address. I have conduct of this matter on behalf of the Proposed Intervener. I am duly authorised by the Proposed Intervener to make this witness statement.

2. Except where otherwise indicated, the facts set out in this witness statement are derived from my knowledge and are true. Where any facts or matters are not within my knowledge, I have stated the source of my information, and I confirm those facts are true to the best of my information and belief.
3. There is now produced and shown to me an exhibit marked **AO1**, a further document referred to in this witness statement. Nothing in this witness statement is intended to waive privilege and privilege is not waived.
4. I make this witness statement in support of the ELSC's applications for:
  - 4.1. Joinder to the above matter as an intervener; and
  - 4.2. Adjournment of the hearing of the Claimant's application for an interim injunction dated 12 February 2025.

**A. BACKGROUND TO THE APPLICATIONS**

5. The ELSC is an independent advocacy organisation focused on defending and empowering the Palestine solidarity movement in Europe through legal means. Its mandate expressly extends to defending the movement from restrictions to the fundamental rights of freedom of expression and assembly. A substantial element of the ELSC's work is the provision of legal advice and support to advocates for Palestinian rights in the UK facing restrictions on their ability to protest and express their views.
6. The Claimant University seeks a 'newcomer' injunction against "*Persons Unknown who, in connection with Cambridge for Palestine or otherwise for a purpose connected with the Palestine-Israel conflict, without the Claimant's consent*" *inter alia* enter, occupy, interfere with access to or erect a structure on:
  - 6.1. Greenwich House, an administrative office building at Madingley Rise;
  - 6.2. The Senate House and Senate House Yard, a formal building and lawn owned by the Claimant in the centre of the town of Cambridge, with ceremonial significance as the symbolic 'heart' of the University (where e.g. degree ceremonies and Senate meetings are held); and
  - 6.3. The Old Schools, a building in the same enclosed site as the Senate House and Senate House Yard housing certain University administrative departments.

7. The Claimant's Claim Form in this matter was filed under stamp dated 12 February 2025. The Claim Form, the Application Notice and evidence in support are said to have been served by (i) uploading a copy to the University website; (ii) sending an email to three email addresses purportedly related to the Defendants; and (iii) affixing a notice at the relevant locations setting out where the documents can be found.
8. The ELSC was not itself served with the Claim Form, or with the Application Notice. The ELSC became aware of the Claim and the Application on Friday 21 February 2025.

**B. JOINDER**

9. The ELSC seeks an order for joinder to this matter, for the purpose of making submissions in the interests of the Defendant class.
10. The ELSC seeks this order:
  - 10.1. Pursuant to CPR 19.2(2), because it is desirable to add the new party so that the Court can effectively resolve all the matters in dispute in the proceedings; or
  - 10.2. Alternatively, pursuant to the Court's inherent jurisdiction in respect of case management decisions.
11. The starting point for this application is the nature of the 'newcomer' injunction sought by the Claimant, which has no named Defendants. The Supreme Court in *Wolverhampton CC v London Gypsies and Travellers* [2024] AC 983 recognised the procedural fairness risk that injunctions without named Defendants may go undefended, with the result that the injunction may be ordered without scrutiny in a contested hearing: at [173]. The Court confirmed therefore that the notice requirement for a 'newcomer' injunction remained in place. But the Court was clear that the advertisement in advance fulfilled a different function (at [176]):

*“[to] alert bodies with a mission to protect [the Defendants’] interests [...] and enable them to intervene to address the court on the [] application with focused submissions as to why no injunction should be granted in the particular case”.*
12. Notably, the Court envisaged that such bodies should intervene before the injunction was granted in a particular case:

- 12.1. The submissions to be made by the body are as to the grant of the injunction (not to variation or discharge); and
- 12.2. The close nexus with the advertisement requirement of the Application Notice indicates that the body is intended to intervene at first instance, and not upon being notified of an injunction having been ordered.
13. The ELSC seeks to intervene on precisely this basis.
14. **First**, as in *Wolverhampton*, there are no named Defendants to this action, and no individuals who have been specifically served with the Claim Form or Application Notice. Nonetheless, the Claim has an expansive reach: all individuals who without the Claimant's consent "*for a purpose connected with the Palestine-Israel conflict*" enter the Claimant's property at any time in the next 5 years would be Defendants to the injunction sought. Many (if not most) of those individuals remain unaware that they are Defendants to this action, not least because the Claimant has no idea who those individuals might turn out to be.
15. **Second**, to my best knowledge and understanding, no individual in the Defendant class has named themselves or requested joinder. From my experience working with protesters in the past, I believe that it is unlikely that any individual would elect to take up that role:
- 15.1. The Defendants, who the Claimant in the Particulars of Claim at [2] consider to include those "*who purport to be students of the University*", will typically lack the financial resources and/or sufficient legal understanding to do so.
- 15.2. Identification as a named Defendant would require providing the Claimant with their name and address. I believe that Defendants may elect not to do so (and so fail to participate in proceedings) because of a fear that the Claimant would subject them to disciplinary penalty (e.g. in respect of participation in previous protests at Greenwich House or the Senate House Yard in late 2024) or to civil claims for trespass.
16. **Third**, and in any event, the ELSC is a particularly well-placed body for adopting this role:

- 16.1. The ELSC’s mission extends to protecting the interests of persons in the Defendant class, including protestors on issues related to the Palestine-Israel conflict in particular.
- 16.2. The ELSC is a well-established institution with a track record of advocating for persons in the Defendants’ position. It has the legal and other resources available to effectively assist the Court with the applicable submissions of fact and law in relation to the grant of the injunction.
17. As a matter of procedural formality, the ELSC invites the Court to make the order sought either pursuant to its power to join a party under CPR 19.2(2) or in exercise of its inherent case management jurisdiction.
- 17.1. The Court has previously permitted bodies to intervene in civil claims, both under CPR 19.2(2) (see e.g. *Dobson v Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Ofwat intervening)* [2007] EWHC 2021 (TCC) at [6] (reversed in part on appeal on other grounds)); or its inherent jurisdiction (see e.g. *Golden Eye (International) Ltd v Telefonica UK Ltd (Consumer Focus intervening)* [2013] EMLR 1 (ChD) at [9] (reversed in part on appeal on other grounds)).
- 17.2. It is unclear on the face of the published judgments on what basis the interveners in *Wolverhampton* were joined, other than that it was considered expedient at the CMC at first instance: *Barking and Dagenham LBC v Persons Unknown* [2021] EWHC 1201 (QB) at [112].

### **C. ADJOURNMENT**

18. Subject to joinder, the ELSC seeks an order that the hearing of the Claimant’s application for an interim injunction be adjourned, under the Court’s general power of case management at CPR 3.1(2)(b).
19. The Claimant filed its Claim Form and Application Notice under stamp dated 12 February 2025. However, these documents were only published to the University’s website a week later, on 19 February 2025 (last Wednesday): First Witness Statement of Samuel Maw at [5]. At the University’s request, the hearing has been listed urgently for 27 February 2025 (tomorrow).

20. This urgency was unjustified: it threatens the orderly determination of the application and risks substantial prejudice to the Defendants.
21. **First**, the injunction sought raises significant and novel questions of legal and public interest. As explained below, it has not been possible for ELSC to develop adequate submissions or evidence on the various suspect grounds in the time available. However, it is clear on the face of the papers that the Claimant intends to seek an interim injunction in an unprecedented form, which is likely to pose significance prejudice to the large class of affected persons and their ECHR rights. Without limitation and reserving all rights to vary or add grounds in due course, the ELSC has identified the following issues that it considers will require full legal submission:
  - 21.1. The compliance of the injunction with Articles 10 and 11 ECHR (including as read with Article 14) and/or the Equality Act 2010. I note in particular the description of the Defendants as including all those who *inter alia* access the Claimant's property "for a purpose connected with the Palestine-Israel conflict". As this description will affect the scope of any injunction the Court may make, on any terms, the ELSC understands that this will be a threshold question for the interim relief sought;
  - 21.2. The geographic coverage of the injunction, extending to both the Senate House Yard (a significant location in the University) and Greenwich House;
  - 21.3. The extended temporal scope of the injunction; and
  - 21.4. The broad description of the prohibited conduct.
22. I note that the injunction sought differs materially in each of these respects from the otherwise similar order made on 30 October 2024 by Thompsell J in respect of Palestine-related protests at SOAS, University of London: University of London v Harvie-Clark, Mann, Adam & Persons Unknown [2024] EWHC 2895 (Ch). In any event, that order was made without the benefit of legal submissions on behalf of the named Defendants or any Intervener. I have been informed by Counsel for the Defendants since instructed in that case that the hearing for a final determination was adjourned, due to the importance of the Defendants receiving the benefit of legal representation. The date of this hearing has not yet been fixed.
23. None of these points are adequately addressed in the Claimant's witness evidence or in its Counsel's skeleton. In particular, the full and frank disclosure at [56]-[64] of Counsel's

skeleton addresses matters that the ELSC may wish to raise in due course, but none of its core concerns. It follows that, without adjournment, the Court will not have the opportunity to hear submissions on these key matters.

24. I understand from contact I have had with other interested parties that other bodies also intend to apply to intervene in due course. In particular, I believe that both Liberty and the Cambridge Students' Union are considering intervention, in order to make submissions within their mandate and expertise on freedom of speech and protest issues, and student welfare, respectively. These submissions, which are material to the determination of the Claimant's application, are not yet before the Court.
25. It is appropriate that the Court and the Claimant deal with the ELSC's (and any other) arguments at the initial hearing of the Claimant's application, rather than upon a later application to vary or discharge. It is incumbent on the Claimant to satisfy the Court of its application, at its own cost risk, before it gains the benefit of the relief it seeks, particularly given its far-reaching effect. It is therefore vital that the application receive the Court's close scrutiny at a contested hearing, including the consideration of submissions from the Proposed Intervener.
26. **Second**, the Claimant has not itself proceeded with its Claim expeditiously, despite now claiming it faces imminent prejudice if the injunction is not ordered urgently.
  - 26.1. The Claimant only filed its Claim Form and Application Notice on 12 February 2025. The Claimant therefore elected not to proceed for more than two months following the end of the protest at Greenwich House on 6 December 2024, or the protest at the Senate House on 30 November 2024 (both of which are now said to justify the injunction: First Witness Statement of Emma Rampton at [44]-[59] ("**Rampton 1**")).
  - 26.2. Even then, the Claimant failed to advertise the Claim Form or Application Notice for a full week following its filing: these documents were only made available on the Claimant's website on 19 February 2025. As a result of this delay, the ELSC only became aware of the application on 21 February 2025, less than a week before hearing.
  - 26.3. Despite its delay in commencing and advertising the claim, the Claimant still sought a hearing on two weeks' notice from date of the application.

- 26.4. None of the matters raised in Rampton 1 at [166] regarding this delay justify the Claimant's conduct. Ms Rampton explains only that (over the course of more than 2 months) the Claimant prioritised other legal proceedings and undertook internal discussions as to how to proceed. Those are matters for the Claimant and its own resourcing. It is no reason to subject the Defendants and the Proposed Intervener to the obvious prejudice caused by rushing to hearing.
27. As a result of the Claimant's approach to its application, both the Defendants and potential interveners (including the ELSC) have been denied the opportunity to seek advice, instruct counsel, and prepare the submissions and evidence necessary to adequately respond to the application, all in time to participate effectively at a hearing on 27 February 2025.
28. **Third**, the only basis of actual urgency on which the Claimant relies is the graduation due to take place at the Senate House on 1 March 2025: Rampton 1 at [165]. This is insufficient to justify the Claimant's approach.
- 28.1. The Claimant has provided no evidence of any planned protest at the Senate House that is due to affect that graduation. The highest its evidence goes is to rely on vague and rhetorical posts by Cambridge 4 Palestine (the collective whose actions are said to justify the injunction) about the group's "*commit[ment]*" to the "*struggle*" and intention to "*redouble[ ]*" efforts: Rampton 1 at [146]-[152]. Without more, these statements are plainly insufficient to give rise to the requisite fear of imminent harm justifying urgent determination.
- 28.2. In the event, Cambridge 4 Palestine has made no public announcement that it intends to hold a protest at the Senate House or in Senate House Yard on 1 March 2025. On the contrary, Cambridge 4 Palestine has indicated that it intends to protest at Great St Mary's instead. I exhibit at **AO1** publicly accessible posts by Cambridge 4 Palestine advertising the protest on a range of social media (including Facebook, Instagram, and X). From these advertisements, it appears that this protest will take place outside the designated property covered by the injunction, and on land which I understand is public and not owned by the University. For the avoidance of doubt, I do not believe that the University would have any entitlement to injunct a protest taking place outside Great St Mary's on 1 March 2025 (and none is sought by the Claimant).



- 28.3. Any graduation at the Senate House has no bearing on the injunction sought in respect of Greenwich House, which is almost 2 miles away.
- 28.4. There are no protestors currently on site at either Greenwich House or Senate House Yard. In the absence of any evidence of a planned protest, the risk identified is, at its highest, speculative.
29. The Proposed Intervener’s application for adjournment would cause no material prejudice to the Claimant, but would allow its injunction application to be considered in good order and on full submissions by affected parties.
30. The Proposed Intervener proposes an adjournment of eight weeks, for listing in the week commencing 21 April 2025. This would allow the development of reasoned submissions and potentially the addition of further Interveners. This would allow the matter to be determined in good time before the commencement of Easter Full Term at the University, on 29 April 2025.
31. In the alternative, the Proposed Intervener notes that the next graduation at the Senate House after 1 March 2025 is 29 March 2025. A determination in the week commencing 24 March 2025 would put great pressure on the Proposed Intervener and any potential Defendants. However, if the University is capable of demonstrating a real and imminent risk to that ceremony, the ELSC would be willing to consider a four-week adjournment to facilitate prior determination.

**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.

Signature: *AMost* .....

Dated: ...26.2.2025.....



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
KING'S BENCH DIVISION**

**Claim No: KB-2025-000497**

**BETWEEN:**

**THE CHANCELLOR, MASTERS AND  
SCHOLARS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE**

**Claimant**

**- and -**

**PERSONS UNKNOWN WHO, IN CONNECTION WITH CAMBRIDGE FOR  
PALESTINE OR OTHERWISE FOR A PURPOSE CONNECTED WITH THE  
PALESTINE-ISRAEL CONFLICT, WITHOUT THE CLAIMANT'S CONSENT (I)  
ENTER OCCUPY OR REMAIN UPON (II) BLOCK, PREVENT, SLOW DOWN,  
OBSTRUCT OR OTHERWISE INTERFERE WITH ACCESS TO (III) ERECT ANY  
STRUCTURE (INCLUDING TENTS) ON, THE FOLLOWING SITES (AS SHOWN  
FOR IDENTIFICATION EDGED RED ON THE PLANS 1 AND 2 ATTACHED TO  
THE CLAIM FORM):**

- (A) GREENWICH HOUSE MADINGLEY RISE, CAMBRIDGE, CB3 0TX**
- (B) SENATE HOUSE AND SENATE HOUSE YARD, TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE, CB2  
1TA**
- (C) THE OLD SCHOOLS, TRINITY LANE, CAMBRIDGE, CB2 1TN**

**Defendants**

**- and -**

**EUROPEAN LEGAL SUPPORT CENTRE**

**Proposed Intervener**

---

**EXHIBIT "AO1"**

---



# Posts

Follow



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



1/8

# UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE IS ATTEMPTING TO CRIMINALISE THE MOVEMENT FOR PALESTINE



2,079



34



499



cambridgeforpalestine BREAKING: Cambridge takes unprecedented steps to repress the movement for Pal... more

22 hours ago



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others





# Posts

Follow



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



2/8

## CAMBRIDGE'S CLAIM

In a claim dated 12 February, Cambridge University filed for a 5-year injunction to **criminalise** protests for Palestine on or around Senate House, Old Schools, and Greenwich House, threatening its own students with **imprisonment and fines** for protesting genocide.

- (1) An order that until 12 February 2030 the Defendants must not, without the consent of the Claimant:
- a. Enter, occupy or remain upon the Land.
  - b. Block, prevent, slow down, obstruct or otherwise interfere with the access of any other individual to the Land.
  - c. Erect or place any structure (including, for example, tents or other sleeping equipment) on the Land.

 Disclose. Divest.



 2,079  34  499 

cambridgeforpalestine BREAKING: Cambridge takes unprecedented steps to repress the movement for Pal... more

22 hours ago



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others





# Posts

Follow



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



3/8

# EXPLICITLY TARGETING THE PALESTINE MOVEMENT

2. The Defendants are comprised of Persons Unknown, who purport to be students of the University, protesting in relation to the Israel-Palestine conflict and the University's alleged complicity in the actions of the Israeli Defence Force, such as by its investments in and research arrangements with the defence industry. Many of them appear to be

**Defining the "Defendants" as anyone protesting "in relation to the Israel-Palestine conflict and the University's alleged complicity in the actions of the Israeli Defence Force," Cambridge seeks to single out and criminalise anyone protesting for Palestine, continuing its pattern of racist targeting.**

**By the terms of its claim, something as simple as a graduating student waving a Palestinian flag outside of their Senate House ceremony could constitute "obstruction."**



2,079 34 499

cambridgeforpalestine BREAKING: Cambridge takes unprecedented steps to repress the movement for Pal... more 22 hours ago



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others





# Posts

Follow



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



4/8

## DANGEROUS PRECEDENT FOR POLITICAL SPEECH

25. Even if it were found that an injunction would amount to an interference with the Defendants' Article 10/11 ECHR rights by a public authority, any such interference would be justified in that:

**The claim attempts to justify the use of an injunction "even if" it interferes with students' "rights to freedom of expression and assembly."**

**To meet peaceful civil disobedience with violent policing and criminalisation sets a chilling precedent for academic freedom at large, following the lead of US and UK universities that have turned campuses-- spaces of learning and expression--into hostile environments for any meaningful exchange.**

 | Disclose. Divest.



 2,079  34  499 

cambridgeforpalestine BREAKING: Cambridge takes unprecedented steps to repress the movement for Pal... more

22 hours ago



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others





# Posts

Follow



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



5/8

## “EVEN AFTER THE CEASEFIRE”

**The University’s claim expresses surprise at the fact that our movement remains committed to our struggle “even after the ceasefire.”**

*“We will be back”, under the tag line “We Will Not Stop, We Will Not Rest”. Similarly, even after the ceasefire between Israel and Hamas was announced on 15 January 2025, Cambridge for Palestine announced the following on its social media channels on 18 January 2025:*

*“CEASEFIRE TODAY... LIBERATION TOMORROW...*

*We commit to continuing the struggle from the belly of the beast, in unequivocal solidarity with the pursuit of a free Palestine, from the river to the sea.”*

**As we speak, the Zionist occupation continues to make Gaza unliveable, Palestinian prisoners are being from barred release, and the West Bank is under military attack with over 40,000 indefinitely displaced. Cambridge’s moves distract from the core issue: its ongoing moral and material complicity in genocide as Israel violates basic commitments and US politicians greenlight the ethnic cleansing of Gaza.**



2,079 34 499

cambridgeforpalestine **BREAKING: Cambridge takes unprecedented steps to repress the movement for Pal...** more  
22 hours ago







# Posts

Follow



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



6/8

# TO PROTEST WITHOUT DISRUPTION

The University has justified its repressive moves, claiming a lack of "less restrictive" alternatives to prevent disruption.

25.3. There are no less restrictive alternative means available to achieve the aims.

In the past months, the University has manipulated and rejected attempts to seek urgent action on divestment through administrative channels, and has refused to engage with student protesters, proactively choosing repression instead.

We protest not with the objective of "disruption," but because it is the only moral, principled option available to us.

At a university that has made it "normal" to pour money into mass murder, any act of protest--whether an occupation or a waving of a flag--constitutes disruption.



2,079 34 499

cambridgeforpalestine BREAKING: Cambridge takes unprecedented steps to repress the movement for Pal... more  
22 hours ago



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others





# Posts

Follow



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



7/8

**The University of Cambridge may seek to weaponise legal tools and bureacracy against us, but in doing so, it will only further alienate itself from students, faculty, and people of conscience who refuse to remain silent at an institution entrenched in violence.**



2,079



34



499



cambridgeforpalestine **BREAKING: Cambridge takes unprecedented steps to repress the movement for Pal...** more

22 hours ago



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others





Posts

Follow



cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



8/8

**RALLY:**  
**SATURDAY**  
**01/03 11 AM**  
**GREAT ST.**  
**MARY'S**

**LONG LIVE THE**  
**STUDENT INTIFADA.**  
**LONG LIVE**  
**PALESTINE.**



2,079



34



499



cambridgeforpalestine BREAKING: Cambridge takes unprecedented steps to repress the movement for Palestine. The struggle for divestment and liberation will not be deterred. 🇵🇸





cambridgeforpalestine and 4 others



**RALLY:**  
**SATURDAY**  
**01/03 11 AM**  
**GREAT ST.**  
**MARY'S**

**LONG LIVE THE**  
**STUDENT INTIFADA.**  
**LONG LIVE**  
**PALESTINE.**



2,083



34



493



< Cambridge for Palestine's post



Like

Comment

Share

**RALLY:**  
**SATURDAY**  
**01/03 11 AM**  
**GREAT ST.**  
**MARY'S**  
**LONG LIVE THE**  
**STUDENT INTIFADA.**  
**LONG LIVE**  
**PALESTINE.**

Like

Comment

Share

Send message



**Cambridge for Palestine**

Stories · 22h · 🌐





Post



Cambridge for Palestine @cam4palestine

Join us on Saturday. If they come for us in the morning they will come for you in the evening.

**RALLY:**  
**SATURDAY**  
**01/03 11 AM**  
**GREAT ST. MARY'S**  
**LONG LIVE THE STUDENT INTIFADA.**  
**LONG LIVE PALESTINE.**

The University of Cambridge may seek to weaponise legal tools and bureaucracy against us, but in doing so, it will only further alienate itself from students, faculty, and people of conscience who refuse to remain silent at an institution entrenched in violence.

Disclose. Divest.



Cambridge for Palestine @cam4palestine · 20h

x.com/cam4palestine/...

University tried for a 5-year injunction to criminalise protests for Palestine on or around Senate House, Old Schools, and Greenwich House, threatening its own students with imprisonment and fines for protesting genocide.

(1) An order that until 12 February 2030 the Defendants must not, without the consent of the Claimant:
a. Enter, occupy or remain upon the Land.
b. Block, prevent, slow down, obstruct or otherwise interfere with the access of any other individual to the Land.

2. The Defendants are comprised of Persons Unknown, who purport to be students of the University, protesting in relation to the Israel-Palestine conflict and the University's alleged complicity in the actions of the Israeli Defence Force, such as by its investments in and research arrangements with the defence industry. Many of them appear to be

Defining the "Defendants" as anyone protesting "in relation to the Israel-Palestine conflict and the University's alleged complicity in the actions of the Israeli Defence Force," Cambridge seeks to single out and criminalise anyone protesting for Palestine, continuing its pattern of racist targeting.

By the terms of its claim, something as simple as a struggle - even after the ceasefire -

25. Even if it were found that an injunction would amount to an interference with the Defendants' Article 10/11 ECHR rights by a public authority, any such interference would be justified in that:

The claim attempts to justify the use of an injunction "even if" it interferes with students' "rights to freedom of expression and assembly."

"We will be back", under the tag line "We Will Not Stop, We Will Not Rest". Similarly, even after the ceasefire between Israel and Hamas was announced on 15 January 2025, Cambridge for Palestine announced the following on its social media channels on 18 January 2025:

"CEASEFIRE TODAY... LIBERATION TOMORROW... We commit to continuing the struggle from the belly of the beast, in unequivocal solidarity with the pursuit of a free Palestine, from the river to the sea."

Post your reply

