The document is a detailed court judgment concerning the case of MBR Acres Ltd v. Curtin, involving protest activities at the Wyton Site, Cambridgeshire. The judgment addresses various legal claims and applications, including trespass, public nuisance, interference with access to the highway, and harassment.

#### Case Details:

The case involves MBR Acres Ltd and John Curtin, with claims of trespass, public nuisance, interference with access to the highway, and harassment at the Wyton Site, Cambridgeshire.12

## • Interim Injunction:

An interim injunction was granted on 10 November 2021 to prevent trespass and obstruction at the Wyton Site, which was later modified to address specific issues.34

## • Alleged Breaches:

Several contempt applications were made against John Curtin and other protestors for alleged breaches of the interim injunction, including trespassing and obstructing vehicles.56

## Drone Usage:

The Claimants alleged that flying drones over the Wyton Site constituted trespass and harassment, but the court found insufficient evidence to support these claims against Curtin.78

#### Harassment Claims:

The court dismissed the harassment claims against Curtin, finding that his actions did not meet the threshold of oppressive and unacceptable conduct.910

# Contempt Application Outcome:

John Curtin admitted to one breach of the interim injunction and was fined £90 for his contempt of court.1112

# • Contra Mundum Injunction:

The court granted a limited contra mundum injunction to restrain future acts of trespass and obstruction at the Wyton Site, but not for drone usage or public nuisance.1314

# • Police Involvement:

The court acknowledged the role of the police in managing protest activities and found no evidence of police failure in responding to the protests.1516

# • Wolverhampton Decision:

The judgment references the Supreme Court decision in Wolverhampton, which clarified the law on injunctions against "Persons Unknown" and the use of contra mundum orders.1718

## • Future Applications:

The court imposed a requirement for the Claimants to obtain permission before bringing any further contempt applications against "Persons Unknown" to prevent abuse of the injunction.19