

Case reference: QB-2020-002702

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

KING'S BENCH DIVISION

Before the Honourable Mrs Justice Collins Rice

B E T W E E N: -



QB-2020-002702

**(1) MULTIPLEX CONSTRUCTION EUROPE LIMITED
(2) LUDGATE HOUSE LIMITED (INCORPORATED IN JERSEY)
(3) SAMPSON HOUSE LIMITED (INCORPORATED IN JERSEY)**

Claimants

-and-

**PERSONS UNKNOWN ENTERING IN OR REMAINING AT THE CLAIMANTS'
CONSTRUCTION SITE AT BANKSIDE YARDS WITHOUT THE CLAIMANTS'
PERMISSION**

Defendants

ORDER

FURTHER TO the Order of Ritchie J dated 22nd January 2024 providing, among other things, for injunctive relief in the Claimants' favour, expressed to be effective until Monday 20th January 2025 ('the Order of Ritchie J');

UPON the Claimants' application dated 20th December 2024 requesting, among other things, the extension of that period until 30th April 2026 ('the Claimants' application');

AND UPON that Application being placed before me as Interim Applications Judge on Friday 17th January 2025;

AND UPON considering the materials filed by the Claimants in support of their application;

AND UPON reading the judgment of Ritchie J in this matter handed down on 19th January 2024 (*Multiplex Construction Europe Limited & Ors v Persons Unknown* [2024] EWHC 239 (KB)) ('the Judgment of Ritchie J');

WITHOUT A HEARING

NOW IT IS ORDERED AND DIRECTED:

- 1. The Claimants must, no later than 3pm on Monday 20th January 2025, apply to the King's Bench Listing Office for their application to be listed to be heard by a High Court Judge as promptly as reasonably possible, with a time estimate of 2 hours.**
- 2. The Order of Ritchie J remains in effect until the hearing of the Claimants' application or further order of the Court.**

Observations

There is considerable history to this matter. The first of a series of *interim* PU injunctions was made by Soole J in July 2020, and there has been a succession of extension orders made since then.

The most recent exercise of the Court's important supervisory functions in relation to *interim* PU injunctions of this nature was by Ritchie J a year ago, at an oral hearing. The Judgment of Ritchie J on that occasion is essential reading in connection with the present application, in particular what he says at [10] about the difference between interim injunctions of this nature and final injunctions, and the procedure for transitioning from one to another.

Real issues of concern must arise about the serial replication of *interim* orders over a period of years with no visible prospect of a final determination. I do not consider it appropriate for the Claimants to expect a further extension of 15 months to be determined on the papers. This Order makes provision for a hearing accordingly.

At that hearing, the Claimants should expect not only to be required to make the case for the necessity of injunctive relief, on its merits and by reference to evidence of how matters stand now; but also to explain why this comes to Court as a request

for more *interim* relief and how it is proposed the matter be brought to a litigation conclusion.

17th January 2024.