

This is a statement on behalf of the 11 people arrested while peacefully protesting outside Southwark Crown Court on Tuesday 2nd July.

We are responding to a factually incorrect assertion made at the verdict hearing on Thursday 11th July by judge Justice Hehir.

None of the 11 arrestees were able to attend the verdict hearing because of bail restrictions imposed by Justice Hehir. That means none of the arrestees could hear or correct the statement at the time, something of which Justice Hehir would have been aware. We correct that statement here:

We, the arrestees, wish to put on the record that we acted on our own direction and according to our own beliefs when we engaged in peaceful protest outside Southwark Crown Court on Tuesday 2nd July.

We vehemently refute the unfounded accusation that we were manipulated into acting for or by Roger Hallam or any other person. No evidence has been put forward to support this false accusation.

We are appalled that Dr Neil Stevenson's hearing loss is being used as an excuse to cast us all as "vulnerable".

We note that Dr Stevenson's hearing was only an issue because the court failed to make reasonable adjustments, as required by the Equality Act 2010, on both occasions Dr Stevenson was brought into court.

Dr Stevenson described this assertion as "insulting", and we all agree.

We have learned from the press that UN special rapporteur Michael Forst attended Southwark Crown Court on July 11th because of his concerns about a fair trial in this case. Where a trial is being run in a way that is not fair and democratic, and where relevant information is being kept from a jury, many organisations, including Defend Our Juries, will of course take an interest.

Allowing juries to hear the whole truth and informing juries of their right to acquit according to their conscience have been Defend Our Juries goals since its inception last year.

We act in support of every jury, in every court, in England and Wales. This is something we stated to the court security on Monday 1st July.

The Defend Our Juries goals are publicly visible on the defendourjuries.org website.

The right to protest is a protected right under the European Convention on Human Rights.

We note that no arrests were made on any other days at Southwark Court or any other court in England and Wales where similar protests have occurred for over two weeks as part of the current "Truth" campaign. Indeed no arrests have been made in over a year that Defend Our Juries has been campaigning, covering almost every court in England and Wales.

In April this year, just 3 months ago, Mr Justice Saini gave a High Court ruling in the case of Ms Trudi Warner who was also accused of Contempt of Court for standing outside a court with a sign, circumstances almost identical to our action. Justice Saini said, "However, even if [Ms Warner's] words had been wrong in law and her conduct inappropriate, the succinct Direction given by the judge was sufficient to deal with any prejudice to the trial. A criminal prosecution is a disproportionate approach to this situation in a democratic society.". Some of the 11 arrestees were in court to hear the ruling. This ruling would seem to cover the 3 "Old Bailey" signs (which are identical to Trudi Warner's sign or the wording from the plaque in the Old Bailey) as well as the newer "Truth" signs. We have heard Justice Hehir referred to an appeal by the previous Solicitor General. We note no appeal has been heard so Justice Saini's ruling is current law.

Personal statements

Those arrested would also like to make the following personal statements.

1. Terence McGinity

My Name is Terence McGinity. I am 76 and a retired teacher and actor, now a sculptor. Jurors deserve to hear the whole truth and having heard it base their decisions on it. This is my conviction and I state loudly and clearly that no-one asked me to take part; certainly not Roger Hallam, as maintained by Judge Hehir. I wasn't even aware he was on trial that day. I am perfectly able to act on my own accord and have done so for many years.

2. Katharine Amberley

My name is Katharine Amberley. I took this action as part of a campaign by Defend Our Juries, on my own volition and not at the request of Mr Roger Hallam. I became involved with DOJ to support its aim of raising awareness of jury equity and because I had learnt in 2023 that some defendants were being told they couldn't mention motivation at their trial and I think this is incompatible with the oath to tell the whole truth in court.

3. Elizabeth Helen Simpson

I am proud to stand up for the right of jurors to hear the whole truth as understood by defendants in court. I am a seventy-three year old mental health worker and grandmother and I have attended seven Defend Our Juries events. I understand the informed judgement of jurors to be an urgent human right. As an (aspiring) pacifist I see non-violent protest as being part of how we resist violations of human rights, increasing militarisation and climate collapse.

No-one encouraged, instructed or persuaded me to attend. I was not encouraged or influenced to attend by Roger Hallam or anyone else from Just Stop Oil. My presence was entirely on account of the high esteem I hold for the actions of the organisation Defend Our Juries.

4. Professor Anne Richards

I am a 66 year old emeritus professor and I have been involved with Defend Our Juries since its inception. I have sat outside multiple crown courts on many different occasions and was in attendance at the RCJ to witness Mr Justice Saini's ruling to, "refuse the Solicitor General permission to proceed with these proceedings against Ms Warner, I dismiss the case". I sat outside Southwark Crown Court, as I had done before on previous occasions, holding a sign saying that 'Jurors deserve to hear the WHOLE truth'. I

believe that jurors should be furnished with all the evidence and be allowed to make their own collective decision. I sat outside Southwark Crown Court out of my own volition and with no interference from any defendant in the court. I strongly refute that I was manipulated in any way and I assert that I am not a vulnerable individual.

5. Yvonne Hayward

My name is Yvonne Hayward. I am an 80 years old. I have participated in Silent Vigils with the self-organising group " Defend Our Juries" for the past 16 months. Sitting on 10 occasions at various Courts. I wish to sit and peacefully highlight injustice.

I refute Judge C Hehir's statement that I was manipulated by Mr Roger Hallam to be outside Southwark Crown Court on 2nd July 2024. As in the past 16 months, I make my own decisions as to when and where to sit in Silent Vigil. I find Judge C Hehir's statement to be both insulting and untrue.

6. Jane Leggett

I am 73 and since I retired from teaching I volunteer with a number of community groups.

I have been part of Defend Our Juries from the beginning and have held signs outside multiple Crown Courts, including Southwark. On September 2nd I held a sign saying 'Jurors deserve to hear the WHOLE truth' because this is what I believe. At no time before I sat did I have any contact with any defendant in any of the courts within Southwark Crown Court.

I believe I was not breaking any law since Justice Saini had dismissed the case against Trudi Warner.

7. El Litten

My name is El Litten - I'm a front end web developer and I also do voluntary work. I have been involved with Defend Our Juries for a long time, because I believe it is vital that we have a fair justice system, in which jurors know their rights and important facts are not hidden from them. Neither Roger Hallam nor any other defendant had anything to do with me being at Southwark on 2 July. I was very surprised to hear that this is what Judge Hehir claimed in court, because it is completely false. I was there because I chose to be, just as I have chosen to do the same at several other courts in

the past, because jurors do have the right to acquit according to their conscience, and because jurors do deserve to hear the whole truth. The truth is something that ought to matter. Big truths matter - for example the fact of the climate emergency and its consequences, and smaller ones matter too - like the fact no defendant at the trial judge Hehir was presiding over had anything to do with my actions.

8. Dr Neil Stevenson

I have been an active member of the Defend Our Juries campaign since its inception in May 2023.

I have been encouraged by the April 2024 High Court ruling that the action, which mimics that of Trudi Warner outside Inner London Crown Court in March 2023, is lawful, the message is correct and the action is protected by Human Rights legislation Article 10(1) ECHR. My arrest on July 2nd outside Southwark Crown Court on the basis of the judge's allegation of Contempt of Court was a shock and an interference with my right of self-expression.

The inference by Judge Hehir that in displaying the same sign as on previous occasions I was persuaded by Roger Hallam is fanciful and without foundation. I find insulting his conclusion that my profound deafness renders me vulnerable to manipulation by Roger Hallam.

9. Dr Clive Dolphin

I have been a member of Defend Our Juries almost since its creation, and later a spokesperson for Defend Our Juries. I am motivated by the desire to have fair trials where 12 ordinary people, the jury, decide the verdict based on all the facts.

I have attended sittings outside of all the courts in the Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire area as well as multiple sittings at over a third of the courts in London, including multiple occasions at Southwark Crown Court. I was in the High Court when the Trudi Warner ruling was read out. I have heard multiple complimentary comments from members of the public and legal professionals including one who said, "... if you object to this you object to the right to protest".

When I sit at a court it is always my decision. I was not manipulated by Roger Hallam or anyone else. The irony being that the only time I have ever

met Roger Hallam is when I was arrested and called into court by Justice Hehir.

10. Brian Barker

It has been reported to me Justice Hehir said that I was in some way vulnerable and had been influenced by one of the defendants. I refute this completely, I attended this silent protest under the banner of Defend Our Juries, just one of more than a dozen such actions I have attended. I don't know any of the defendants in your case and have never had contact with any of them.

I was motivated as usual by a desire to spread knowledge of the principal of jury equity and the desire that all juries should be able to hear the whole truth before deliberating.

11. Paul Stephens

I am a retired Metropolitan Police Detective Sergeant and was awarded a certificate of exemplary service after 34 years. I was one of the sign holders arrested and held upon your instruction on Tuesday 2nd July. In my view this was a disproportionate interference with my Article 10/11 rights and therefore unlawful.

I held a sign that read 'Juries deserve to hear the whole truth'. I was silent and knelt on the ground, holding the sign as a billboard, until I was arrested. Given my professional history, I fully understand that certain facts, such as the previous convictions of a defendant or covert policing methods used, may be rightly withheld from the jury.

What is happening in many climate protest trials, however, is that defendants are being prevented from explaining their motivations. To me this is totally unjust in principle and in practice.

I have been working with Extinction Rebellion for 5 years and Defend our Juries since its inception. I have never belonged to JSO or Insulate Britain, but fully support their aims. I work with a number of other former police officers and we are committed to ensuring that

climate protests are absolutely non-violent, as safe as possible (we insist upon a blue-light policy to ensure emergency vehicles are not obstructed) and that they share the ultimate aim of saving life - an aim which is also the one that motivated us to join the police.

I was at the RCJ for the Warner case and I had a copy of Mr Justice Saini's ruling with me when I knelt outside court on Tuesday 2nd July 2024. The point of the protest; to start a conversation about Bushel, jury nullification and the diversity in Judges' directions that often prevent defendants, who are risking their liberty in order to save life, from explaining their motivations. The fact that climate protest defendants act in the public good to reduce harm, non-violently, with no personal gain, are accountable and tell the truth, must be recognised by the courts if they are to retain any moral credibility.

My protest was aimed at highlighting the injustices that I have described, inflicted by the judiciary upon young people. My protest was not aimed at jury members at all.

For me, protest is a catalyst.

I am not vulnerable and I have not been manipulated.

END.