

# **LEGAL ADVICE ON POLICE TACTICS AGAINST PROTESTORS (NOVEMBER 2006)**



## Introduction

Recent use of oppressive and intimidatory police tactics on demonstrations has prompted many protestors to ask what they can and cannot do on protests. There is no doubt that the grass roots animal rights movement, and the anti-vivisection movement in particular, is currently facing an all out assault on the rights to peaceful protest and assembly and to freedom of expression. Responsibility for much of the recent intimidation must lie with the National Extremism Tactical Co-ordination Unit (“NETCU”), who appear to be co-ordinating the police clampdown. The purpose of this briefing is to explain the role of NETCU in co-ordination of the police intimidation and to examine the legality of some of the most common police tactics currently being used against protestors.

## NETCU

Responsibility for the intimidatory tactics outlined above must lie, in part at least, with the National Extremism Tactical Co-ordination Unit (“NETCU”). NETCU was set up ostensibly in order to co-ordinate policing tactics of so-called “extremist” protest by anti-vivisection groups. In reality however, the purpose of NETCU appears to be to ensure that animal rights protests are disrupted by any available means at the police’s disposal.

NETCU’s co-ordination of policing policy towards animal rights protest includes a series of briefings on how to disrupt and intimidate persons taking part in animal rights protest. This appears to include briefings on the use of the following legislation as a means of causing disruption:

\* Guidance on the enforcement of the new laws on “economic damage”. NETCU advises police forces that anti-vivisection protestors are only allowed to hand out leaflets on anti-vivisection protests, and that any other form of protest, for example shouting, use of loudhailers, displaying of banners etc is illegal.

\* Guidance on the use of Section 50 Police Reform Act 2002 (PRA) to obtain protestors’ names and addresses.

\* Guidance on the use of Section 14 Public Order Act 1986 to effectively ban protests against vivisection companies and their customers and suppliers, by the imposition of time limits on the protests of 15 minutes or less and/or by directing that the protest takes place away from the view of the public.

\* Guidance on the use of Section 5 Public Order Act 1986 to prevent the display of placards and leaflets which highlight animal abuse.

\* Guidance on the use of the Highways Act 1986 to prevent public information stalls.

\* Guidance on the use, and enforcement, of High Court injunctions to impose draconian conditions on assemblies and processions. NETCU has provided evidence in court to assist private companies and individuals to obtain injunctions. NETCU then advises the police on how to enforce those injunctions and on the police powers of arrest.

As we will see, NETCU’s briefings are based on an inaccurate understanding of the various laws. Their purpose is clearly to encourage police forces to intimidate protestors by the unlawful use of legislation, in such a way as to deter them from attending future protests.

## New Laws on “Economic Damage”

There are two new laws on “economic damage” of animal research organisations, created by Sections 145 and 146 of the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 (“SOCPA”). Section 145 makes it an aggravated criminal offence to carry out or to threaten to carry out an unlawful act with the intention of harming an animal research organisation, if the unlawful act is intended or likely to interfere with a lawful contract. Section 146 makes it an offence to threaten with an

unlawful act any person connected with an animal research organisation, with the intention of causing that person to abstain from doing something which they are entitled to do or to do something which they are entitled to abstain from doing.

For both Sections 145 and 146, the relevant unlawful act has to be either an existing criminal offence or a civil wrong (a “tort”) which has caused damage or loss. An example of an offence under Section 145 would be where someone damaged the car of a director of a company which supplied equipment to an animal research organisation. This would be a criminal offence (“criminal damage”) if it was carried out with the intention of harming an animal research organisation, and was likely to cause the supplier to sever its contract with that organisation. Another example of an offence under Section 145 would be if someone sent out letters accusing the same director of being a child abuser. Such a letter would probably be defamatory, which is a civil wrong, and would be likely to cause him/her to suffer loss. An offence under Section 146 might be carried out by someone who wrote to the same director threatening to damage his/her property or to publicise the fact that she/he was a child abuser.

There is no doubt that the laws on economic damage create an extraordinarily wide range of offences. However, they are being treated by many police forces as if they have made all forms of protest against customers and suppliers of animal research laboratories illegal. This is clearly incorrect, along with NETCU’s advice that any protest involving the use of noise is contrary to Section 145 SOCPA. It is neither criminal nor against the civil law to shout or use a megaphone during the course of protest. Indeed the right to use such noise has been upheld by the High Court on several occasions recently. Care must of course be taken when using amplified sound, and it ought not to be used as a means on conveying threats or abuse. Subject to those considerations, however, use of amplified sound remains a healthy part of our democratic tradition.

Similarly, it is not an offence under either of the new laws to display pictures of animals in distress or to hand out leaflets depicting the same. NETCU advises that such displays are contrary to Section 5 Public Order Act 1986. This is incorrect – see “Displays of Pictures” below.

## Section 50 Police Reform Act 2002 (PRA)

Under Section 50 PRA the police can demand your name and address if they reasonably suspect that you have engaged in anti-social behaviour, that is behaviour which has caused, or is likely to cause, harassment, alarm or distress to other persons. The police can arrest you if you refuse to give them these details. There is no requirement under Section 50 PRA to give the police your date of birth.

Section 50 PRA is certainly available to the police where protestors have acted in an “anti-social” manner, for example by shouting abuse at workers or members of the public. However, taking part in a protest is clearly not in itself anti-social behaviour. Certain police forces across the country are using Section 50 to demand peoples’ details, even where they have no evidence that they have acted in a way which caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress. For example the West Mercia and Thames Valley police have been using Section 50 to demand names and addresses of people who have simply attended a peaceful protest.

Police Powers to Regulate Assemblies: Use of Section 14 Public Order Act 1986, Section 42 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 and Section 1A Protection from Harassment Act 1997

## Section 14 Public Order Act 1986

Under Section 14 of the Public Order Act 1986, the police have powers to impose conditions as to the time, place and duration of a public assembly involving two persons or more. Until 2003, this power could only be used where the protest involved 20 persons or more

but following intensive lobbying by the pharmaceutical industry and the police this figure was reduced to just two. In order to justify the imposition of conditions, the police need to have reasonable suspicion that the assembly is likely to cause serious disruption to the community, serious criminal damage, serious public disorder or that the purpose of the protest is intimidation with a view to the coercion of others.

Before the Public Order Act 1986 came in to force the Home Office published a white paper entitled “Review of Public Order Law” which set out the rationale for the proposed changes to the law. In relation to the new powers governing assemblies it stated that the new powers to regulate assemblies would be unlikely to be exercised frequently (and this was then in relation to assemblies of 20 persons or more). Regarding the “coercion” condition above, it stated that this could be used where pickets deliberately obstruct the passage of those going to work or where demonstrators used other means forcefully to obstruct the free movement of people or vehicles. The white paper also stated that conditions should not be imposed, which effectively amounted to a ban of the assembly.

In practice the police nowadays are routinely abusing Section 14 on animal rights protests, even where the protest is entirely peaceful. Conditions are being imposed for example on protests consisting solely of a small number people displaying a banner, addressing the public by megaphone and handing out leaflets to passers by. Certain police forces, notably Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire police, are imposing conditions which do effectively amount to a ban. For example, on a recent SHAC demo Hertfordshire police stated that under Section 14 the assembly had to take place on a section of road which was obscured by a hedge, effectively preventing the protestors from communicating with the public. On the same day in Cambridgeshire, officers imposed conditions stating that the protests could only take place for 15 or 30 minutes, which again effectively amounted to a ban. In both situations the police clearly acted unlawfully. Firstly the officers could not reasonably have suspected that the purpose of the protest was to coerce others (ie forcefully to prevent people from going about their lawful business) or that the protest might result in serious disruption etc. Secondly, the conditions imposed prevented the protestors from expressing their views to the public, and thus effectively amounted to a ban on the protest.

Other more obvious examples of the unlawful use of Section 14 are where the police have used it to restrict the use of megaphones and displays of banners. This is unlawful, as Section 14 can only be used to impose conditions on the time and location of an assembly and on the numbers of people who can take part.

## Section 42 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001

Due to the fact that Section 14 restrictions which the police can impose on assemblies are limited, the police sometimes rely instead upon the law preventing demonstrations outside peoples’ houses, under Section 42 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001. This enables the police to impose conditions on protests taking place within the vicinity of a person’s home. Although the legislation was supposedly introduced to prevent intimidatory protest directed at people in their homes, it was drafted much more widely than this. Conditions can be imposed under Section 42 if the police reasonably suspect that the protest is likely to cause harassment to anyone residing within the vicinity of the protest whether or not they are in fact the target of the protest. Also, unlike Section 14 which is restricted to time, place and numbers of protestors, the police can impose any conditions they consider necessary to prevent the resident from being harassed, including a condition that protestors leave the area immediately.

One example of the abuse of Section 42 where the protest is not aimed at intimidation of the resident is in Humberside, where for years protests have been taking place at Bantyn and Kingman (B&K), suppliers of animals to the vivisection industry. The protests take place outside commercial premises, but B&K workers apparently reside about a mile away from the site. The police are using Section 42 to ban all protests at B&K on the grounds that the protests are within the vicinity

of their dwellings and that they are likely to cause the residents harassment, alarm and distress. The primary objection to the police’s use of Section 42 here is that the residents are not within the vicinity of the location of the protest. Although the term “vicinity” is not defined by the Act, the clear intention of the legislation was to give powers to the police to prevent intimidatory protests outside peoples’ houses. The police could not in any event argue that banning such protests is necessary to prevent residents from being harassed, given that they are living so far away.

Another example of abuse of Section 42 is at Sequani, a contract animal testing laboratory based in Ledbury, Worcestershire. As with B&K, the police say that residents nearby are likely to be distressed by the protests. They then impose conditions under Section 42 to prevent the display of “offensive” banners and the use of amplified sound, and to tell protestors where they can and cannot stand. Section 42 can only lawfully be used to prevent residents from being harassed, but the police at Sequani are simply using it as a means to impose conditions on protests which are not available using Section 14 Public Order Act 1986. Again this use of Section 42 is probably unlawful, as it is very unlikely that the conditions imposed on the protests are necessary to prevent the residents from being harassed.

## Protection from Harassment Act 1997

If there are no dwellings within the vicinity to trigger the police’s use of Section 42, the police may turn to the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 as an alternative means of imposing additional restrictions on an assembly.

The Protection from Harassment Act 1997 makes it an offence to pursue a course of conduct (ie conduct on at least 2 occasions) amounting to harassment of another person. When the legislation was first introduced, the offence was only committed if the course of conduct was carried out against the same individual. So if someone harassed two individuals of a company on one occasion each time, this would not amount to an offence under the Act as no single employee had been harassed on more than one occasion. Because of this, the offence was recently extended by the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2006. Under the new law you would now be committing an offence in the example given above, if it could additionally be proved that by harassing those individuals you intended to persuade them (or anyone else) not to do something they were entitled to do.

A common tactic of the police nowadays is to issue “harassment warnings”. These are often used, as with Section 42 above, as a means of imposing conditions on demonstrations which would not be available under Section 14 Public Order Act 1986. For example they may use the Act to impose restrictions on the use of amplified sound or on the display of “offensive” placards or banners. The lawfulness of these warnings will depend very much on the circumstances of the demonstration. However, they should not be used as a means of stopping protestors from expressing their views. Any restrictions preventing the use of amplified sound to address the public or preventing the display of animals being abused are probably unlawful.

## Displays of Pictures

A common complaint about the police is the use of Section 5 Public Order Act 1986 to prevent the public display on posters or leaflets of animals in distress. Section 5 of that Act makes it an offence to display any writing, sign or other visible representation which is threatening, abusive or insulting within the hearing or sight of a person likely to be caused harassment, alarm or distress.

The police often say that a picture of a distressed animal is “offensive” or causing harassment to the public, and that it is therefore an infringement of Section 5. However an essential ingredient of the Section 5 offence is that the display must be either threatening, abusive or insulting. Clearly pictures of animals in distress are not threatening, abusive or insulting and Section 5 does not apply.

The police sometimes perversely maintain that the displays are “insulting”. There is one precedent in the High Court for this in 1994, in which it was held that displays of dead foetuses by anti-abortion campaigners to women arriving at an abortion clinic were capable of being insulting. However the legal landscape has shifted since 1994. The Human Rights Act 1998 has created a presumption in favour of a protestor’s right to freedom of expression, and we live in a media age where people are accustomed to seeing graphic public displays of both human and animal suffering, for example on the front pages of newspapers displayed in public. It is doubtful therefore whether the anti-abortion case could be used as a precedent today.

Despite the fact that Section 5 does not apply to the display of such posters, it continues to be abused by the police. The most blatant example is by the police in Blackpool, where “SPEAK” campaign protestors have been arrested on several occasions over the course of a few months for refusing to remove displays of primates being experimented upon. The police have additionally on each occasion removed the protestors’ stalls and placards and all their evidence gathering equipment. Very few of the arrests have resulted in protestors being charged and where people have been charged, charges have been swiftly dropped by the Crown Prosecution Service.

To our knowledge, no-one has ever been successfully prosecuted for displaying pictures of abused animals either under Section 5 Public Order Act 1986 or under any other legislation. The few cases that have reached the courts have resulted in acquittals either at first instance or on appeal.

## Stalls

Sometimes the police use Section 137 of the Highways Act 1986 to say that an information stall is illegal as it amounts to an unlawful obstruction of the highway. Section 137 makes it an offence to cause a wilful obstruction of the highway without lawful authority or excuse.

If you have a permit for the stall from the Council then this would amount to lawful authority to hold the stall. However, you would not be automatically committing an offence if you did not have a permit. An offence would only be committed if you did not have a “lawful excuse” to hold the stall. The courts have held that the test for whether or not you have a lawful excuse to cause an obstruction will depend on all the circumstances, including for example its duration, the purpose of the obstruction and the extent to which people are actually obstructed from using the highway. Not all obstructions are therefore unlawful. For example, in 2002 the High Court ruled that the obstruction of the highway created by Brian Haw, the anti-war protestor in Parliament Square, was not unreasonable in all the circumstances, including the fact that the obstruction only covered a small percentage of the highway.

Recent examples of abuse of the legislation are in Brighton and Crawley where the Sussex police summonsed some individuals for holding a SHAC stall whilst completely ignoring other non-animal rights stalls nearby, which were obstructing the highway to the same extent. This law is not being regularly abused nationally, but protestors need to be aware of it particularly in the light of the recent admission by the Home Office that one of the government’s aims was to disrupt the funding and communications of animal rights protest groups.

## Injunctions

Since April 2003 there have been 22 cases brought against SHAC and other anti-vivisection groups, the purpose of each case being to obtain injunctions which restrict when, where and how protests in relation to a particular company can take place. Most of the earlier injunction applications were supported by evidence of a senior officer from NETCU, who stated that the injunctions were necessary in order to prevent “anti-social” behaviour by protestors. These statements convinced the court that an injunction was necessary.

However, as more evidence emerged in the various cases serious doubts began to be raised about the manner

in which confidential material was being disclosed by the police to the claimants for the purposes of pursuing the various cases. This was raised in court on a number of occasions and concerns were expressed by High Court judges about the manner in which confidential material held by the police was being passed to the claimants. In the light of these concerns, it appears to be no coincidence that the police are no longer providing evidence in support of the injunctions.

The use of injunctions to regulate protest has been steadily declining recently. In the past 12 months there has only been one new injunction against an anti-vivisection group. One reason for this might be that the injunctions are no longer deemed to be necessary now that the new laws on economic damage are in place. It is more likely however that the injunctions have often proved to be more beneficial to protestors than the police, as the conditions imposed in injunctions tend to be much less draconian than those imposed by the police using their public order powers.

For example the injunction at Huntingdon Life Sciences allows for protest outside the laboratory for up to 6 hours. By contrast, police in Cambridgeshire typically impose conditions, which allow only half an hour (or less) for a protest to take place. There is no escaping the irony that protestors often have greater freedom to protest against companies protected by injunctions than against those who are not.

## WHAT YOU CAN DO

There are a number of means of challenging the various abuses of police power outlined above.

## Contact Us

If you feel that the police have acted unlawfully towards you, then please let us know. We collate evidence across the country from protestors, who have been intimidated by the police. This enables us to focus on which areas are causing protestors the greatest concern and to act accordingly. Also it is important for you to know that you are not alone and that others are being treated in the same way. We can put you in touch with other protestors in your area with whom you can share your experiences. We can also put you in touch with local solicitors if need be, and we can give you legal advice about your specific situation.

## Know the law

Knowing the law can often help. Also carry a legal advice booklet with you, which covers the areas of law you are likely to encounter. The police you are dealing with on protests are not usually familiar with the laws they are trying to enforce. Often they will be relying on orders from above or a briefing from NETCU. When challenged they may back down and even accept that they are acting unlawfully, particularly when faced with someone who knows the law better than they do.

## Complain

The police will not always back down when challenged. Nowadays they are often enforcing a police policy under the guidance of NETCU, and they will simply ignore everything you have to say. Or they may be briefed themselves on the law and take a different view from you on its interpretation. In such cases, the best thing you can do is to take down as much evidence as possible regarding the police’s conduct. Take a note of their badge numbers and descriptions (if they will not give you their name) and make a note of everything, which was said. Ideally use a videocamera and/or a dictaphone. Better still use a hidden camera or recording device, as the police can often be caught out in this way. Contrary to what the police might say, it is not against their human rights or otherwise unlawful to film the police.

Once you have obtained the evidence, you can use this to make a complaint to the police. You should make the complaint to the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). They will then refer the complaint to the chief constable of the relevant police force. The complaint will be dealt with by the Professional Standards Department of that police force. Complaints to

the police are not often upheld, which is why it is very important to have independent evidence and witnesses. Complaints are usually investigated by the police themselves, and the investigators will inevitably side with the police when it is just your word against theirs.

Investigations can be dealt with either informally (by "local resolution") or formally. Most officers in Professional Standards will attempt to deal with the complaint by local resolution, as this is less time consuming and reduces their workload. Complaints dealt with by local resolution involve engaging in dialogue with the police concerned, and asking for an explanation or apology for the way they have behaved. However a common concern with the local resolution procedure is that people often feel that they have been "fobbed off" and that their complaint has not been taken seriously by the police. Additionally, local resolution is not likely to succeed where the police have a resolute policy in place in relation to animal rights protest. This is why it is usually advisable to ask for the complaint to be dealt with formally and not by local resolution. This means that the police have to take down witness statements from you and from anyone else who witnessed the incident, and usually have to interview the relevant police officers as well.

If you wish to have the complaint dealt with formally, you should make this clear in the letter to the IPCC. You can also specify the place where you want to make the statement to the police. This can either be in your home, at a local police station to you or at another place of your choosing. Complaints are not often upheld, and use of the complaints procedure is only advisable when there are both clear grounds for the complaint and when there is independent evidence in support. If both exist, then the police complaint can be a useful mechanism for challenging the police and influencing their future actions.

You can contact the IPCC at:  
Independent Police Complaints Commission  
5th Floor  
90 High Holborn  
London  
WC1V 6BH  
Tel: 08453 002 002  
<http://www.ipcc.gov.uk/>  
Email: [enquiries@ipcc.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@ipcc.gsi.gov.uk)

## Take Legal Action

### Judicial review

Your complaint against the police may be unsuccessful, and even if it succeeds it may not have the desired effect on the police. In such cases, you could consider taking legal action. Sometimes the IPCC says that it will not investigate a complaint, because it relates to police policy. For example, the police may have a policy stating that it is unlawful to use amplified sound on any anti-violence protest. The IPCC will say that where such a policy exists a complaint cannot be pursued against an individual officer. Such a response opens up the possibility of an application in the High Court for "judicial review". The "judicial review" process can be used to ask the High Court to determine whether a decision by a public authority such as the police is unlawful, for example where the police have made an irrational decision or where they have exceeded the powers conferred on them by legislation. So if the police are regularly abusing the use of Section 14 Public Order Act 1986 or Section 42 Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, you can apply to the High Court for a determination of whether the police are acting unlawfully.

Judicial review can be an extremely potent weapon against abuse of power by the police. Recently the police completely altered their policy of policing protests in London simply as a result of a letter written to them by a solicitor stating that they were acting unlawfully, and which threatened judicial review unless their policy was altered. The probable reason for this is that decisions made in judicial review proceedings are legally binding. If the police's lawyers think you have a good case, they are likely to back down rather than risk the judicial review go against them.

If you are considering judicial review, you should contact a solicitor who specialises in these matters. Listed

below are some specialist firms of solicitors. Individuals can apply in person for judicial review, but this is not recommended unless you have a detailed knowledge of the law and of the judicial review process. The costs incurred by a police force in defending a judicial review application can be upwards of £20,000. If you apply for judicial review and lose you could be held liable for those costs, so you should think seriously before taking action. Also bear in mind that the wrong judicial review application could set a precedent in the police's favour. This would play in to the police's hands and give them judicial licence to continue to abuse the law in the future.

Judicial review applications have to be made within 3 months of the police action, which is the subject of the complaint, so if you are considering judicial review you need to act fast. Also bear in mind that you cannot usually claim damages in a judicial review application. You are simply asking a High Court judge to decide whether or not the police have acted lawfully.

### Ordinary Claims against the police

The more traditional legal route for protestors is to make claims against the police for assault, false imprisonment and malicious prosecution. Protestors have made hundreds of thousands of pounds over the years in such claims, and this is likely to continue with the police's current policy of arrest first, ask questions later.

The advantage to making such claims is that you can make money! A typical payout for an unlawful arrest and detention of up to 12 hours is £2000, but the figures can be even higher. However these kinds of claims are unlikely to result in rapid changes to police policy, if at all. Most claims against the police are settled out of court. This means that no legal precedent is set, leaving the police to continue to act unlawfully in the future at a cost of a few thousand pounds in legal fees and settlement of your claim. This is why an application for judicial review is preferable, where at all possible.

## RECOMMENDED CRIMINAL LAWYERS

**BIRDS SOLICITORS**  
Tim Greene  
1 Garratt Lane, Wandsworth  
London, SW18 2PT  
020 8874 7433  
Out of hours arrests: 07966 234994  
Email: [earlshall2003@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:earlshall2003@yahoo.co.uk)

**KIERANCLARKE & CO**  
Kevin Tomlinson  
36 Clarence Road  
Chesterfield  
Derbyshire, S40 1XB  
Tel: 01246 211006  
Fax: 01246 209786  
Email: [kevin.tomlinson@kieranclarke.co.uk](mailto:kevin.tomlinson@kieranclarke.co.uk)

**WALKERS SOLICITORS**  
Tim Walker  
2 Bouverie Road  
Stoke Newington  
London, N16 0AJ  
Tel: 020 8800 8855  
Fax: 020 8800 9955  
<http://www.walkerssolicitors.co.uk>  
Email: [info@walkerssolicitors.co.uk](mailto:info@walkerssolicitors.co.uk)

**KELLYS SOLICITORS**  
Lydia Dagostino & Teresa Blades  
Premier House, 11 Marlborough Place  
Brighton  
BN1 1UB  
Tel: 01273 674 898

**BINDMANS**  
Michael Schwarz  
275 Grays Inn Road  
London  
WC1X 8QB  
Tel: 020 7833 4433  
Fax: 020 7837 9792  
Email: [info@bindmans.co.uk](mailto:info@bindmans.co.uk)

**CHRISTMAS & SHEEHAN**  
78 Grand Parade  
Green Lanes  
London  
N4 1DX  
Tel: 020 8880 2558  
Fax: 020 8880 2599  
<http://www.christmasandsheehan.co.uk>  
Email: [mail@christmasandsheehan.co.uk](mailto:mail@christmasandsheehan.co.uk)

**CHRISTIAN FISHER & CO**  
Louise Christian  
42 Museum Street  
Bloomsbury  
London  
WC1A 1LY  
Tel: 020 7831 1750  
Fax: 020 7831 1726

**HARRISON BUNDEY**  
219-223 Chapeltown Road  
Chapeltown  
Leeds  
LS7 3DX  
Tel: 0113 200 7400  
Fax: 0113 237 4685  
(Cover Leeds & surroundings only)  
<http://www.isonharrison.co.uk/htm/bundey.htm>

## RECOMMENDED CIVIL LAWYERS

**IRWIN MITCHELL SOLICITORS**  
(Specialists in actions  
for false imprisonment)  
St Peter's House,  
Hartshead,  
Sheffield. S1 2EL  
Tel: 0870 1500 100  
<http://www.imonline.co.uk>

**HICKMAN & ROSE SOLICITORS**  
Maples Business Centre  
144 Liverpool Rd, London, N1 1LA  
Tel: 020 7700 2211  
<http://www.hickmanandrose.co.uk/>  
Email: [mail@hickmanandrose.co.uk](mailto:mail@hickmanandrose.co.uk)

**BINDMANS**  
275 Grays Inn Road  
London  
WC1X 8QB  
Tel: 020 7833 4433  
<http://www.bindmans.co.uk>  
Email: [info@bindmans.co.uk](mailto:info@bindmans.co.uk)