

Court of Appeal Upholds Proscription of Palestine Action in Ammori Ruling

The Court of Appeal's ruling in Ammori restores Palestine Action's proscription and redraws the line between lawful protest and national security.

LONDON, UNITED KINGDOM, June 22, 2026 /EINPresswire.com/ -- Case Number : CA-2026-000583

The Court of Appeal has restored the order proscribing Palestine Action under the [Terrorism Act 2000](#), overturning an earlier Divisional Court ruling and reaffirming the breadth of the Home Secretary's powers in matters of national security. [Jo Morris](#), a barrister at Drystone Chambers specialising in criminal and counter-terrorism law, has published analysis of the decision in *Ammori v Secretary of State for the Home Department*.



Jo Morris, Drystone Chambers

“

A fair society tolerates vigorous political dissent, but it is under no obligation to tolerate a risk to national security.”

Jo Morris, Drystone Chambers

The proscription was challenged by Huda Ammori, a co-founder of the group, who argued that it unlawfully interfered with rights of protest and assembly. While the Divisional Court initially ruled in her favour on limited grounds, the Court of Appeal restored the proscription order in full.

“The decision forces into the open a difficult question: when does direct action become terrorism?” said Morris. “Under section 3 of the Terrorism Act 2000, the Secretary

of State may proscribe an organisation believed to be concerned in terrorism. It is a broad power, and intentionally so. The purpose of counter-terrorism law is preventative rather than reactive — the state is not required to wait for catastrophe before acting.”

The proscription followed an incident at RAF Brize Norton in June 2025, in which activists entered the airbase and damaged military aircraft. The Government relied on a wider pattern of

coordinated criminal activity linked to the organisation, including incidents in Glasgow, Kent and Bristol.

According to Morris, the central issue was whether those acts amounted to militant but legitimate protest or crossed the statutory threshold into terrorism. "Civil disobedience has a long and honourable history in the UK," she said. "It is a public, non-violent act contrary to law, done with the aim of exposing injustice, whose practitioners accept arrest and legal consequences as part of the protest. The suffragettes are a case in point."

That, Morris notes, was not how the Court of Appeal characterised Palestine Action. The court accepted the Government's description of the organisation as covert and structured to avoid detection, with an "underground manual" describing operations performed by anonymous cells. "This was not civil disobedience undertaken in the open," said Morris. "It was organised unlawful activity pursued through concealment and coordination."

Morris emphasises that the proscription does not criminalise support for Palestine, criticism of Israel or protest against the defence industry. "It criminalises support for a proscribed organisation. The distinction matters. A fair society tolerates vigorous political dissent, but it is under no obligation to tolerate a risk to national security."

Ammori, she concludes, is not about the legitimacy of protest but about the boundary between political expression and conduct which threatens national security. "The Court of Appeal's answer was unequivocal. Protecting the public is a matter for the elected executive, and the courts will not stand in its way."

About Jo Morris

Jo Morris is a barrister at Drystone Chambers, London, practising in criminal law, military justice and public law, including the law of armed conflict. Her experience spans terrorism, homicide, serious violence and fraud. She is a Grade 4 Prosecutor and sits on the CPS counter-terrorism and serious crime panels.

Media contact: media@jomorrisbarrister.co.uk

Jo Morris

Jo Morris Barrister

+44 7936 658801

[email us here](#)

Visit us on social media:

[LinkedIn](#)

This press release can be viewed online at: <https://www.einpresswire.com/article/921292436>

EIN Presswire's priority is source transparency. We do not allow opaque clients, and our editors try to be careful about weeding out false and misleading content. As a user, if you see something we have missed, please do bring it to our attention. Your help is welcome. EIN Presswire, Everyone's Internet News Presswire™, tries to define some of the boundaries that are reasonable

in today's world. Please see our Editorial Guidelines for more information.

© 1995-2026 Newsmatics Inc. All Right Reserved.