

stated that the recent threats from the Defendant has made it difficult for them to live in their own home and that they are constantly having to double lock their front door for fear that the Defendant may break into their flat again.

#### **ORDER SOUGHT FROM THE COURT**

- **Request that the Claim and interim injunction order of 09th August 2017 be reinstated**

12. The Claimant has in its application notice dated 03<sup>rd</sup> January 2018 provided evidence that it filed its questionnaire on time. As such the Claim should have never been struck out and the Court is asked respectfully, to reinstate the Claim and the injunction order.

13. The Claimant's legal department contacted the police on 05<sup>th</sup> January 2018 and enquired as to the reasons why no arrests were made to the Defendant on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2017 while a civil injunction was in place. The police officer looked at the file notes and explained that at the time the incident was reported by Mr Mathiyalagan, they were not aware of the injunction although it was served to a different department. The Defendant also denied the incident and Mr Mathiyalagan could not prove that the incident took place. The police have now referred this incident to an investigating officer and created a crime reference number 5200 37618.

14. The Claimant also advised the police of the incidents dated 02<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2018 but the police confirmed that they could not take actions as at the time of the incidents the civil injunction was discharged by the Court. The police advised that had the injunction been in place, the Defendant

16