



HEDDLU
GOGLEDD CYMRU
NORTH WALES
POLICE

Response Date:04/09/2025

2025/897 - breaches of Restraining Orders and Non-Molestation Orders

In response to your recent request for information regarding;

Please may I request a list of which actions (made by/on behalf of Restrained Parties) constitute breaches of Restraining Orders and Non-Molestation Orders. And, please may I also request information in relation to which actions fall under direct and indirect breaches respectively.

I query this, as I have recently learned that actions which both Police Forces and Legal Professionals have - initially - believed to be (indirect) breaches of Restraining Orders, have later been identified as non-breaches (not a breach of the Order). One such example includes:

At present, a Restrained Party/Perpetrator will NOT be in breach of a Restraining Order if he chooses to view a Protected Party's LinkedIn Profile. This is despite the fact that viewing leaves a notification for the protected party that the Restrained Party/The Perpetrator/The Abuser/Offender has viewed their profile (terrifying the protected party, making them fear for safety). By viewing the Profile: The Perpetrator will NOT have breached the Restraining Order - It matters not that the victim has changed their name, and has created a brand new account: In such a case, the viewing of a profile in this way is NOT a breach. This is also despite the fact that Restraining Orders are often written to cover indirect contact and social media in the following way:

"Not to Contact Jane DOE either directly or indirectly in anyway including, by telephone, text, or social media platforms."

At present, the reporting of such to a Police Force will ensure a Domestic Violence Incident is recorded, alongside a screenshot taken, but it will NOT be deemed a breach. Another way in which such conduct may occur, but isn't necessarily clear whether or not it constitutes a breach includes: A Restrained Party views (but doesn't interact with) a Protected Party's Instagram Story - This shows the Protected Party that their story has been viewed by the Restrained Party, and puts them in fear for their safety. The Protected Party is left feeling harassed and unsafe.

For transparency, should you need it, I am a party protected by a Restraining Order, and my Abuser recently viewed my profile in the way mentioned above (LinkedIn example). I mention here it is NOT advice I am seeking here, and neither is this a complaint of any kind (in fact, Met Police were incredibly sensitive and kind when recording the incident). Rather, it is a list of actions which amount to (direct and indirect) breaches of Restraining Orders/Non-Molestation Orders I am

Pencadlys yr Heddlu,
Glan-y-Don, Bae Colwyn LL29 8AW
www.heddlugogleddcymru.police.uk

Police Headquarters,
Glan-y-Don, Colwyn Bay LL29 8AW
www.northwales.police.uk

requesting. I also support victims of Domestic and Sexual Violence, some of whom are protected by Restraining Orders and Non-Molestation Orders: Having an idea of exactly which actions constitute breaches will assist with how I may manage expectations of those protected by Restraining Orders/Non-Molestation Orders.

I thank you for your time. I look forward to hearing from you.

North Wales Police do not hold any specific information in relation to your request.

We do not hold definitive lists of what would constitute either a direct or indirect breach of non-molestation order. Each case would be assessed on its circumstances. In a domestic abuse setting the DASH risk assessment would be applied and there would be a secondary review by a specialist DA Supervisor to identify the nature of the offences, ensure the appropriate resource and lines of enquiry are conducted (including whether any direct or indirect action by the subject would constitute a breach of order.)

We also work closely with independent domestic violence advocates who do report breaches of non-molestation orders to us and are skilled in explaining the effect a breach has had on the victim.

THIS INFORMATION HAS BEEN PROVIDED IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST
UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000, AND IS CORRECT AS AT 28/08/2025