

B5 – Family Law Act 1996 Order

Case ref: ED24F00300

Date: 05.02.2025

IN THE FAMILY COURT AT EDMONTON

IN THE MATTER OF
THE FAMILY LAW ACT 1996

BETWEEN:

Miss Irene Sara Spalletti

Applicant

– and –

Mr Alexander Michael Luke Wolf Walker

Respondent

B5 – Family Law Act 1996 Order

Dated: 05.02.2025



Order
Family Law Act 1996

Irene Sara Spalletti

Applicant

Ref

Alexander Michael Luke Wolf Walker, date of birth 24th February 1988

Ref BJ.SMW.WAL023.1

Before Deputy District Judge Barrett sitting at the Family Court at Edmonton, 59 Fore Street, London, N18 2TN

The parties: The applicant is Irene Sara Spalletti, a litigant in person

The respondent is Alexander Michael Luke Wolf Walker, represented by Charles Richardson of counsel

Recitals

1. This hearing was listed to consider:

a. The applicant's application in Form FL403, dated 31 December 2024, to vary the non-molestation order dated 26 November 2024, which was made by consent on the basis that the respondent did not accept the allegations made by the applicant and that the court did not make any findings of fact ("the variation application");

b. The applicant's application in Form FP2, dated 7 January 2025, seeking financial reimbursement from the respondent (the "first financial reimbursement application").

2. The court also considered a further application made by the applicant in Form FP2, dated 4 February 2025, seeking further financial reimbursement from the respondent in respect of legal costs the applicant was said to have incurred (the "second financial reimbursement application"). A hard copy of the application form was provided to the court and to the respondent during the hearing and was deemed to have been made.

3. The court made an order that the applicant shall pay towards the respondent's costs, having considered all the circumstances of the case and reflecting that all three applications were dismissed. The court determined that it was not reasonable for the applicant to contest the issues that she raised.

4. For the avoidance of doubt, the order of District Judge Davies dated 26 November 2024, which includes a zonal non-molestation order in respect of 92 Ollerton Road, Enfield, N11 2LA, remains in force.

5. Pursuant to the respondent's current bail conditions, the respondent is only permitted to communicate with the applicant through his solicitors, who may only communicate with either an agreed third party or solicitors instructed by the applicant. The respondent, through his counsel, attempted to agree a method of communication with the applicant, to enable the respondent's solicitors to be able to communicate with the applicant, in compliance with the current bail conditions. The applicant stated that she would not agree to or put forward any third party for the purpose of communication with the respondent's solicitors.

IT IS ORDERED:

6. The variation application is hereby dismissed.

7. The first financial reimbursement application is hereby dismissed.

8. The second financial reimbursement application is hereby dismissed.

9. Permission is given to the parties to disclose a copy of this order, to the Metropolitan Police, and to the court within any proceedings between the parties under the Trusts of Land and Appointment of Trustees Act 1996.

Costs

10. The applicant shall pay towards the respondent's costs of and relating to these applications, summarily assessed at £1,625 (inclusive of VAT and disbursements), which shall not be enforced until the sale of the parties' property, 92 Ollerton Road, Enfield, N11 2LA, or otherwise by agreement between the parties.

Ordered by _____
Deputy District Judge Barrett

on _____
5th February 2025