

John Smith MP, Labour Member for the Vale of Glamorgan, South Wales, UK.
House of Commons
Westminster

6th March 2009

Dear Mr Smith, Your Ref k/2002

ABUSE of PROCESS

South Wales Police, Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons & Welsh Assembly

Summary

1. The Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons convened a court to have my name removed from the veterinary register for life relying on the evidence of a Miss Felicity Norton, Miss Wall, Inspector L A Collins of the South Wales Police and a dubiously acquired list of erroneous criminal convictions obtained, it appears, by Members of Parliament and the Welsh Assembly and College external lawyers visiting Cardiff police station.
2. Complaint made no mention of 'animal welfare', 'deceit', 'use or misuse of drugs' or 'interfering with one's patients', being the usual list for professional people to deliberate upon when considering a colleague's demise.
3. Their Lordships at the Privy Council Appeal went so far as to complimenting me on my only commitment under the 1966 Veterinary Surgeon's Act, that of animal welfare.
4. Information before the Preliminary Investigation Committee, prior to and Disciplinary Committee and 2002 trial, was only obtained by my application of the 1998 Data Protection Act after I was struck off the veterinary register.
5. The RCVS continue to refuse just what was before them in 2002 and disclosure of the South Wales police complaint enquiry, the College even write, was not relevant.
6. I was refused any witnesses referred to in the College's protracted and expensive enquiry, identified below, being only allowed restricted cross examination facilities of cherry picked South Wales Police officers and others summoned by the College.
7. I was refused the right to serve witness summons on any one, for my defence, including the RCVS case workers who had originally gathered, I now know, favourable contemporaneous notes of evidence, even from a Welsh assembly Member, before handing it over to Jane Hearn, Registrar and barrister for the College and Gordon Hockey, Deputy Registrar and barrister, two of the main players in their game of deceit.
8. Partially disclosed material, below, clearly indicates paranoid communications between Members of Parliament and the Welsh Assembly to obtain confidential police records about me.
9. Potential RCVS witnesses, many my own clients, were first interviewed but then served false witness statements to sign, drafted by G Hudson of Penningtons, Solicitors, of Gutter Street, London. At least one witness refused and others were soon 'air brushed out', Austin Psychiatric Hospital Court style, once their credibility came into doubt, as if they never existed.
10. THE RCVS continue to refuse to disclose, contrary to the Act, any contemporaneous notes that were taken by any of RCVS case workers relating to the evidence heard in the 2002 court.

11. Only five years later did the RCVS barrister, Ms Fenella Morris, let it slip that their original enquiry was '*privileged*', '*absolute*' or '*qualified*, *still remains a complete mystery*.
12. *The protection* by the 1967 RCVS Royal Charter, bestowing HM immunity on College personnel and agents, such as Penningtons, to any criminal or civil prosecution, is quite wrong.
13. I watched a High Court deliberate this very point of law with an RCVS barrister. The transcript will be on website shortly for web site readers from around the world to decide.
14. HM Information Commissioner, for the very same reason, therefore, refuses to disclose any RCVS documentation, at all or of his clearly perfunctory enquiry. The 'Royal' College had told their Lordships of the Judicial Committee HM Privy Council, at least ten times in five differently convened courts, that there had been 'full relevant disclosure' and then served on me a fraudulently concocted bill of costs, exceeding £66,000.
15. HM Privy Council have the power, with or without the 1966 Statute, to intervene tomorrow, if they feel so minded but the Chief Clerk, Mr Galloway, refuses even to receive my 'Humble Petition' containing this new evidence of criminal conduct of those also under the protection of 'The Memorandum of Understanding between Chiefs of Police and the Law Society'.

Felicity Norton

History

She could find no Cardiff veterinary practice open on a Sunday for an emergency. I was therefore presented with a distraught stranger and a dying cat needing immediate hospitalisation and 24 hour critical care with no access to medical history.

Following the demise of the cat Ms Norton, anxious to promote a TV documentary on '24 hour cover in the veterinary profession', caused well over two hundred letters to be written, at least, that I now know about, to anyone conceivably remote enough to assist in my name being removed from the veterinary register even phoning politicians and council members for the college on their home numbers!

Even after I had been referred to the Disciplinary Committee, on her false information before the Preliminary Investigation Committee, even more statements were drafted for her, should the first not stand the test of proof!

Should the first disciplinary committee hearing fail, this lady, I am told now, while pursuing all but the Arch Bishop of Canterbury on the matter, was ready to give evidence on yet another re interview in a Cardiff hotel.

She as with the College case workers, holding my 'character witness evidence' for re instatement, refuse to voluntarily appear on my behalf in my seventh application court hearing to be re instated as a practicing veterinary surgeon.

The RCVS continues to refuse my applications, contrary to their own drafted 2004 statute, drawn up by the very same members of Royal College Council who had earlier communicated with Ms Norton, police and other alleged complainants back in 2001, like Ms Wall, their documentation, incidentally, having been carefully withheld from the 2002 Disciplinary Committee hearing and now despite my Data Protection Act Application.

Just how incestuous, Mr Smith, does this case have to become for you to act on my behalf?

The RCVS can never allow an oral hearing, yet alone 'character witnesses' for fear of the consequences now that it is known so many politicians were active in the enquiry. No wonder I was refused and witnesses or access to the RCVS investigation.

Extract from RCVS records partially disclosed under the 1998 Act.

1. 6th July MJK explaining and asking **Jon Owen Jones MP, Labour Member for Central Cardiff**, for help on '24 hour service difficulties within the profession', in the light of 'learned helplessness' rife in our society, having been first introduced in 1946 by HM government of the day. MJK received no reply.
2. 10th July 2000 Ms Norton's Complaint Form to RCVS
3. 21st July RCVS internal memo reveals Ms Norton's true agenda.
4. 3rd August 2000 **Jon Owen Jones MP** to RCVS letter pressing the College to prosecute me, enclosing thirty five press cuttings!

Mr Jones was one of the almost permanent RCVS lay jury members, contrary to the 1998 Human Rights Act, available to sit on my disciplinary committee hearing due that very September.

5. 24th Aug 2000 **Ms Jenny Randerson, Lib Dem AM**, letter pressing the RCVS to 'explore' the thirty odd enclosed newspaper cuttings provided by Ms Norton, in order to prosecute me.
6. 4th Sept 2000 RCVS letter asking **Ms Jenny Randerson, Lib Dem AM**, 'for any information she can uncover' relating to my alleged convictions.
7. 4th October 2000 **Jenny Randerson Lib Dem AM to RCVS** enclosing newspaper cutting.
8. 12th September 2000 MJK's detailed explanation, point by point, to RCVS enclosing staff witness statements of Ms Norton's abusive language, verbatim, each time she entered my premises with clear indication she would complain should she have to pay. Not an uncommon experience for a veterinary surgeon when dealing with a stranger on a one off basis, unable to refuse veterinary assistance for fear of being struck off.

I have now found time in Brittany to read my own staff and VN two page statement, for the first time and I must say I can feel some sympathy for others who may have had to deal with the lady, RCVS lawyers apart.

9. 19th Sept 2000 **Jon Owen Jones MP** to RCVS enclosing newspaper cutting and a 'new' statement by Ms Norton.
10. 2nd Nov 2000 **Ms Jenny Randerson Lib Dem AM** letter again to RCVS complaining of delay in litigation and that I am still practicing.
11. 13th Dec 2000 **Crown Prosecution Service** letter refusing Ms Norton my criminal record and suggesting she writes to RCVS to ask the South Wales Police to disclose, knowing full well it was all contrary to 45/1989 Home Office Regulations.
12. 20th Nov 2000 RCVS receive a video from Ms Norton. MJK never seen it or notified.
13. Nov 2000 RCVS internal memo by Vice Chairman stating "**this case can only go to Disciplinary Committee**"
14. HM CPS letter even suggested to the **Welsh Assembly Member** that the RCVS should ask the police!
15. 20th December 2000 **Welsh Assembly Member** letter to the RCVS confirming there was to be a Disciplinary Committee hearing in January 2001, relating to Ms Norton and expected the RCVS to obtain confidential police records from her constituent's police station. Which they promptly did.
16. 1st Dec 2000 RCVS letter to MJK referring to Ms Norton's complaint omitting to furnish information gathered or that Ms Norton had caused around four other complainants, yet to be identified, to press for my name to be removed from the veterinary register

17. 1st Dec 2000 RCVS letter to Ms Norton arranging for Geoffrey Hudson of Penningtons to interview Ms Norton in the morning and partner, Roy Irvin in the afternoon and he would be bringing them their expenses.
18. 15th Dec 2000 RCVS Ms Penny Butler, case worker, refers to web site content for PIC.
19. 18th Dec 2000 RCVS Head of Professional Conduct Department, Gordon Hockey, asking **Jenny Randerson AM** to obtain MJK criminal convictions from the police.

"If you could use your office to persuade the relevant authorities to release these details to the College it would seem to me that there is an overriding public interest that would make this possible".

20. 13th Dec 2000 Crown Prosecution Service letter refusing Ms Norton my criminal record and suggesting she writes to RCVS to ask the South Wales Police to disclose, knowing full well it was all contrary to 45/1989 Home Office Regulations.
21. 8th Feb 2001 RCVS lawyer letter to Ms Norton stating MJK will only be supplied by the Geoffrey Hudson drafted statement for Ms Norton to sign, despite contemporaneous notes taken over one working day in a Cardiff hotel, never yet revealed and contrary to law. Gordon Hockey quote:

"Complaints to the College are not normally discussed with third parties and the average number of complaints against a vet surgeon is about 1 in every 10 years".

22. 23rd Feb 2001 **David McClean MP, Lib Dem**, letter referring to **Welsh Assembly Member's** pressure, based on obtuse, unverified information from an apparent lunatic, all three now pressing the RCVS to prosecute me on the information of Ms Norton's personal phone call to his private House of Commons number!

Mr McClean just happened to be the other Member of Parliament lay member of the RCVS jury due to sit in a few weeks.

David McClean MP's warning to the RCVS was that the case, "**needed to be 'cast iron' or he would immediately seek a Judicial Review**", "**I decided to look at his website and I must admit it is Bizarre**".

[Just how many more lorry loads of 'devil worshipping freemasons' do you want me to mention in my complaint to your Government, Mr Smith, before there is violent insurrection?]

23. 27th February 2001 RCVS Registrar letter to **Mr McClean MP** telling 'David' she is keeping everybody informed of 'developments'.

"I am happy to notify you if, as a consequence of his convictions, there is a disciplinary hearing"

24. 15th March 2001 **Charity Commission for England and Wales** to **Jenny Randerson AM** her concern "a veterinary surgeon has donated £10,000 in order to assist in the creation of a new animal charity in Wales"
25. Whose money was it, anyway, that worried a **Welsh Assembly Member** so much as to write to a government department without first asking me?
26. 2nd April 2001 RCVS letter to Ms Norton for Nicola Tucker, case worker, to re interview Ms Norton at Moat House Hotel Cardiff on 5th April 200 there being a refusal by Ms Norton and Mr Irvin signing the GH drafted statements (as with Magistrate Williams and sister, witnesses on the Barry beach, false Penningtons' statements?).
27. 5th April 2001 RCVS letter to Ms Norton assuring her that a named veterinary surgeon in her area was also pressing for a College prosecution and that Mrs Tucker and G Hudson would have to be stay an extra day in the area to pursue her other complaints.

Gordon Hockey assures Ms Norton that should she not pursue her complaint by not signing the RCVS version of her evidence it may not be "practical" to prosecute later if College only proceed with convictions.

28. 11th April 2001 RCVS Tucker letter to Ms Norton confirmed 2nd interview took place in Cardiff and that the College "utilised" her list of contacts to pursue complaint in the Cardiff Area.
29. Ms Tucker also confirmed Ms Norton's worry that if she signed the typed RCVS witness statement it may allow MJK to be able to examine the **'contemporaneous note of enquiry'**.
30. Miss Tucker confirmed her return to Cardiff to see her yet again and interview other witnesses after Easter
31. 27th April 2001 RCVS Hockey letter to MJK cited 4 complaints: Ms Norton, Ms Wall, Chief Inspector LA Collins, South Wales Police and alleged police convictions'.

Hockey stated, **"I do not consider your requirements for disclosure of police material a matter for the college"**, **"and your response will be copied to the complainant"** which, the RCVS assures me has always been the case for me.

32. 30th April 2001 RCVS Ms Tucker letter to Ms Norton stated that the College was not to proceed with her complaint. So did she sign the first drafted statement or not and if not, why not? Why tell her when her case, on the 20th June, went right back before the same PI Committee, NOT DROPPING IT, but, instead, referring her case to the full court? Why tell her something different? Ms Tucker told Ms Norton, in the letter, the College could not prove MJK was in the vet hospital when the cat died, Ms Norton saying MJK was in court at the time! (MJK, again, was not notified of any of this utter nonsense)
33. 19th May 2001 RCVS e-mail memo indicates Ms Norton had telephoned Austin...**"she blames us for putting her in a position so she cannot sign her statement-if we had acted promptly Kirk would not be as threatening"**.
34. 21st May 2001 RCVS Ms Tucker 4 page letter to Ms Norton admitted that the RCVS had supplied Ms Norton with MJK's criminal record and circumstances surrounding each conviction and details of other confidential, some false, information about other complainants and the RCVS gathered material by numerous visits to the Cardiff area, including written communication with surrounding veterinary surgeons writing to the College. None of this was made known to MJK.
35. 23rd May 2001 RCVS Hockey letter to MJK referred to complaint by Ms Herbert (Ferret ITV footage, it is guessed) and Dogs for the Disabled, a charity with more money than sense. Despite the court hearing from the defendant's barrister, I had been given permission to put a dog to sleep, they still had refused to pay the modest veterinary fees following protracted orthopaedic surgery on a poor dog that should never have been subjected to their work in the first place.
36. 6th June **Alison Halford, Welsh Assembly Member** letter has been disclosed, far too late, under the Act, as being copied to **Jenny Randerson AM** an ideal character witness for the trial and speaker on the Home Office Regulations relating to confidential police records.
37. 18th June 2001 RCVS letter being evidence that Ms Norton wrote to members of the PI Committee asking and getting further information MJK still knows nothing about.
38. 20th June 2001 RCVS Preliminary Investigation Committee Memo, only obtained under the 1966 Data Protection Act, voted a majority vote for MJK to be prosecuted on evidence furnished by Ms Norton, her partner, Mr Roy Irwins (employed by the media), Ms Walls evidence (dog over a cliff) and that ever could be obtained from of the South Wales Police.

One committee member, present, caused to be recorded:

"asked the committee to consider the problems there would be if disciplinary were taken, because the case would be both expensive and protracted".

Susan Pyper, the lay observer present, comments were also fortunately recorded but she refuses to reply to my letters in the light of new evidence previously withheld from her.

39. 29th June 2001 MJK to RCVS letter, following being notified of court action, I state:

"Further to your previous correspondence I require, for my defence, full details of your enquiries on all matters of alleged complaints and otherwise, especially those that are not before the college enquiry in September. I ask because I have become aware that members of the public, including my clients, have been approached by lawyers of the college, what could only be information to support the college's allegations against me. I therefore require private investigators records and copies of any statements relating to me that followed from this investigation".

Maurice J Kirk BVSc MRCVS

Remember, Mr Smith, I was refused all witnesses, refused the right to issue any witness summonses or see any contemporaneous record of the RCVS enquiry at the 2002 trial. Even Gary Flather QC ordered the College to accept my list of disclosure requirements, in November 2006, in yet another farcical but equally illegal hearing, to be re instated, witnessed and clearly understood by Mr Patrick Cullinane Esq.

I wish you to meet Mr Cullinane and other well informed witnesses of this conspiracy between the police and a bunch of reject attorneys.

What is my 29th June 2001 letter asking for routine disclosure if it is not 'The little list' to which the Learned Legal Assessor for the College had demanded that day [if nothing but to keep Mr Kirk's sanity]?

Barrister Fenella Morris denied knowledge of it, again before court, before Mr Justice Lloyd Jones, now on appeal to the Court of Appeal. Another futile exercise.

Gordon Hockey replied to my request refusing to disclose anything. He was waiting for Ms Norton's third or fourth version statement to be drafted as a back- up charge should the convictions case fail.

New information that year caused the College to withdraw Ms Norton from the hearing all together there being no procedure to return the matters to PI now much material had been found to be incorrect.

40. 13th and 30th July 2001 RCVS letters to Ms Norton indicated further statements were sent to the College by her with appreciation given for her new 'material' none ever disclosed to me.

41. 2nd August 2001 RCVS internal memo reveals Ms Tucker obtaining information from Ms Norton that a new a statement drafted by GH for the September trial had not yet been received for her promised signature.

42. 6th Sept 2001 RCVS letter to Ms Norton stated the Preliminary Investigation Committee had decided to refer her complaint to the Disciplinary Committee. But they had informed me on the 21st June and her third or fourth statement, none of which were ever released to me, I now find was dated 25th August 2001

Ms Wall

There appears to be little or no disclosure as to how the ownership changed at least 3 times during the night once this 'Sunday emergency, dog over the cliff' was likely to die, the '3 owners' having not

been unable to contact their own veterinary surgeon. The ITV Ferret film clarifies the position well, had it not been so mischievously edited.

The above sequence of disclosed letters of some of the 'RCVS enquiry' came to an abrupt halt following suggestions by **Members of Her Majesty's Parliament and the Welsh Assembly** that they could override Home Office regulations to obtain confidential police records when chasing a constituent's misconceived believe I was expected to work a miracle on her dying cat.

Enquiry causes me to believe **David McLean MP** and **John Owen Jones MP** just happened to be 'cherry picked as lay committee members of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons as was **Sir John Wood QC** was as RCVS Legal Assessor when, clearly, quite 'unfit for purpose'. Politicians input into my case is worrying and far exceeds what I have so far been prepared to understand or manage to disclose.

Convictions list

On the 18th April 2001, it is now disclosed, the Preliminary Investigation Committee were 'minded' to send these convictions, acquired since 1993, before the RCVS Disciplinary Committee to have me removed from the veterinary register.

On 20th June 2001 when I was referred to the court for the criminal conviction sheet, acquired from I know not where, had no less than 35 convictions written on it.

Examination confirmed **16 convictions were incorrect, nonexistent or won on appeal**, while the remainder reflected on the statistics specific for the 35 times I had been made to produce my driving documents by South Wales Police, often when about my business.

Since my arriving in Wales, in 1992, to practice I, instead experienced consolidated police harassment, over a period of 10 years, being subjected to around 130 charges brought by the police, 121 of which were later dropped, withdrawn, part heard or won on appeal with little or no compensation.

The 30 odd Judicial Review Applications that followed, including the most trivial of motoring convictions, were all, without exception, trivialised by their Lordships unaware of the 'end game' being played out by the deceitful lawyers employed by the RCVS.

I knew, from past experience, these remaining convictions would be used by the RCVS to prevent my practicing veterinary surgery due to Masonic pressure, even if it meant politicians.

So just where did these lawyers obtain such a distorted and clearly falsified criminal record to go before the June 2001 Preliminary Investigation Committee in order to have me struck off?

It stinks, doesn't it Mr Smith?

What can you do about it when **HM Partnership** already has your hands tied by your oath of allegiance to it, instead of it being to your constituents in the Vale of Glamorgan?

Yours sincerely,

Maurice J Kirk BVSc

Copy to the Conservative Party