

House of Commons  
London

17<sup>th</sup> March 2009

Dear Mr Smith,

I enclose my latest statement of complaint to an indolent Welsh organisation, riddled with deceit and intrigue.

We are demonstrating at Bucking Palace on Sunday and again in early April around London.

Demonstrations are being mobilised across the country, as I write, on the current state of UK Law and Order.

I wish to know what progress there is, as soon as possible, on the points raised in my 6<sup>th</sup> March letter.

Thank you.

**Maurice J Kirk BVSc**

## **Police Complaint against Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons**

**My complaint is supported by documentary evidence referred to in my communications with my Member of Parliament, Mr John Smith MP, to indicate a conspiracy to pervert the course of justice, perjury and breaches of the Fraud Act committed by lawyers and members of Royal College Council.**

- 1. In January 2002 I was prosecuted before the College Disciplinary Committee upon the decisions of the Preliminary Investigation Committee.
- 2. On the 29<sup>th</sup> May 2002 my name was removed from the veterinary register, subject to my appealing to the HM Privy Council within twenty eight days, my having been refused witnesses of fact or disclosure of the contemporaneous material gathered by the prosecution.
- 3. On the 19<sup>th</sup> January 2004 Their Lordships upheld both the 'findings' and ambiguous RCVS 'judgment' having been '**assured**' by the College, in five different hearings, that there had been full disclosure of the relevant material gathered by their team of investigators across South Wales, England and Scotland.

- 4. No RCVS contemporaneous notes of evidence have ever been disclosed to me, relating to either **Charge A, my criminal convictions** or **Charge B, that I had brought the profession into disrepute**. The RCVS repeatedly lied before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Royal Courts of Justice Administrative court and Court of Appeal reliant, each time, on immunity to prosecution by the 1967 RCVS Royal Charter which states UK HM judges **must** favour the Royal College or agents thereof when cited as a litigant in either civil or criminal proceedings.
  
- 5. The RCVS went on to repeatedly inform other courts, while still on oath, that there had been full disclosure and that the original material before the 2001 Preliminary Investigating Committee, to obtain a court hearing, had all been disclosed to me when it had not. Discovery now, under the 1966 Data Protection Act, of UK politicians' communications directly with the College lawyers and members of council confirms this was also a deliberate lie.
  
- 6. It was not until November 2006, at an application hearing for my re instatement, did the College finally admit that their years of mounting contemporaneous notes of evidence were all protected by '**legal professional privilege**' and therefore need not be disclosed. Again the College was lying as a witness is anybody's property and withholding relevant evidence was both fraudulent and contrary to the laws of discovery.
  
- 7. Despite court directions to make the RCVS acknowledge my list of documents requested, (I assume based on CPR standard procedure for discovery of evidence), the College has continued to refuse even to disclose whether the interviews by their lay staff with Ms Felicity Norton and numerous other clients of mine, as potential prosecution witnesses, was evidence being withheld as '**qualified**' or '**absolute**' privilege?
  
- 8. Before the 2002 trial commenced I had asked the College, in writing, for disclosure of the evidence gathered in enquiry in the Vale of Glamorgan but I was refused every time.
  
- 9. **Now I know why**. The political threats and interference of 'due process' by Members of Parliament and Welsh Assembly, one actually on the RCVS Committee, another recently resigned, all based on erroneous information, known to be deliberate, was left to lawyers, accountable to know one, to hide the paranoia so clearly displayed in the withheld documents of evidence now disclosed.
  
- 10. During the 2002 trial I was repeatedly refused evidence with the Chairman, a Mr Brian Jennings, finally saying I could not because a Sir John Wood QC, the Legal Assessor to the Committee and me, had 'said so!' It was plainly obvious, to all, the gentleman in question was both mentally incompetent and his judicial role had been set down by Statute as one of giving advice only.

- 11. Members of the almost permanent RCVS jury, I now know, knew that their judicial procedure had already been accepted by the College as being contrary to the 1998 Human Rights Act.
  
- 12. The RCVS Registrar mysteriously arranged for a van load of South Wales policemen, the original complainants to the College and previously interviewed as prosecution witnesses, to attend court for my **defence**, contrary to the Court of Appeal Court Order ruling, handed down only just a few days before.
  
- 13. The RCVS continue to refuse to disclose the official court transcript, apparently not a public document anymore, protected by Crown copyright, required to support this criminal complaint.
  
- 14. I have established new evidence, since my last court application. In order for an RCVS trial, under the 1966 Veterinary Surgeons Act, the gathered information had to first go before the President or Vice President of the College and then, if need be, onto the Preliminary Investigation Committee. Only the PI Committee can cause a College court to be convened.
  
- 15. This was achieved by College lawyers in 2001 who, deliberately withholding favourable evidence, tendered, instead, the false evidence on the PI Committee which was an indictable offence, as all this complaint is, not being time barred by Statute.
  
- 16. A 20<sup>th</sup> June 2001 RCVS College internal memo identifies the main issues before the PI Committee that day that were never revealed either to me or Legal Assessor in open court.
  
- 17. Issues included a long list containing my purported police criminal record, dominated with motoring and public order offences, gathered from just where is still to be established. This list matured, it appears, following the refusal by the HM Crown Prosecution Service, in Cardiff, to a direct request from politicians, despite Home Office Regulations 1987/45.
  
- 18. Sixteen of those convictions on the list, before the PI Committee, were deliberately false.
  
- 19. The Deputy Registrar of the College, Mr Gordon Hockey, even wrote to politicians asking them to use their 'influence' to obtain the confidential police files from the South Wales Police when external RCVS lawyers, Penningtons of Gutter Street, London, next visited Cardiff police station.

- 20. My letter of 4<sup>th</sup> October 2008 to Barry Police station refers and particularly asks what progress has been made in any of the forty one police identified incidents (occurrence numbers) relating to the RCVS's unlawful failed disclosure.
- 21. I have, to date, received no response from the police concerning my requests in that letter which is placing me in some difficulties in disclosing all the facts for this complaint.
- 22. Convictions before the PI Committee were either withdrawn **before** a magistrates hearing took place, **overturned** at Magistrates or Crown Court, **withdrawn part heard** or having **never existed** in the first place!
- 23. Approximately **one hundred and twenty one charges fell into these categories**, during the ten years of interest the South Wales Police had in my welfare, while I attempted to run my veterinary hospital in Barry in The Vale of Glamorgan.
- 24. Police examination of court record, Data Protection Act disclosure on the HM Attorney General and content of letters to John Smith MP, will confirm I now have proof these politicians are still frantically writing letters, as they did in 2001/2002, now attempting to change the law, literally overnight, in order to prevent my applying 'to practice veterinary surgery', every ten months. A minimum of five years is their target, just to prevent disclosure of their conduct. My family's profession has been ridiculed by this ongoing 'web of deceit' being spun by those, in positions of privilege, dependent, as always, upon their daily abuse of '**Her Majesty's Royal Prerogative**'.
- 25. Politicians implicated by documentary evidence, now found, include Jon Owen Jones MP, Central Cardiff, David McClean MP, somewhere in Scotland, Martyn Jones MP, Flintshire and Ms Jenny Randerson AM of the Welsh Assembly. They even tried, at one point, to drag in Alison Halford AM as a witness, a client, my never ever knowing about it.
- 26. Erroneous undisclosed evidence from A Ms Felicity Norton, before the PI Committee included allegations of a breach in '**professional privilege**'. Hearsay evidence suggests she was in the process of gathering information about the veterinary profession for a TV documentary program, at the time my services were needed, the lady being unable to obtain veterinary help from elsewhere at the time.
- 27. A Ms Wall, in similar circumstances, concerning 'her' injured dog having fallen over the cliff at Llantwit Major, had also made an erroneous complaint but, again, this undisclosed evidence, was only put before the PI Committee to influence their final solution.

- 28. Recent discovery of documents, referred now to my Member of Parliament, reveals that the Royal College falsified witness statements, some of which were served on me, as true copies of the originals, while other statements were unlawfully drawn up but refused by the relevant potential witnesses. All these witnesses were withheld completely from the trial, College Council members present knowing, full well, it had been unlawful to deny me the witnesses.
- 29. On the 20<sup>th</sup> June 2001 the Preliminary Investigation Committee, by majority vote, put my name forward to be prosecuted before Disciplinary Committee court reliant on false information.
- 30. The Clerk to HM Privy Council, a Mr Galloway, refuses, in writing, to acknowledge receipt of these complaints by way of my Humble Petition, to which I am entitled, under the Act.
- 31. K Reid, female, of the 1948 European Convention of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, in writing, refuses to acknowledge receipt of any further complaint from me relating to the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

**The content of this, my statement, is true to the best of my belief.**

Signed: Maurice J Kirk BVSc 17<sup>th</sup> March 2009

Marlpits

St Donats

Llantwit Major

Vale of Glamorgan

South Wales CF61 1ZB

Copy to John Smith MP and Barbara Wilding, Chief Officer of South Wales Police.