

**ANIMAL HEALTH CENTRE
49-53 TYNEWYDD ROAD, BARRY,
VALE OF GLAMORGAN, CF62 8AZ**

Tel No: 01 446 733406 Fax 01 446 748500

Email: maurice@kirkflyingvet.co.uk

www: kirkflyingvet.co.uk

**Veterinary Surgeon:
Maurice J Kirk BVSc, MRCVS**

MJK/DHG/df/Oct/2002
22 October 2002

Justice and Victims Unit
Home Office
50 Queen Anne's Gate
London SW1H 9AT

Dear Sir

EX GRATIA COMPENSATION

In the early 90's I was falsely imprisoned in Bristol by the Guernsey authorities, which led to Home Office compensation of a financial nature.

A similar situation has arisen and I enclose the relevant Particulars of Claim for your understanding, as I am currently pursuing these acts of illegal imprisonments, harassment and/or abuse of process through the civil courts. I had overlooked, until now, your procedure to which I now turn, as, once again, no lawyer will act for me.


I enclose just a sample of some of the 70 odd law firms who specialise in such matters but who have refused to act, for whatever reason. As you will see my actions are against the South Wales Police involving a considerable number of imprisonments and well over 100 charges that have been lost or withdrawn with no appropriate compensation to myself.

The Avon and Somerset police appear to have closed ranks with them to include a number of malicious prosecutions and false imprisonments. In particular, I was caused to stay at Bristol prison in March 1997 on information that was proved to be totally false and only verbally tendered by a mentally sick member of the public, well known to the police and prosecution service, who had a motive for financial gain. I refer to Christopher Paul Ebbs of Dursley, Gloucestershire. I was 'acquitted' of all the allegations of grievous bodily harm and conspiracy to pervert the course of justice.

Reliance and the Prisoner Escort and Custodial Services, are also identified in a personal injuries claim, enclosed, when I was 'seriously injured' more than once whilst in and out of custody at Bristol Magistrates, my being later acquitted of all allegations of child abduction, robbery, criminal damage, driving under the influence of alcohol etc etc.

Under the relevant laws and procedure I would be grateful if someone could intervene as my current difficulties concerning legal representation may be construed as a breach of human rights.

Yours faithfully



Maurice Kirk

Copy to: Privy Council
Cardiff County Court - BS 614159/CF101741/CF204141
Bristol County Court - CF204140

(FROM RE) FILE
15/5/13
JE
MORRIS TO
MJK

SOUTH WALES POLICE
SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE
'E' VALLEY BRANCH
30 III 2007

32

27/07/07

FPO

Chief Constable
South Wales Police.

1/3 BARRY POLICE STATION
BARRY
SOUTH WALES.

Dear Sir,

The Civil Justice Centre
at Cardiff refuses to accept
my report and lodging the
enclosed documents.

I make formal complaint
of abuse of process and
~~also~~ CRIMINAL INTENT

1, TYNEMYDD RD
BARRY


M. J. KIRK

RECORDED

DEVIATED

Application Notice

You should provide this information for listing the application

1. How do you wish to have your application dealt with

a) at a hearing? } complete all questions below
 b) at a telephone conference?
 c) without a hearing? complete Qs 5 and 6 below

2. Give a time estimate for the hearing/conference
 _____ (hours) 30 (mins)

3. Is this agreed by all parties? Yes No

4. Give dates of any trial period or fixed trial date 31/7/07

5. Level of judge LORD JUSTICE THOMAS

6. Parties to be served SOUTH WALES POLICE

In the <u>DEVIA</u> COURT OF APPEAL	
Claim no.	<u>B2/2006/2307</u>
Warrant no. (if applicable)	
Claimant (including ref.)	<u>KIRK</u>
Defendant(s) (including ref.)	<u>CHIEF CONSTABLE SOUTH WALES POLICE</u>
Date	<u>25/07/07</u>

Note You must complete Parts A and B, and Part C if applicable. Send any relevant fee and the completed application to the court with any draft order, witness statement or other evidence; and sufficient copies for service on each respondent.

Part A

1. Enter your full name, or name of solicitor I (We)⁽¹⁾ MAURICE JOHN KIRK (on behalf of) ~~(the claimant)~~ ~~(the defendant)~~

2. State clearly what order you are seeking and if possible attach a draft intend to apply for an order (a draft of which is attached) that⁽²⁾
STAY OF PROCEEDINGS
 because⁽³⁾

3. Briefly set out why you are seeking the order. Include the material facts on which you rely, identifying any rule or statutory provision

ABUSE OF PROCESS

- HMCS HAVE LOST COURT FILE.
- CPS HAVE FAILED FULL DISCLOSURE.
- SOUTH WALES POLICE HAVE, IN BAD FAITH, DESTROYED EVIDENCE.
- LORD JUSTICE COLLINS'S ECRO HAS PREJUDICED PROCEEDINGS.
- VEHICULAR ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL WAS MALICIOUS AND WITHOUT REASONABLE

4. I (We) wish to rely on: tick one box

~~the attached (witness statement) (affidavit)~~ my statement of case CAUSE

4. If you are not already a party to the proceedings, you must provide an address for service of documents

evidence in Part C in support of my application

Signed [Signature] Position or office held _____
 (Applicant)'s Solicitor/'s litigation friend (if signing on behalf of firm or company)

Address to which documents about this claim should be sent (including reference if appropriate)⁽⁶⁾

<u>S1 TYNEWYDD ROAD BARRY SOUTH WALES</u>	if applicable	
	fax no.	
	DX no.	
	Tel. no. <u>01446792109</u> Postcode <u>CF62 8AZ</u> email	

Part C

Claim No. B2/2006/2307

I (We) wish to rely on the following evidence in support of this application:

ATTACHED AND BY
E-MAIL

AND I RELY ON BUNDLE
HANDLED TO LORD JUSTICE THOMAS
ON 17TH JULY 07 AT
COURT OF APPEAL, CARDIFF
AND IN COURT ON
31ST JULY 07
AT ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE


COURT FEE TO BE PAID INTO
CARDIFF & CIVIL JUSTICE CENTRE
ON 27/07/07

Statement of Truth

*(I believe) *~~(The applicant believes)~~ that the facts stated in Part C are true

*delete as appropriate

Signed



(Applicant) ('s Solicitor) ('s litigation friend)

Position or
office held

(if signing on behalf
of firm or company)

Date

26/07/07

Court of Appeal

FAXED TO
COURT OF APPEAL 27/7/07

B2/2006/2307

Abuse of Process Application

FAO
Lord Justice Thomas,
Royal Courts of Justice
London

24th July 2007.

Summary

In 2003 The Attorney General of Great Britain instructed all court files under his control relating to Maurice John Kirk, both in England and in Wales, to be sent to the Treasury Solicitor with the view of certifying Kirk, whether plaintiff or defendant, as a Vexatious Litigant.

Since then court files have been unavailable either for Mr Kirk to prepare for trial or brief his barrister. Court files are now confirmed lost.

The relevance of Mr Kirk's 45 plus Judicial Review Applications and 7 Privy Council hearings has revealed widespread 'Abuse of Process', criminal conduct and 'Failed Disclosure', all contrary to the laws of both England and Wales.

Where criminal conduct was occasioned official complaint was made to the appropriate authorities supported by documentary evidence.

No indication has been given to the complainant that an appropriate investigation has been carried out either by the Civil Service, employed for such purposes or by the Metropolitan, Avon and Somerset or South Wales Police Constabularies.

The failure of the South Wales Police to investigate complaint and to conspire with the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, by laying false claims and disclosing confidential information in order to obtain his name being removed from the register, was unlawful.

Mr Kirk has the right to 'practice veterinary surgery' and a fair trial, under Article 6 of the Human Rights Act ratified by HM Queen.

Article 6 allows the applicant's right to a jury in his court for compensation having suffered 10 years of sustained harassment and false imprisonment by the South Wales Police.

Unlawful conduct has been perpetuated by the 'Memorandum of Understanding' between Chiefs of Police and the Law Society and the 'HM Partnership', the latter including the Crown Prosecution Service, Treasury Solicitor and Her Majesty's Court Service, all riddled with the seriously out dated secret practices of Freemasonry making the chance of a fair trial in the United Kingdom an anathema.

Mr Kirk claims costs.

Vexatious Litigant and 'who is to benefit'?

Concise Oxford Dictionary: (Law) 'not having sufficient grounds for action and seeking only to annoy defendant'.

Rough Calculation on the outcome of MJK court cases in the past 15 years when compelled to be 'Litigant in Person':

76% won

8% withdrawn or part heard

The remainder lost or pending

The vast majority, over 11 years of working as a veterinary surgeon, had been for 'veterinary services rendered (84% win, 12% withdrawn)', eviction of thieving tenants and for acts of vandalism, arson and criminal damage once word was 'on the street' the Barry police would not prosecute.

Only one 'practice bad debt case' was lost but several were abandoned, part heard, once Mr Kirk realised the UK judicial system was not just manifestly corrupt, it was ineffective in satisfying the mounting number of judgments obtained, just 'worthless', expensive pieces of paper.

Article 6 allows the applicant's right to a jury in his court for compensation having suffered 10 years of sustained harassment and false imprisonment by the South Wales Police.

Unlawful conduct has been perpetuated by the 'Memorandum of Understanding' between Chiefs of Police and the Law Society and the 'HM Partnership', the latter including the Crown Prosecution Service, Treasury Solicitor and Her Majesty's Court Service, all riddled with the seriously out dated secret practices of Freemasonry making the chance of a fair trial in the United Kingdom an anathema.

Mr Kirk claims costs.

Vexatious Litigant and 'who is to benefit'?

Concise Oxford Dictionary: (Law) 'not having sufficient grounds for action and seeking only to annoy defendant'.

Rough Calculation on the outcome of MJK court cases in the past 15 years when compelled to be 'Litigant in Person':

76% won
8% withdrawn or part heard
The remainder lost or pending

The vast majority, over 11 years of working as a veterinary surgeon, had been for 'veterinary services rendered (84% win, 12% withdrawn)', eviction of thieving tenants and for acts of vandalism, arson and criminal damage once word was 'on the street' the Barry police would not prosecute.

Only one 'practice bad debt case' was lost but several were abandoned, part heard, once Mr Kirk realised the UK judicial system was not just manifestly corrupt, it was ineffective in satisfying the mounting number of judgments obtained, just 'worthless', expensive pieces of paper.

A). A purchase dispute of a house involving avaricious lawyers, Ungood, Thomas and King of Carmarthen warned Mr Kirk of the true purpose of the Court of Appeal. These lawyers obtained quite huge sums of tax payers' money in their clearly hopeless case for a deceitful defendant.

B). Mr Kirk's divorce case exemplified both the incompetence of HMCS and the plain greed of lawyers on both sides with distressed clients dependant upon lawyer integrity.

Wendy Hopkins of Hopkins and Co, solicitors, of Cardiff allocated an office clerk on the case, portrayed as solicitor throughout, with disastrous financial consequences.

Mr Toogood of and King, solicitors, Bath exploited the situation by obtaining large sums of family money for himself from his frail client and Mr Kirk, abusing his position of privilege as a lawyer.

C). Another example of avarice was Mr Kirk v Reliance Custodial Services when custody staff inflicted 'malicious wounding', not once, but 3 times whilst in the court cells. It is believed because he was accused of 'kidnapping a child' [his own son from Clifton College, he being reluctant to visit the dentist] for 'robbery' [he took his ex mother in law's spare car key] for attempting to steal a fictitious car whilst under the influence of drink [no car identified or evidence of any alcohol consumed].

After years of the usual court hypocrisy and inflated £7,000 legal costs Reliance settled 'out of court' for £10,000 with Mr Kirk also winning all the criminal allegations for only the bus fares.

D)The one case lost, 'Dogs for the Disabled' petty debt, is listed below as a JR Application, significant for the man in practice just trying to earn a living.

Abuse of Process

On the 16th July, 2007, whilst examining Cardiff court records for his 15 year Action against the South Wales Police BS614159-MC65, Mr Kirk

found in marked green court file, '**Potential Vexatious Litigant**', his letter of the 21st Feb 2004 to the South Wales Police Solicitor predicting their 'end game' with the HM CPS [Exhibit].

Mr Kirk wrote the prediction that 'evidence', under the control of the CPS, Treasury Solicitor and Lord Goldsmith, were to be destroyed including the remaining custody records not yet handed over, despite orders of HHJ Vosper QC and others. The destruction included cctv film and taped interviews, under caution and the identification of eye witnesses known to the police. Also predicted was the refusal to declare what money Dolmans, solicitors, Cardiff was making in this case, strung out for so many years.

Lord Justice Thomas understands the significance of that by the documents served on him on the 17th July and information in the 'lost' files.

If now, with Cardiff court having 'lost' 4 large boxes of official court records, already 'missing' for at least 3 years, how did this 'single letter' get sent immediately up to the Treasury Solicitor just a few days after the Mr Kirk's 29th January 2004 Privy Council Judgment in the RCVS case and turn up in the green file?

Their Lordships at Downing Street, in the appeal, never mentioned the 'grounds' of the humble petitioner in either their deliberations or judgment namely:

- a) **Refused any witnesses or police investigators of the incidents relied on by the RCVS.**
- b) **Refused Disclosure of gathered witness statements by both RCVS and South Wales Police.**

Mr Kirk was refused sight of his own records kept by the complainants to the college, the South Wales Police, despite they disclosing to the RCVS in return for a favour and so seriously prejudice the matter now for the Court of Appeal, B2/2006/2307, the claim for damages.

The 'Kirk 24th Feb 2004 letter' to police solicitor ended predicting a 4th Action for harassment damages about to be lodged.

This would be based on the criminal conduct identified during his experiences in Downing Street with the Privy Council influenced by the ongoing malicious conduct of the South Wales Police.

Is that what caused a Vexatious Litigant Enquiry by Lord Goldsmith and the destruction of relevant evidence?

It all stinks, My Lord, doesn't it?

Mr Kirk submits, as a British citizen, documents, tapes of evidence and any other record of these serious allegations, most already proved in UK courts, be seized forthwith from the courts, police, 'Whitehall' and the Royal College of Veterinary surgeons by the appropriate authority for a judicial enquiry.

The remaining cases at the time of Lord Goldsmith and others' intervention into Mr Kirk's private life were both pending:

1. Civil damages claim against the [REDACTED] for false imprisonment and harassment the police having lost around 120 charges and 7 Crown Court cases and having locked up Mr Kirk in Cardiff prison on the pretext he could not be recognised!

2. The Appeal from the [REDACTED] for the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for being struck off following a complaint by the South Wales Police

Police harassment stopped immediately Mr Kirk was refused the right 'to practice veterinary surgery'.

Police harassment stopped following the 35th time he had to produce his motoring documents to the South Wales Police when he refused and following 200 court appearances obtaining him just bus fares.

Examples of CPS involvement.

Mr Kirk had applied for [REDACTED] prosecutors to give evidence before the RCVS despite the prosecution barrister for the CPS writing to the court saying the conviction (RCVS A7) should never have been opposed by the CPS at Crown Court [CPS costs claimed exceeded £7,000]. It should have been dealt with as a simple 'breach of the peace' leaving no criminal record.

Jackie Seal, the original prosecutor at Barry magistrates had other ideas. She and a string of others in the CPS perpetuated the campaign and knowingly allowed falsified evidence, including police note books, statements and even the charge sheets, arranging the forged new documents to go before, for example, Roderick J, Recorder of Cardiff on Mr Kirk's Abuse of Process Application [Judicial Review CO/1569/00 on **Failed Disclosure**]. CPS allowed the withholding of custody records and witnesses interviewed. At least 4 JR Applications were refused.

30 Judicial Review Applications, some listed below, reveal 'Failed Disclosure' of relevant evidence, many supported by ignored court orders.

HM Jackie Seal had pleaded in the Cardiff witness box, on oath, earlier, "I am not answering Mr Kirk's questions for fear of incriminating myself". [see transcript]

Mr Kirk was struck off the veterinary register for that conviction.

The Treasury Solicitor had to also represent witnesses in the RCVS court proceedings in 2002 and obviously was successful, with Crown Immunity, in overturning about 10 witness summonses of HM court 'entourage', Seal included, threatening a bill of £6000 if I dared appeal to the Court of Appeal for his predicted £20,000 bill.

The RCVS 1967 Royal Charter specifically orders judges in the UK to favour any person within or is an agent to the Royal College if cited in litigation.

Extract from 1967 Royal Charter for the UK Veterinary Profession

And We do hereby, for Us, Our Heirs and Successors further grant unto the College that these Our Letters, or the enrolment or exemplification thereof, shall be in all things valid and effectual in law according to the true intent and meaning thereof and shall be taken, construed and adjudged in the most favourable and beneficial sense for the best advantage of the College as well in Our Courts of Record as elsewhere by all Judges, Justices, Officers, Ministers and other subjects whatsoever of Us, Our Heirs and Successors, any non-recital or other omission or thing to the contrary notwithstanding.

IN WITNESS whereof We have cause these Our Letters to be made Patent.

WITNESS Ourselves at Westminster the nineteenth day of October and in the sixteenth