

Delay in filing Claimant's closing submissions:

1. This Claimant is no longer capable of presenting a coherent argument to complete the only remedy available left to him in order to conclude just a fraction of his long list of grievances.
2. Even after twenty years of deliberate acts of *misfeasance* by The Defendant, targeted at its victim, The Claimant was, on 12th July 2013, arrested and jailed on the most spurious of allegations by someone simply 'on the make' for monetary gain.
3. It has become only too apparent during the three month trial that The Claimant's memory loss, especially that of his short term memory, has been severely affected.
4. During the months just prior to the trial and during it the Claimant has had his motor vehicle broken into no less than four times with three computers stolen and legal documents, including court exhibits, also going missing.
5. Defendant purported enquiries on some of these incidents have been nothing short of perfunctory if not derisory to the function the laws of our land so demand of them.
6. Since the last theft from his vehicle the Claimant was told by a senior officer that no video footage of the incident was seized by The Defendant despite staff of the premises, where the video machines are installed, told him to the contrary.
7. The business tenant, below his current Cardiff flat, after first reneging on an agreed lease and work to be done to the premises, has set about a course of conduct of deliberately harassing the Claimant confident he, as with so many before him, would also be immune to prosecution by any of the relevant authorities.
8. During the trial **Mark Davenport**, the business tent, switched off the Claimant's electricity and without a coherent excuse, continues to refuse to reconnect its supply.
9. For a period of time the tenant even had The Claimant locked out of his own flat by changing the lock of his front door.
10. The tenant then proceeded, by a witness statement to The Defendant, stating and appearing to have much delight in boasting about it in front his gang of workers many of whom are all drawing the dole, that The Claimant and his daughter had knowingly committed fraud when drawing up his lease.
11. This caused The Claimant being visited by The Defendant but the police officers were unable to gain entry to the flat.

12. The Claimant has asked The Defendant as to the meaning of the visit and requesting explanation to the current situation on several of the other incidents but to no avail.
13. The Claimant, with reluctance, then made complaint to The Defendant of the apparent theft of his file, last seen in his flat, relating to the whole premises and including The Claimant's details of its original purchase by him.
14. The tenant had originally been supplied with a spare key to the Claimant's flat in the likely event of any attempts of his business premises being burgled.
15. By refusing to supply either The Claimant or his landlord with a spare key the tenant then changed the lock of the communal gate leading to rear yard and garage for the security for The Claimant's vehicle.
16. Davenport has now allowed 'fly tipping' on his landlord's yard on a major scale not tenanted by him. When asked by whom he bluntly replied, "**For me to know and for you to find out**".
17. The tenant has long stopped paying any rent to his landlord and has now fabricated a story to The Defendant that he had been assaulted by the Claimant, contrary to Section 39 of The Criminal Justice Act 1988.
18. The Claimant was arrested on 12th July 2013 and released from custody late the next day following his repeated insistence, starting at time of his arrest, for The Defendant to simply view the video footage of the purported incident known to be in existence. Deja Vu?
19. Extract from custody record:

'The DP is alleged to have poked the two victims to the chest'
When asked how? It was explained to their prisoner as, "With your finger".
20. Despite given the telephone number at 9pm for someone to be informed of the Claimant's incarceration The Defendant waited until 12.40 am before ringing The Claimant's Mackenzie Friend, Sabine to be told she was needed immediately in the police station to represent their victim. She therefore had to try and make contact with The Claimant's sister in Jersey and Mrs Janet Kirk in Bristol in relation to this and the other myriad of ongoing civil proceedings caused by The Defendant. The usual frustrated calls by the above, to the Cardiff custody suite, achieved the usual disinformation expected of any Masonic cabal in any police station.
21. It is important to note that The Claimant, having both bluntly denied the allegations by explaining why and having never set eyes on this new bunch of police officers, ***refused to reveal his identity, date of birth or any address but was still released only to be then bailed to an address he had never given in the first place or is ever likely to agree to.***

Maurice J Kirk BVSc

14th May 2013