

1. This is a ruling upon an application for a trial by jury. The application concerns three actions which are all brought by the Claimant against the Chief Constable of the South Wales Constabulary albeit that the Defendant in the first two actions is described as the "South Wales Police". The first action appears to involve 20 live causes of action that relate to dates between 1993 and 1996. The second action involves some 14 causes of action arising between 1995 and 2000. The third action involves 6 sets of incidents of which the first set started in 1998. The last incident was in 2002. The three actions involve about 40 allegations against the Defendant. The great majority of the matters complained of concern alleged motoring offences in connection with which it is said that the Claimant was either wrongfully arrested and detained or maliciously prosecuted or both. In addition a similar complaint is made in respect of matters that first arose in connection with a fracas that occurred on 19 August 1998 at the Vale of Glamorgan Agricultural Show. There is also complaint in respect an incident arising out of a flight by the Claimant to the Republic of Eire. Finally the Complainant asserts various breaches of duty which he recognises cannot be the subject of trial by jury. These comprise about 7 out of all the incidents that are said to ground causes of action. All three actions are being managed as a single set of proceedings.
2. Despite the long, complicated and occasionally unfathomable history of the proceedings, there is no need to enter upon any detailed account or investigation of what has occurred. It is enough to say that for a relatively lengthy period at least the first action was managed in Bristol. It is the Claimant's case that he always wanted a jury to try those proceedings and that was what he told the solicitors who were then acting for him. However that may be, those acting for the Defendant have no recollection of the matter being mentioned at that time. Nevertheless no point is taken on the application being out of time in respect of any of the actions. Those acting for the Defendant have made their position known with clarity and succinctness.
3. The Defendant argues that, given the age of the allegations and the circumstances in which they are made, I should be of the opinion that the trial will require a prolonged examination of documents which cannot conveniently be made with a jury (section 66 of the County Courts Act 1984). In this connection I have been referred to the transcripts of the judgments of the Court of Appeal in respectively *Aitken v Preston* 15 May 1997 and *Oliver v Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council* 23 June 1999. These cases set out in detail the criteria that I must have in mind in exercising my jurisdiction. In particular I note the tendency towards trial without a jury and the fact that were I to hold that trial with a jury would be inconvenient that should operate as strong presumption against having a jury. But I also note that my overriding concern should be to do justice between the parties. It is now necessary to go back to allegations in question.
4. The best way of putting the matter is colloquially. It is the Claimant's loud assertion and belief that the South Wales Police are, and for many years have been, out to get him. They know who he is and have made his life a misery by treating him improperly