Registrar European Court of Human Rights Strasbourg

Maurice Kirk v United Kingdom

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find enclosed an Application that is, I hope, succinct with 'grounds', Sections 5,6 and 7, within the refused Appeal to HM Privy Council, drafted by a London law firm, for this purpose.

Summary

1. **[Page 59]** chairman of the disciplinary committee of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons' refusal to 'convene a court', for reinstatement applications, is contrary to Article 6 (enclosed).

Extract from 2004 Statutory Instrument:

20.3 On receipt of an application to which this Rule applies, the application shall be listed for hearing within 3 months.

20.6 At the hearing of an application to which this Rule applies -

(a) The applicant shall be entitled to address the Committee, and to adduce evidence and make submissions, in support of the application;

(b) The Solicitor shall be entitled to address the Committee, and to adduce evidence and make submissions, in opposition to the application.

- 2. **[Page 27]** Refusal by the Judicial Committee of the HM Privy Council to use its 'default powers' to intervene (Para 22 of The Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966) is contrary to Article 6.
- 3. **[Page 7]** The RCVS Royal Charter 1967 indicates bias to the college and its agents, contrary to 1998 Human Right Act and European Convention of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.
- 4. The Royal College had a duty to inform any of its members of its veterinary profession when considering embarking in lengthy litigation, in British law courts, against this apparent anomaly.
- 5. **[Page 77]** Reply to 23rd Dec 2004 RCVS reinstatement conditions was first accepted by the January 2005 court but then varied at subsequent applications, all contrary to human rights.
- 6. Since 1844 no applicant, for reinstatement, has been subjected to such perverse conditions.

Maurice John Kirk BVSc, Puits aux Papillons, St Doha, 22230 Merdrignac, Brittany, France