

January 2014 bail was overruled by the police again without the need of a court hearing with it not being the first time, by far, in the Claimant's experience.

The Claimant was released on 4th July 2014 but gaoled again, within a week, for complaining his July hospital operation had been cancelled by the South Wales police. No evidence of a complaint from the medical fraternity was required for his further eight month incarceration.

MAPPA/HMP and NHS (Wales) records prove widespread malfeasance and widespread criminal conduct too vast to allow intervention but just as with the general police records of any incident with the Claimant any trial judge need only obtain their disclosure to establish who is most likely to be the blatant liar.

The Claimant's successful surgery in April 2015, to alleviate severe gut pain, had to be achieved abroad just like the nine month delayed hip replacement, in 2010, needing to be done in France.

Why? No South Wales doctor could be found to carry out the surgery while the police doctor's false reporting remain uncorrected on NHS/GMC/RCVS/CAA and MAPPA files.

Criminal Cases Review Commission, with the Crown Prosecution Service and various Bristol and Cardiff barristers, have copy of the damning 1st December 2011 Cardiff magistrates record as to whether a restraining order was ever written on the day yet alone served.

The 4th May 2012 jury asked for them and was refused so why can the Claimant not have copy of public records? More to the point the CCRC state the Claimant's legal team are not allowed even sight of the court log (because it has been re written to try and cover up the conspiracy to pervert the course of justice). The Claimant is bemused at the lengths authority will go to cover up the truth.

September 2013

The Bristol Bailiff laid complaint of an assault causing actual bodily harm (ABH) by Davenport and his fellow kind but was told by the attending police sergeant that had the current owner of the property not have had the same surname as the Claimant the twelve police officers would not have attended.

The following Bailiff's statement of complaint of the police and their informer, Davenport, has also been ignored the Claimant has been reliably informed.



Statement of Witness

Statement of Stephen Edward Wood

Age if under 18

This statement consisting of Five pages signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated this the 16th September 2013

Signature

I am Stephen Edward Wood a Private Investigator, & Certificated Bailiff, along with a member of the Chartered Institute of Legal Executives; I am also an Ex-Avon & Somerset Police Constable, and Managing Director of Able Investigations & Enforcements. Of 1 Riverside, St Annes Road, Bristol, BS4 4ED, I will STATE and say as follows:-

1. That I am over 18 years of age.
2. I am a Certificated Bailiff with twenty years' experience in Bailiff Law, I also trained Avon and Somerset Constabulary Officers on bailiff law, I have also written two books on the powers of rent and distress which have been published, these therefore are my credential in this matter.
3. I make this statement in relation to an incident that occurred on the 31st July 2013 & the 5th August 2013
4. I was first instructed by the owner of 175 Cowbridge Road, Cardiff in relation to non-payment of rent by the tenant. The owner being Belinda Kirk on the 24th July 2013. I was informed that the tenant Mr Mark Davenport had a lease on the property in which he had failed to pay rent or service charges since approximately March 2013. I am also aware that the tenant Mr Davenport had breached a number of conditions within the lease but note that no Section 144 have been served on him. I therefore advised Miss Kirk that the best way to reclaim the property was by forfeiture of lease for non-payment of rent, a self-remedy action under common law.

Signed



Statement of Witness

Statement of Stephen Edward Wood con't

Age if under 18

5. Having received the signed documentation from Miss Belinda Kirk we attended the property on 31st July 2013, taking peaceful possession, changing the locks and making the property secure again in line with the law of rent and distress under Common Law.
 6. 24 Hours after taking peaceful possession of the property, the ex-tenant, Mr Davenport contacted this office requesting that he be allowed to attend at the property to remove his goods. We requested from Miss Kirk that this be allowed, which was agreed.
 7. We therefore sent a bailiff to meet with the ex-tenant at the property on the 2nd August 2013; the tenant did not remove anything from the premises and disappeared for an hour, then reappeared. After approx. A further 2 hours, three other males attended at the shop. Mr Davenport and the three male then approached the Bailiff man handling him out of the premises and refusing to allow him back into the shop, thereby allowing Mr Davenport to re-take possession of the property, becoming a trespasser in the building where the leasing had been forfeiture.
 8. The Bailiff called for assistance from South Wales police were called, despite attending at the property and the bailiff explaining the circumstances they refused to take action as Mr Davenport was making unfounded allegations of assault against the bailiff. The police did not pursue this matter, but decided to believe Mr Davenport rather than a court appointed bailiff.
 9. On 5th August 2013, at 22:00 hrs myself and team of three bailiffs returned to the property to remove the trespassers from illegally being in the premises, as is the right under common law. On attending at the property we met with police officers with whom we had previously informed of our arrival and explained the situation along with the full legal redress we were about to apply. As we approached the property Mr Davenport opened the main front door.
-
10. We spoke to Mr Davenport and explained the situation to him. He stated that he would not be leaving the property and nothing was going to move him from property, threatening to assault anyone who attempted to remove him. It became clear that Mr Davenport had moved his entire family into the property and they were now temporally residing there.

Signed _____



Statement of Witness

Statement of Stephen Edward Wood con't

Age if under 18

11. Whilst outside the property I was approached by an unknown adult male who made threats of violence to me, thereby putting me in fear for my safety, and as an officer of the court I expected to receive the protection from the Police, at the time of the incident the male was one inch from my face, him comments were so forceful that as he was speaking to me, he was spitting.
 12. I requested that the police arrest the male whom I now know to be the son of Mr Davenport, and was alleging that he is a qualified solicitor which I have since discovered is not the case.
 13. However a female Police Sgt in attendance questioned my attendance and the reasons for me attempting to evict the occupants. I explained the situation and provided proof of my Bailiff Certificate.
 14. However the female Sgt refused to look at my identification stating that they did not believe that I was a Certificated Bailiff the quote was "you can get anything off the internet these days". Despite producing my Bailiff Certificate and offering to show the police the government website where a list of Certificated Bailiffs is held they refused to assist us, and continued to disbelieve me. I then requested that she clarify her remarks to which she replied "take it as you will" I then stated that she was accusing me of being a liar to which she replied that she had, but I could read into what I liked.
 15. Therefore two of the bailiffs entered the premises and tried to remove Mr Davenport, however the scene soon became violent on Mr Davenports side with his family assisting him, in defecting the bailiffs whilst the police stood by and watched. One of the Bailiffs was injured receiving gouging to his skin causing bleeding by two females within the property, he still has the scars to this day,
-
16. Mr Davenport & his son were extremely intimidating and physically violent to me and the bailiffs but the police refused to assist in arresting them. After two hours the police informed us that we were to stand down and if we did not there was a possibility that we would be arrested. I did point out that we were acting lawfully and as Certificated Bailiffs we had a right to re-enter the property and evict the trespassers. The police in their infinite wisdom refused to acknowledge this fact, even when I pointed out case law Chief Constable of Essex -v- Bibby [2000]. Should a bailiff be arrested whilst in the execution of his lawful duty.



Statement of Witness

Statement of Stephen Edward Wood con't

Age if under 18

17. It was clear that the Female Police Sgt In attendance had a personal grievance against Bailiffs or knew the illegal occupants of the property, which I am uncertain of. However it was clear that she was siding with the tenants and having accused me of being a liar, ignoring crimes that were committed in clear sight of them, they were not going to support our lawful action.
18. As the Davenport family were extremely aggressive and the police clearly failing in their action to protect us, I was left with no alternative but to stand down, taking further instructions.
19. I truly believe that South Wales Police have failed in their lawful duty in protecting not only a member of public, but have also inferred that I as a court appointed Bailiff was a liar. They also ignored a serious offence of Grievous Bodily Harm-With Intent, contrary to Offence against the Persons Act 1861 s18. The victim was wounded, therefore the actions of the other party were deliberate, and it intended to cause serious bodily harm. R v Belfon [1976] 3 ALL ER 46 CR.
20. As a Civil Enforcement Officer with over twenty years' experience I have never been treated as badly as I was by the female Sgt that evening, due to her lack of action, and the inaction of the officers around her, not only did a member of my staff receive injuries, which were totally ignored, but I was put in fear of my safety in clear sight and hearing of at least twelve officers and again no action was taken.
21. I am currently seeking further legal advice on this action through my Profession Association

Signed _____

The Criminal Cases Review Commission now admit having had a copy of the 1st December 2011 Magistrates court file (harassment conviction of a police doctor and subsequent restraining order) since February 2013 but refuse to release anything to the Claimant. The 4th May 2012 jury had

specifically asked for the original clerk of the court's notes but the trial said they were 'not available' even to them.

Just because it indicates proof of criminal conduct occasioned by others, HM immune to any prosecution, it does not detract from the fact this documentatation has been shown to 3rd parties and now been tampered with since while in the possession of the court, the Crown Prosecution Service and no doubt, the police.

The fact that the 2014 Crown Court staff informed my Mckenzie Friends that the court exhibits of a previous Crown Court case, including these magistrates records, were seized during the last jury trial comes with no surprise bearing in mind this above brief account of police persecution will continue.

A 'withheld' altered page of 1st Dec 2011 harassment convictionn court file and letter to CCRC

PROTECT - PERSONAL

Offence	Date	Sentence/Final adjudication	Financial imposition	Driving disqual
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">32 HARASSMENT</p> <p style="text-align: center;">23/9/11</p>	10/11/11	1ST GRES WITNESS HEARD	FCOMP: £ V/S: £ FCPC: £ FCOST: £ FO: £ FVEBD: £	<input type="checkbox"/> L/E Points <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> DC
	29/11/11	RESTRICTIONS EVIDENCE HEARD SUBMISSION FOR NO CASE TO ANSWER REJECTED DJ MADE MENTAL HEALTH	<input type="checkbox"/> Credit for Guilty Plea (GPTAC) <input type="checkbox"/> Comm/Susp Order imposed (see page 2)	Band: @ %
		TO RECALL A SECURITY TO AVOID IN THE COURT EVIDENCE. LIFE NEW CITY TRIP ALL OF BTL.	FCOMP: £ V/S: £ FCPC: £ FCOST: £ FO: £ FVEBD: £	<input type="checkbox"/> L/E Points <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> DC
		DI SAYS NO EVIDENCE IN GRES	FCOMP: £ V/S: £ FCPC: £ FCOST: £ FO: £ FVEBD: £	L / 1 Poin. <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> DC
		DI SAYS NO EVIDENCE IN GRES	FCOMP: £ V/S: £ FCPC: £ FCOST: £ FO: £ FVEBD: £	L / 1 Poin. <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> DC
	1/12/11	DEFENCE EVIDENCE HEARD BEFORE DJ DECIDES NOT GIVING ANY RELEVANT EVIDENCE + CONVICTS DEFENDANT (DJ. HAS REASONS)	FCOMP: £ V/S: £ FCPC: £ FCOST: £1500 FO: £ FVEBD: £	<input type="checkbox"/> L/1 Points <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> DC
		18 WEEKS PRISON REASONS: CAMPAIGN TO DISCREDIT TEAGYR WILLIAMS, INCLUDING OF VIOLENCE PLANNED COURSE OF CONDUCT UNWARRANTED 29 DAY 2 CLEAR TIME ABOUT ON REMNANT	FCOMP: £ V/S: £ FCPC: £ FCOST: £ FO: £ FVEBD: £	<input type="checkbox"/> L/1 Points <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> S.3 <input type="checkbox"/> DC

Handwritten notes:
 2J Confirms that the bill of £1000 plus VAT is reasonable as if the donor's assistant had home...
 REASONS: CAMPAIGN TO DISCREDIT TEAGYR WILLIAMS, INCLUDING OF VIOLENCE PLANNED COURSE OF CONDUCT UNWARRANTED 29 DAY 2 CLEAR TIME ABOUT ON REMNANT

Relevant weekly income
 Actual: £.....
 Benefit, or up to £100
 Assumed (£350)
 Receipt of Means Form

Payment terms
 To be paid forthwith
 Pay by date: 29/12/11
 Lump sum amount (£):
 Instalment amount (£):
 Instalment start date:
 Payment Card requested? Yes No

Payment type
 WK
 WL
 FN
 FL
 MO
 ML

Other Orders
 COLLO Reserve terms: UNLAWFUL NOTICE AS ATTACHED
 DBO
 AEOC
 No. of TICs: Date TICs admitted on:

Compensation offence/TIC
 Amount Name Full address
 £ PLEASE ARRANGE PAYMENT OF 1000 PLUS VAT TO VINCE WILLIAMS

CCRC

Maurice J Kirk

Birmingham

A7306AT

Your Ref 00031/2013

27th February 2015

Dear Ms Dilks,

My Ref: **BS614159** etc

Magistrates Public Court Records and My Son's Affidavit

I apologise for appearing to have written to you, by mistake, rather than to the case worker but it may have now highlighted the possibility of us not all exactly 'singing from the same hymn sheet'.

At A20140082 Crown Court, for arrest of 1st Dec 2011 Crown Prosecutor (Cardiff harassment conviction) Appeal, there was disclosed documentary evidence indicating CCRC have copy of the original clerk of the court's notes for 1st Dec 2011 Cardiff Magistrates hearings and especially copy of original court log. No reference of any 'restraining order is' recorded.

Also, possibly, you may have the altered and re written version of court log, omitting some hearings and inserted (written over) what the T20120090 4th May 2012 jury requested in various 'notes' (some still withheld by Cardiff's cabal) to His Honour Judge Curran QC. Following cross examination of clerk of court and custody manager, in Cardiff Crown Court, the jury asked to see written proof of a typed, part typed or manuscript form 'restraining order' existed, at the time, recorded in the Geoamey and/or clerks notes.

Cross examination at 1st and/or 2nd trial of Geoamey, who unlocked my cell door and now Davis Gareth Evans, prosecutor (added fictitious allegation re posting letter for my served custodial sentence/switched 'WANTED' posters etc) indicated more than one version left 1st Dec 11 court to my cell including the elusive manuscript only version? That bit of typical nonsense 'went walkabout', over the years, between courts depending on who asked for it and who was presiding.

At the time of 'jury notes', being banded about in open court I was not there with the court having been told by Geoamey Custody Services I had been hurriedly returned to prison, for a doctor's attention, they having witnessed the extreme haemorrhage from my rectum. As with all litigation with police civil damages claims and criminal defences are both dependant on the police disclosing their records to the appropriate adjudication. **Where is the tape and transcript of all this?**

In your case annex A or B of the regulations pretends to the general public I, for example, will now get from you those Cardiff court records to prove my innocence. Far, far more to the point police, Geoamey, Crown Prosecution Service, Magistrates, Crown Court and 2012/324/D2 Royal Courts of Justice Application to Appeal, before Lord Justice Leveson, Mr Justice Males and Mr Justice, records between various courts you can get your 'hot and sweaty' on, can you not?

I am interested, for starters, copy of jury note (s) friends in the public gallery say were passed back and forwards in Cardiff Crown Court on 4th May 2012. Can you obtain a certified true copy (I will pay) of those jury notes because, today, I have received the transcript indicating Their Lordships were quite oblivious to any jury notes asking for clerk's notes etc (paragraph 9 of 14th March RCJ judgment). No jury note was disclosed to me by Crown Court, if you get my drift, thank you,

Maurice J Kirk BVSc

Copy to RCVS/McKenzie Friends and little sis.

This CCRC also refusing Claimant copy of court records suggests an indictment in itself

The Claimant has, since March 2015 release from HMP Swansea, trawled the lawyer firms across England to see if this case and any one aspect of the above interests them to be so instructed.

Brief particulars of claim for one South Wales Police related reason for the Claimant's incarceration including continued MAPPA 3/3 fabricated registration, incorrect PNC records and 'out of the blue' December 2014 child molestation allegations designed to affect the Claimant's 4th February 15 Parole Board hearing only for them to be expunged from the record immediately after this 2nd hearing was successfully cancelled.

1. SECRETARY OF STATE FOR JUSTICE
2. PAROLE BOARD FOR ENGLAND AND WALES
3. CHIEF CONSTABLE OF SOUTH WALES CONSTABULARY

Brief details of claim

Damages for misfeasance in a public office and/or unlawful imprisonment and/or under section 8(1) of the Human Rights Act 1998 for wrongful and/or unlawful imposition of licence conditions under section 244 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 and/or the Criminal Justice (Sentencing)(Licence Conditions) Order 2005 dated on or about 4 July 2014, in breach of article 10(1) ECHR as incorporated under schedule 1 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and/or the Treaty on European Union, and/or wrongful and/or unlawful revocation of licence under section 254 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003 on 11 July 2014, and/or subsequent unlawful detention and/or imprisonment and/or failing to make arrangements for an oral hearing before the Parole Board with all due expedition and/or failing to provide the said oral hearing eventually set for hearing on 4 February 2015 in respect of his release from custody, in breach of article 5 of the ECHR as incorporated under schedule 1 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and/or under the principles set out in R. (Haney, Kaiyam and Massey v. Secretary of State for Justice; R. v. Robinson v. Governor of HMP Whatton and Secretary of State for Justice [2014] UKSC 66 until the Claimant's final release from HMP Swansea on 28 March 2015.

MAY 2015

Despite the passage of time Claimant still remembers the horror of assailant having neither reasonable nor probable cause other than to deliberately bully and harass its victim following the mounting acquittals and relevant appeals before both CCRC & RCJ

Action 1 para 8.3 The repetitive nonsense of police 'failing' to check up on their motorist's validity.

Action 1 para 8.5 PC Lott 'not having heard of the Claimant' with her husband in the same Barry police station, Claimant's 'night before' police examined practice vehicle, altered HORT 1 reprimand by His Honour Judge Birt.

Action 1 para 8.6 Claimant subjected to 4 days Cardiff imprisonment while police 'establish' the 'identity' of their local veterinary surgeon despite the vivid telephone account from Guernsey police of his wearing Nazi uniform in courts to always successfully prove a point.

Action 1 para 8.7,8,9,15, 17 etc Incessant stopping of his practice vehicles, eg driving whilst disqualified, just to find out who the current Claimant's insurance company was and then to harass London office to decline further cover. Please note Dawn Davies' (Taunton insurance agent) clear evidence as to why the victim of harassment still needs to have foreign registered cars, a blow-up doll, a selection of driving licences and more than one passport if he is to drive into South Wales.

Action 1. para 8.13 Police first observe theft of the Claimant's motor cycle, steal the number plate to frustrate owner recovery and lock up the witness (G Thomas) to it for the duration of the trial to avoid the evidence. Police stations refusing to accept witness summonses for six of the incidents.

The late evidence, unprovoked, from retired good Llantwit retired Sergeant Booker said it all.

Action 1 para 8.16, Action 2 para 1? ...Inspector Howard Davies who first pushed the Claimant into a car claiming damage and then, later, with full force of the hand slapped the Claimant across the face, the prosecuting barrister, at the time, confirming to the RCVS it was the 'first blow' and had he known he would not have defended Crown Court appeal for 'common assault' and the Claimant would still be practicing veterinary surgery (Sgt Rice, the custody officer, refusing bail).

Action 1 para 8. 18, 19, 20, 21 Police avoiding the prosecution of assailant following the Claimant being violently thrown down a flight of stairs to hospital, in full view of police, deliberately ignoring repetitive acts of criminal destruction/arson of Claimant's property.

Action 1. 8.23 Attempted police cover up of two related police incidents over the validity of claimant's car insurance, yet another collapsed prosecution hearing and police records of the whole truth, as to what was recorded, withheld with impunity.

Action 1. Para 8.26. Yet another example of 'evidence of similar fact' with vandalising of the Claimant's property, malicious prosecution, withholding of damning police records and subsequent inactivity following the usual Claimant's complaint of loss.

Action 2. Para 2 The insult that the Claimant was even suspected of being in breach the Terrorism Act and especially when dealing with the IRA who nearly shot his his brother. The London CPS prosecutor warned, in writing, by the Claimant as to exactly what to expect, the spectacular collapse of the case with the special branch officer caught perverting the course of justice by overnight fabrication of records and the hurried shredding of the documents to avoid senior management.

Action 2. Para 3 More to harass the London insurance company. Claimant found 'not guilty' of 'careless driving' but denied incident as 'evidence of similar fact' of further malicious harassment.

Action 2. Para 4 Police again altering 'pocket note book' entries after the incident is prosecuted.

Action 2. Para 5 Deliberate falsification of prosecuting facts proven when protected CPS Stoffa (blocked from attending trial) was found to have had the identity, name and address of the Claimants' workman (the speeding driver) by his photo falling out of the CPS file as Claimant had him arrested. Inspector Rice's denial of the 2 squad cars, full of police speeding to the Barry court, all five

of them bursting in to the court room at speed only to be handed the CPS file for immediate shredding.

Action 2. Para 6 Again, Barry police station records of yet another road side breath test version from one police officer, falsifying the facts in conflict with another, is obvious but release of the documentary proof of lying could affect someone else's freedom, for a change.

Action 2. Para 7 Police launch a helicopter just to establish who was 'pilot in command' when already clearly identified in controlled air space and cleared to land at a designated airfield just 5 minutes from Llantwit Major police station! Money no object. The dangerous act of flying so close, the air traffic controller (police block his witness summons) seeing the police withheld video of what was written on the Claimant's T shirt while the usual withheld radio messages, hatching the conspiracy, are quickly wiped.

Action 2. Para 8 PC Lott's PS husband and yet another fabricated 'positive' road side breath test only to be , again, zero in under 20 minutes back at Barry police station.

Action 2. Para 9 Another 'sour grapes' motoring prosecution and again police refusing to inform the Claimant of the whereabouts of his confiscated practice vehicle left unlocked on the roadside, full of dangerous drugs, for six weeks to clock up a substantial garage bill.

Action 2. Para 10 Claimant stopped by police, in his vehicle, three times in one day with the 2nd and 3rd clearly fabricated reasons to identify insurance cover, examine the two vehicle and excuse to breath test. Using the usual, straight from the training manual, unsubstantiated allegations the Claimant was, again, put at serious risk of gaining convictions for 'weaving' and 'speeding'.

Action 2. Para 11 Violent assault by police caught on overhead road camera, the video deliberately doctored to redact the officer dragging the Claimant from his vehicle, subsequent negative breath test and refusal by court to allow him to change his pleas are a similar feature in several of the awaiting civil claims, involving machine guns and assaults upon his persons, currently barred from proceeding by this same court.

Police relied on a breath test refusal in the Claimant's driver's seat but evidence or lack of it (redacted video) followed by what might or might not of happened in the police van, with prisoner deliberately left alone, unhandcuffed and back door left wide open for his police proposed 'escape'. HMC&TS and CPS conduct of the subsequent Administrative Court, Cardiff Crown Court and Cardiff magistrates court proceedings' remain vivid as appalling memories.

Action 2. Para 12 Crown court judge stopped the 'dangerous driving' jury trial as there were simply no elements, in the evidence in chief, to remotely indicate a serious motoring offence .The trial caused the jury to write (see above picture asking for the senior police officer, in the well of the court, not public gallery, to stop signalling to police under Claimant cross examination. It went further, he then admitted having to been there purely 'to monitor the evidence' for his senior officer the Claimant had already subpoenaed to deliberately expose yet another conspiracy. The usual alleged positive breath test and negative at the station, to provoke their victim to committing an arrestable offence, was again applied.

Action 2. Para 13 Public Order arrest, resulting in the police sergeant Kihlberg stating, on video, I swore at him in the street, to cause the arrest and prolonged custody, is clear by statements, evidence and of course, the retained police video available to the trial judge to hear for himself.

Action 2. Para 14.1 Two police officers, intent in setting out to do their job correctly, clearly received radio instructions to the contrary once the motorist was identified demonstrating outside Cardiff's Civil Justice Centre.

Action 2. Para 14.3 An almost identical set of circumstances occurred, as in **Action 2 Para 14.1** again substantiated on evidence, of a police officer first acting reasonably only to be interrupted by senior management radio message to harass the Claimant with a spurious 'breath test' right in the middle of busy consultations with a waiting room of clients and their animals.

Action 3 Para 4 Claimant also has vivid memory of motoring to a client, the ridiculous circumstances for an arrest, admission by the sergeant, possibly in plain clothes, walking through the Bridgend custody suite, admitting his knowing the Claimant. Evidence indicated the usual pretence earlier of no one seeming to know the Claimant despite contents of his pockets and car.

Action 3 Para 5. Claimant recalls taking his insurance documents to court, for the 35th time, for production to the South Wales Police and the very able clerk of the court, at the time, confirming with Their worships the certificate could remain in his pocket for the subsequent acquittal.

As the insurance had been proved to be valid on 34 previous occasions and at least 7 times since (before automatic confirmation off number plate came into force) why was there the need for a senior CPS officer, at the time, for only one charge before the court?

It may indicate the unlevel playing field this case has been played out on since 1993. The reason for stopping the Claimant's vehicle, in the first place with all accusations eventually quashed, when it had not been in breach of any conceivable breach of the road traffic act, again beggars belief. A regular officer with the Claimant believed him to be disqualified.

Action 3 Para 6. Yet another stopping of the Claimant on the pretext he was 'driving whilst disqualified' followed by spurious allegations of an assault or frightening the biggest South Wales police officer. Another Crown court case stopped by a judge as 'groundless.

Claimant Court exhibits in this case, consisting of his arch lever files of each and every court case since 1993, remain the documentary proof of malice should the Claimant be disbelieved.

Similarly, police record of each and every incident also remains proof of the Defendant's unusual and extreme malicious harassment of its victim but once again, as in so many damages claims against the state these court and police records, despite subject to the usual '**rules of disclosure**', are guaranteed from the very start to be, as 4th May 12 jury was told, '**unavailable**'.

Obviously any Claimant appeal, should it be appropriate, must be conducted, for his own safety, from well outside The Principality.

Maurice J Kirk BVSc

8th May 2015