

Forensic Analysis-Maurice Kirk v Royal Charter Blocks His Right to Practice as a Veterinary Surgeon

Who's to Blame? 1983 Maurice's Guernsey veterinary practice is sold, contents, building, the lot, to a stranger by mortgage holder, the Nat West Bank, conspiring with HM law officers and private lawyers in the same practice, acting for both partners unbeknown to Maurice. Reliant on the psychiatric ill health of his partner, the mortgagee, misguidedly signs a misleading side document, to the sale, that should Maurice become 'aware' of the transaction of a mere £16,000, within one year, the deal must be reversed.

Upon finding out Maurice immediately performs a '*Clamour de Haro*', ancient Normandy Law for a '*prohibitive injunction*'. In other words, all business must stop and to be immediately investigated by the island's Royal Court with compensation to the winning party.

The Highest Court? 1985 To the horror of many on the island, this law is ignored by HM Insular Authorities of this 'dependant territory of the United Kingdom'. Maurice takes it to the Judicial Committee of HM Privy Council, ultimately responsible but his 'petition' is dismissed.

Tax Haven Intrigue? Later, the Royal Court has to dissolve the original partnership contract, retrospectively, in order to prevent Maurice obtaining any alternative redress through the HM courts his sick partner and mate, having been forced to leave the island, almost penniless.

South Wales 1992 Maurice re settles in Barry, South Wales and modernises another practice to be one of only four veterinary hospitals in the whole of the Principality of Wales.

Covert police surveillance by the local South Wales Constabulary was soon detected but he could tell no one, not even his wife, for fear it would prejudice his flourishing business with surgeries, now, in both Cardiff and Llantwit Major, in the Vale of Glamorgan.

Vendetta? 2001 The police, having lost now, over one hundred and twenty criminal allegations including prison, with only a success rate of around 10%, report him to The Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons disclosing dubious confidential police records to their solicitors during an extensive inquiry including the interrogation, unbeknown to him, of many of his own clients.

Abuse of Process? 2002 The RCVS Disciplinary Committee convene a court where he was denied over well twenty relevant defence witnesses similar to prosecution ones, such as investigating police officers and eye witnesses. Throughout the trial, with not one of the four college lawyers, present, including the lead QC, correcting the obviously ill 'Legal Assessor's decisions, he being a long retired High Court judge, turning the hearing into a farce.

Where is the Relevance? Petty criminal convictions, over ten years, previously considered irrelevant, meant Maurice was not struck off for 'dishonesty', 'use and abuse of drugs' or anything to do with his patients or staff but because of his apparent '*disrespect for authority*'.

Justice? 2004 His appeal to the HM Privy Council failed save the fact that Their Lordships 'hoped' his name would be restored within the year, so why not a suspension, Maurice asks?

HM Partnership? The HM Information Commissioner refused to disclose the contemporaneous notes despite solicitors proved falsifying favourable statements before service on Defendant.

For the last three annual re instatement applications the RCVS chairman, has refused even to convene a court, contrary to the rules: **20.3 'On receipt of an application to which this Rule applies, the application shall be listed for hearing within 3 months'.**

Rule of Law or judge's discretion? 2005 Maurice has tramped the expensive route of ten or more High courts, to no avail, with different reasons given each time as to why he cannot be re instated the college knowing, full well, that should he be successful and also be elected onto college Council, he would have unfettered access to withheld inquiry records of evidence.

Our Highest Court? This month's HM Privy Council appeal, against their own Registrar refusing to do exactly what the RCVS chairman had refused, to put the application before a court of law.

Rule 22.(1) Default powers of the Privy Council, allows it to intervene. (2) ***If the Council of the College fail to comply with a direction under the foregoing subsection with respect to any function of theirs, the Privy Council may themselves discharge that function.***

Avarice? Despite the petition being primarily drafted, carrying a £30,000 bill, the solicitor refused to put his name to it, the Judicial Committee informing Maurice: ***"The application on appeal against the Registrar's decision has been considered by the board and REFUSED because the application is incompetent and is an abuse of process"***.

Cosy Relationship? One High Court judge of similar surname, to one sitting, refused his Judicial Reviews and handed down a RCVS requested two year ***Extended Civil Restraint Order***. He even instigated (see internal memos) for HM Treasury Solicitor to commence a seven year running ***Vexatious Litigant*** enquiry, to effectively ban him from any court. This caused havoc for his nineteen year running damages claims against the South Wales Police with court files lost whilst back and forth between the Cardiff Civil Justice Centre and a team of Whitehall civil servants.

A European Conspiracy? The European Commission on Human Rights has already informed Maurice that it will no longer entertain any further Applications from him concerning the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

Maurice's Advice Let this be a warning to anyone else, also seeking justice in our UK courts, for 'HM Partnership' and **Royal Charters** all contain invincible prejudice including built in immunity against either prosecution or any form of compensation for the victim.

23rd January 2011

