

It has been established that any 'victim' who is given hero status and with that massive publicity by known skills is absolutely NOT on the level. And so it is with Maurice Kirk. MK is no heroic resistor of 'HM Partnership' corruption, as he claims. He is just another bought and paid for traitorous enemy soldier.

Maurice Kirk is a long term friend of Norman Scarth, our other elderly intelligent eccentric. Both these men claim to be victims of Establishment corruption, BUT both have **failed to prove any corruption** in their **stories**. Like so many other fakes in the 'Truth Movement' both these arrogant egotists **get themselves** imprisoned for the hero worship and 'truther' celebrity status. And just like all NWO gatekeepers this pair are actually **playing** a very dirty **game**.

Far from being the quintessential, lovable eccentrics, stalwartly exposing 'HM' corruption, as we are led to believe, these two are in fact very dangerous movers and shakers in the 'truther' community and are a serious drain on the public purse.

The job of the NWO gatekeeper is to bury the truth. One of their favourite tactics is to get all of us 'truthers' contained in the 'conspiraloons' box. This way we can be mocked and dismissed. They manage this by giving massive publicity to a number of vociferous 'crazies'. Kirk plays his role admirably. Not only is he officially classed as a 'conspiracy theorist', who 'sees conspiracies under every bush' he is labelled as one who has 'extreme conspiratorial beliefs'. It is reported that he has support from **more extreme members of society**. In psychiatrist Dr Tegwyn Williams' report it is stated: "Another example of supporters of Maurice, include a forum post on a website: godlike productions – UFOs, Conspiracy Theorists, Lunatic Fringe, by "Anonymous Coward"."

Another way Kirk exposes himself as a fake 'victim' is by regularly and unashamedly making unverifiable, unproven and defamatory allegations against doctors and numerous officials of all rank within 'HM Partnership'.

His behaviour and that of all pretend 'truthers' is, by design, counterproductive to the global movement of full awakening.

Before I go any further I'll just point out once again that many of us **genuine** victims of 'HM Partnership' **know** and **have evidence of the corruption** within. However it is not entirely true to make sweeping

statements that these bodies are corrupt or that everyone in senior positions is corrupt. Of course, not everyone in a senior position of authority is a freemason and many 'senior' people probably have no experience of freemasonry. This is true of many professional people, such as doctors, of all grades. It is true to say that all these bodies are  *beholden*  to freemasonry and thus when it suits high up freemasons there will be corrupt practices within all these spheres of power and within all governments, authorities and judicial systems worldwide. Likewise this is the situation within the hierarchy of all 'watchdogs', charities, businesses, organisations etc globally. And it doesn't matter whether they are State or privately run.

Shill Queen Sabine sings from the same hymn sheet as Maurice Kirk Jerk. As is the usual pattern with Sabine, everything she gets her teeth into is twisted to such an extent that the resulting story is far removed from the truth. Let's take a look the spin from her and fellow fraudster Kirk in the 'Maurice Kirk story'. For starters on her website <http://mauricejohnkirk.wordpress.com/current-action/the-claims-and-their-particulars/> she states there are motoring incidents after which Maurice was unlawfully detained. She states there were burglaries of his surgery, where the Defendant [police] arrested and/or detained a person for this offence, but refused to prosecute or provide any details to the Plaintiff to enable him to prosecute or bring a private action for damages. She says there were incidents where the Police were found guilty in the local Magistrates Court, incidents where the Police denied facts, incidents where charges by the Police were withdrawn. She says, regarding an alleged theft of Kirk's BMW motorcycle, that the police recovered it without advising Maurice. She says there were incidents of assault and threats of further incidents by a Paul Stringer where the Police refused to take a statement of complaint or to arrest or detain or charge Paul Stringer.

Sabine states that cheeky Kirk has claims of damages, exemplary damages, special damages, costs, interest – limited to £50,000.

She also states that Kirk requests not only damages and interest, but also an order that the Defendant shall not by himself or his servants or agents harass the Claimant whether by stopping him without Legal justification whilst he drives on public roads or by requiring him without legal justification to provide breath samples or to produce documents or to attend at police stations and/or by arresting and detaining him without legal justification.

She says that Kirk is also claiming failure to investigate crimes against him, his family, surgery and law courts, in particular, the court of the RCVS, false imprisonment, conspiracy, malicious prosecution before a jury with a value up to £50,000. Also that he has a further action about duty of care, abuse of process, failed disclosure, Human Rights Act infringements. The “Particulars of Claim” include: failed ‘disclosure’ contrary to court orders, interference by Crown Prosecution Service, HM Attorney General, Mr Justice Andrew Collins and others.

See

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/SWP%208th%20May%202009%202nd%20schedule.docx.pdf> for more fairy tales - written by Kirk. Notice that he, in typical skill speak, accuses the police solicitors - Dolmans - of fantasising! Pot calling the kettle black. Kirk also gloats that “‘Cyber Space’ will eventually beat you” [Mr Oliver, senior partner]. Well actually Kirky old boy, **you** are the one who is about to be beaten and battered by ‘Cyber Space’.

That’s some of the spin from these despicable underbellies. Let’s now take a look at some facts. Let’s examine the **affidavit**, dated 25/2/2009 of defendant Barbara Wilding, the Chief Constable of South Wales Police. Incidentally Sabine says this document gave her a good laugh. Funny how she laughs at the truth! Not that we should be surprised; Sabine the evil witch finds the suffering of innocent folk funny. Well she won’t be laughing when she receives her just deserts at the hands of an awakened and enraged mass populace.

I ask you good reader to have a good read of this document and tell me how much of it you find funny. You will be absolutely disgusted at the behaviour of Maurice Kirk and the widespread suffering – mental and physical – that he has caused numerous innocent people  
<http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/11/09-02-25-chief-constable-affidavit-pdf.pdf> I comment in red.

11 ... those documents that the claimant **came to disclose as being relevant** in his **undated** list of documents, his second list of documents dated 19<sup>th</sup> January 2001 and his third list of documents dated 23 May 2003.

12. The undated list of documents prepared by the claimant also itemised a photograph and a statement of Mr Kirk regarding a fire. I am advised by Dolmans that these documents **do not relate to the pleaded incidents** and as they are not relevant they have not been itemised on the

Defendant's list of documents. Since Kirk the chronic litigant is trying to prove police corruption – malicious intent, harassment, false arrest and false imprisonment, misfeasance in a public office etc etc you'd think he would only include documents pertaining to incidents he raises issue with and that he would be specific about dates. What was the point producing an irrelevant photo and statement regarding a fire?

15. I refer to the allegation at Paragraph 8.14 of the Particulars of Claim in this action, The Claimant alleges that on 15 December 2003 he was stopped by the Police in Cardiff and with lawful excuse required to produce his motoring documents. He asserts that he produced these documents at Barry Police Station. He claims that he was thereafter maliciously charged with failing to produce the documents, He further claims that such charges were later discontinued with the prosecution offering no evidence. The Claimant has received a civil witness statement from Inspector 913 Griffiths dated 19 May 2000. I can confirm that the enquiries conducted on behalf of the Defendant have recovered no documents in respect of this **alleged incident**. I am advised by Dolmans that the **Claimant has not disclosed any documents relevant to this incident** within the three lists of documents that he has served in respect of this action. **Kirk portrays himself as this gallant warrior against establishment corruption and yet he hasn't kept/cannot produce these vital documents which he needs to prove his case in court. We can only conclude that he never had them in the first place as he's lying. What a joke. Genuine exposers of corruption keep important documents in a safe place, indefinitely. I have important documents dating back from when Melissa was a baby i.e 16+ years and those documents will not be trashed until I pop my clogs.**

16.1 refer to the allegation at Paragraph 8.20 of the Particulars of Claim. The Claimant maintains that on 24 July 1995 Paul Stringer tried to gain access to his veterinary hospital armed with a length of wood. It is alleged that the Defendant negligently refused to take any action to provide protection for the Claimant, his property or third parties. I am advised by Dolmans that **the Claimant has not disclosed any documents relevant to this incident within the three lists of documents that he has served in respect of this action.** In the police's skeleton argument [http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/10-08-18-swp\\_skeleton\\_argument.pdf](http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/10-08-18-swp_skeleton_argument.pdf) signed by Lloyd Williams QC 18<sup>th</sup> August 2010 it is stated that Inspector Griffiths carried out an investigation into this and other complaints. He found no evidence of Mr Kirk reporting such an incident, whether on the police computer network, from the IRIS messenger service or by speaking to officers. Statements have been

obtained from PC Johnson and PC James who previously dealt with Mr Kirk and Mr Stringer, but who say that they were not involved in any such incident on this date. **Why doesn't Kirk provide proof of his assertions? Quite simply because he cannot, as this and other incidents he complains of didn't happen in the way he alleges or didn't happen at all. He is a LIAR.**

17, I refer to the allegation at Paragraph 8.21 of the Particulars of Claim. The Claimant maintains that on 6 August 1995 he was attacked by Paul Stringer. It is alleged that the Defendant's officers were called and negligently refused to take any action, it is further claimed that on 7 August 1995 Paul Stringer broke windows and caused damage to the Claimant's property at 52 Tynewydd Road, Barry. It is alleged that the Defendant's officers were called and negligently refused to take any action. The Defendant had been unable to locate any documentation either recording this incident or receiving any message to attend the Claimant's property on this date. The Claimant has subsequently received a civil witness statement from Inspector 913 Griffiths dated 19 May 2000. I can confirm that the enquiries conducted on behalf of the Defendant have recovered no documents in respect of this alleged incident. I note that the Claimant has disclosed a copy of his letter to Barry police station dated 8 August 1995 concerning this incident together with a copy letter he had received from Mr Sweeney MP dated 31 August 1995. Regrettably this correspondence has not assisted in locating any documents relating to this matter and none are known to exist in the possession of South Wales Police. **This corresponding malarkey with other NWO gatekeepers, such as MPs is a typical skill tactic, to convince people that they must be genuine. As said all MPs and the overwhelming majority of senior police officers and 'high ranks' within the 'taffia mafia' will be 'in' on the pretence. Just like the Hollie Greig saga, whereby the overwhelming majority of 'high ups' within the Scottish establishment will be playing the Masonic game. The fact is, once again, Kirk has failed to provide evidence of his allegations**

Kirk says in his 'particulars of claim'

<http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/99-12-20-m-v-swp-1st-action.pdf> "On 21st July 1995 a Paul Stringer was observed breaking a window at the Plaintiff's property. Stringer then headbutted, punched and tried to throttle the Plaintiff in front of witnesses causing him injury. PC Johnson refused to take a statement of complaint or record in his note book. On return from registering the complaint, the Plaintiff discovered that the doors had been damaged as had an internal door. The Plaintiff again contacted PC Johnson who refused to take any

further action. This incident was recorded by letter to the Defendants on 21<sup>st</sup> July 1995.” Notice that Kirk doesn’t name these witnesses or provide any witness statements. Neither does he specify the injury or provide medical records. And he doesn’t provide photos of the damage. Kirk continues: “On 23<sup>rd</sup> July 1995 the police were in attendance and observed the said Paul Stringer without provocation attack the Plaintiff, throttle him and push him down stairs, as a consequence the Plaintiff was taken to hospital by ambulance. The Defendants again refused to arrest or detain or charge the said Paul Stringer.”

In the police’s skeleton argument it is stated: “There was no complaint at that time of Mr Kirk having been assaulted. The impression gained was that Mr Kirk was more interested in having Mr Stringer removed from the property, rather than initiating criminal proceedings. Later that day the officer [PC Johnson] re-attended at Mr Kirk’s surgery but Mr Kirk was not present. The officer left a message for Mr Kirk to contact him but there was no further contact between Mr Kirk and the officer.” It is also stated: “It is agreed that PC James received a radio message to attend 52 Tynewydd Rd on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 1995. He found signs of damage to the property. The officer observed Mr Stringer lift a hand to push Mr Kirk. Mr Kirk stumbled backwards, hitting a wall and then falling down a short flight of steps. The officer arranged for an ambulance to attend to take Mr Kirk to hospital. The officer then arrested Mr Stringer for assault whereupon he was taken to Barry Police Station and detained in custody. A police Surgeon attended to examine Mr Stringer. The surgeon advised that Mr Stringer was not fit to be detained. Subsequently Mr Stringer was interviewed about this matter on 13<sup>th</sup> December 1995.” It is further stated: “As the Court will observe from PC James’ statement, he made a number of attempts to try and obtain a statement from Mr Kirk so that the prosecution of Mr Stringer could be taken further. Notwithstanding numerous attempts, he was unable to contact Mr Kirk and Mr Kirk did not call into the police station to enable a statement to be made [see page 41 of the statement].”

18. I refer to the allegation at Paragraph 8.23 of the particulars of claim. The claimant maintains that in May 1995 he was stopped and detained by the Defendant's officer in Barry and required to produce his driving documents which he did. He asserts that he was maliciously charged with failing to produce and found not guilty. In the Defence it is denied that the Defendant's officers were acting maliciously. It is further pleaded that as a result of this claim the Defendant had sought enquiries to be made with the ASU Department at Cardiff which included a physical check of HORT 2 books and computer record

checks and there is no trace of the claimant producing driving documents in respect of this matter. A further check has been made with the Summons Section of the ASU with a negative result. Enquiries with the Record Station of Barry Magistrates Court, were also made, who after checking records for 1995 and January 1996 could find no trace of the Claimant having appeared before them in respect of failing to produce driving documents. Furthermore the reference "33139/A", which had been provided by the Claimant, was of no significance to either the Summons Department or the Magistrates Court. The Claimant has subsequently received a civil witness statement from Inspector 913 Griffiths dated 19 May 2000. I am advised that the Claimant subsequently disclosed a photocopy of a South Wales Constabulary photography department booking in receipt. It can be seen that the reference provided by the Claimant of "33139/A" is a reference within the photography department. I can confirm that I have been advised that further enquiries have been made with the photography department who have confirmed that the reference number provided by the Claimant relates to a different matter and is not related in any way to the Claimant. The photography department have explained that after 7 years, reference numbers are often reallocated to new matters. This might explain why this reference number now relates to a matter not involving the Claimant. In the police's skeleton argument it is stated that "Mr Kirk has not produced any documents to establish that he was in fact prosecuted for failing to produce his motoring documents" and "there is no evidence of any malice on the part of any police officer." You'd think Kirk the 'corruption buster' would not only be providing the proof of his claims but that he'd be proudly publishing it on his website too.

19. I refer to the allegation at Paragraph 8,26 of the particulars of Claim. The claimant maintains that in June 1995 the Defendant's officers purported to arrest the Claimant for illegal eviction of a tenant at a house. He asserts that the Defendant knew and/or had insufficient evidence to justify the arrest and in any event should have conferred with the Local Authority who have direct responsibility for administering the Protection Against Eviction Act 1997, He claims that his arrest and detention was unlawful. In the Defence no admissions are made. It is noted that a Request for Further and Better Particulars dated 19 June 1998 has been raised and despite a Court Order dated 22 November 1999 the request remains outstanding. The Claimant has subsequently received a civil witness statement from Inspector 913 Griffiths dated 19 May 2000. I note that Inspector 913 Griffiths confirms that he had been advised that enquiries undertaken did not reveal an arrest of Mr Kirk

during this period for the alleged incident. I am informed by Dolmans Solicitors that the now Retired Inspector Griffiths has confirmed that those enquiries would have included checking with the Custody Officer at Barry Police Station to ascertain whether Mr Kirk had been booked in at Barry Police Station during June 1995. Captor incidents would have also been checked to ascertain whether Mr Kirk had had any involvement with the Police recorded on Captor during June 1995, I am advised that Dolmans solicitors wrote to the Claimant on 18 December 2007 asking the Claimant to provide the following information in respect of this incident:

1. The date of the incident.
2. The names of any police officers who dealt with you on this occasion.
3. The name of the Police Station to which you were taken on this occasion.
4. An indication of how long you were detained on this occasion.
5. Please identify whether or not you were interviewed on this occasion,
6. Please identify whether or not you called a duty solicitor on this occasion, and if so the name of the solicitor.
7. Please identify whether or not you were charged, and if so please specify the offence(s).
8. Please identify the Magistrates Court if you were produced to the Magistrates on this occasion.

I am advised that the claimant has only confirmed that he was taken to Barry Police station. If Kirk was telling the truth he would have had no problem answering these questions and would have been only too happy to do so. I am aware that the claimant has disclosed handwritten notes relating to rent payments in respect of this alleged incident. In these circumstances, there are no further enquiries that can be undertaken. I can also confirm that the enquiries that have been conducted on behalf of the Defendant have recovered no documents in respect of this alleged incident.

In the police's skeleton argument it is stated: "As the Court may recollect, just before Christmas 2009, Mr Kirk produced a statement from Mr Gafael concerning an incident which took place in June 1995. This was not a document which had been disclosed by Mr Kirk previously. As a result of him disclosing this statement, the police were able to trace officers who had been involved with Mr Kirk in June 1995, as a result of which he was subsequently arrested in July 1995. It appears Mr Gafael was a tenant of one of Mr Kirk's properties, when as a result of a dispute between them, Mr Kirk barred the door to the flat, having already removed the possessions of Mr Gafael and his girlfriend, Miss Genner. The overall effect of the statement from Mr Gafael, is that he subsequently discovered that items in his property were broken and/or missing, and that he was holding Mr Kirk responsible for this [see Mr Gafael's statement at page 137]. PC Roach decided that there was



sufficient to raise suspicion of criminal damage. This incident is significant, in that firstly, it confirms the accuracy of Inspector Griffiths' statements when he records the efforts he made to trace some of the untraced incidents complained of by Mr Kirk. **Further it may assist the Court in assessing the accuracy of Mr Kirk's other complaints in relation to matters which are as yet untraced.** It suggests that, at the very least, Mr Kirk's recollection of events can be **materially inaccurate. Mr Kirk identified the wrong date, the wrong offence and that he was arrested by CID Officers or plain clothed officers. These various matters were repeated.**" For more on this 'witness statement', which I believe was forged by Kirk, see below.

20.I also refer to the allegation at Paragraph 8.13 of the Particulars of claim in this action. The claimant's motorcycle was allegedly stolen on 16 October 1993. The Claimant alleges that the Police recovered the motorcycle but failed to advise him. He asserts that he was told by "a third party" that the motorcycle was in the Defendant's possession and with some difficulty he was able to recover the motorcycle from the Defendant. South Wales Police had no record of the motorcycle coming into their possession. It is admitted that the vehicle was reported as stolen. The Claimant has subsequently received a civil witness statement from Inspector 913 Griffiths dated 19 May 2000, a copy of which is included in the bundle of documents. I can confirm that the enquiries conducted on behalf of the Defendant have recovered no further documents than those itemised at numbers 155 to 160 of the list of documents, namely those documents that confirm that the vehicle was reported as stolen. The enquiries conducted on behalf of the Defendant have been unable to locate any documentation which identifies that the vehicle ever came into the Defendant's possession as alleged by the Claimant. In the police's skeleton argument it is stated: "The Defendant has no evidence that the motorcycle was ever recovered, whether by the police or by anyone else. No entry has been made in the stolen vehicles book to record the fact that the motorcycle was recovered. Inspector Griffiths, who, in 1996 was called upon to investigate some of the allegations made by Mr Kirk, found that the PNC still listed the motorcycle as a stolen vehicle." **If Kirk was telling the truth he would have been more specific. For example he would have named the person who had allegedly recovered his alleged stolen motorbike. He would have stated the date that this happened and he would have stated the place that he had eventually recovered his bike from and the date on which he recovered it. He would also have had some documentation to prove his case. The fact that he can only provide vague info and cannot back up what he says with proof suggest that it is**

he who is LYING and not the police and that the police acted correctly. The lying fu\*kwad can't keep up with his own lies and his story changes in his 'BS416 159 1<sup>st</sup> Action 8.23' document. He states there that it was stolen in October 1995. Also that it was found in minutes by one of his clients... minus the bike's number plate ...

On and on it goes ... The next complaint outlined in Barbara Wilding's affidavit is that in October 1997 Kirk says he received a notice requiring him to identify the person driving his vehicle registered D821 LNY on a highway near St Nicholas, Vale of Glamorgan, which was allegedly exceeding the speed limit when photographed by a speed camera. Kirk states that he duly supplied the information required, but thereafter a police officer laid an information against him at Barry Magistrates Court relating to the alleged traffic offence. He states that he received a summons which was subsequently withdrawn at Barry Magistrates Court. Kirk asserts that this prosecution was conducted maliciously. He asserts that he arrested the CPS lawyer Mr Soffa. In the police skeleton argument it is stated: "Initially the Defendant was unable to identify this incident [see statements of evidence of Inspectors Rice and Griffiths, pages 4 and 10 respectfully]; subsequently a statement has been obtained from PC Lovell, a traffic officer who on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 1997 set up a speed detection device at St Nicholas at 12:50pm. The device registered a Maestro car index no. D821 LNY, travelling at 44mph in a 30mph area [PC Lovell's statement is at page 13 and his proforma section 9 statement is at page 17]. Mr Kirk was the registered keeper of this vehicle. Mr Kirk has consistently alleged that he informed the police on a number of occasions of the name and address of the driver [see by way of example, his unsigned and undated statement at page 19]. The documents disclosed by Mr Kirk himself however, reveal a somewhat different picture. A notice of intended prosecution was issued [see page 20] because there was then a conversation between Mr Kirk and Mrs Morse of the Central Ticket Office when Mr Kirk requested a copy of the photograph taken by the speed detection device [see letter confirming this conversation at page 21]. A copy of the photograph was sent to Mr Kirk who confirmed that he was not the driver but stated that he was unable to confirm who the driver was. So he just leaves his car available for anyone to just jump in and drive off in??? By a letter of 21<sup>st</sup> January 1998, the officer in charge of the Central Ticket Office wrote to Mr Kirk informing him that the obligation was upon him to identify the driver. By a letter of 10<sup>th</sup> March 1988 Mr Kirk informed the officer in charge that "One of my staff has suggested that the driver may have been a Mr K Fairman" [page 27]. So he still can't be specific about who the driver was. And why leave it so late to check with his staff if they knew who it

might have been? If Kirk wants to prove corruption he has to state **facts** and produce **evidence**, not give his skewed version. Kirk is not a victim of anything. He plays cat and mouse games, is a lying mischievous thug and a drain on public services. The following day, summonses were issued against Mr Kirk for speeding and alternatively for failing to identify the driver [see pages 29-32]. Somewhat **bizarrely** Mr Kirk attended Court on 27<sup>th</sup> April 1998 and pleaded guilty to the charge of speeding, but then mitigated on the basis that he was not the driver. Following adjournment the CPS considered the evidence and in **view of the poor quality photograph** decided not to proceed with either charge.

As for his assertion that he arrested the lawyer Mr Soffa for “perverting the course of justice”. What nonsense. The clown makes the ridiculous claim, stated as an **afterthought** in his ‘preliminary skeleton argument’ dated 6/9/10 i.e **13 years later**, that during the arrest “**out fell from his prosecution bundle, tucked under his arm, a ‘clear photograph’ of the claimant’s [Kirk] employee, Mr Kevin Fairman**”.

Where is Kirk’s evidence for anything he claims? You’d think he’d be gloatingly happy to publish **details** and **supporting documentation** in his particulars of claim and on his website. There is none. He talks about ‘overhead video’ footage which proves his allegations that the police have ‘malicious intent’ against him, but there are no such videos available; the videos that he does show don’t prove anything! You’d think that by now [with a number of years of *allegedly* being targeted by the ‘Cardiff cabal’] this seasoned campaigner for truth and justice [cough] would have **secret recordings as well as hard evidence** as more **proof** that what he says is true. NOPE. THERE ARE NONE.

**The theme throughout is of Kirk playing sordid games, of outright lying, of fantasising and manipulating and spinning events to paint the picture he wants us to believe;** that he’s a victim of corruption within the police and judicial system.

The next complaint covered in the Chief Constable’s affidavit is that Kirk states he was stopped on 23 January 2000 as he drove along the A4050 by a police officer and required to provide a breath sample. He asserts that there was no good reason to stop him or require him to provide a breath sample. Kirk did **not disclose any documentation** in respect of the incident. He asserts that he was first stopped on the M4 before being stopped a few minutes thereafter on A4050. He claims that on the first occasion there were two police officers who issued a vehicle rectification certificate and on the second occasion it was by a police

officer who followed him after leaving the first police car. PC Guest and PC John Wellbeloved confirm that PC Guest stopped Kirk on the A4232 on the slip road leading to the Welsh Folk Museum **because of the manner of his driving**. The officers state that they knew nothing of an earlier stop on the M4. In the police's skeleton argument it is stated: "In late afternoon/evening of 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2000 PC Guest was driving a marked police car along the A4232 when he saw a vehicle which was **weaving in the road**. The officer tried to speak to Mr Kirk through the broken window and noticed a strong smell of intoxicants and concluded it would be appropriate to breathalyse Mr Kirk. He called for assistance. Mr Kirk provided a specimen which was negative whereupon he was allowed to go on his way." **So Kirk had no reason for complaint or litigation as there is no evidence that police acted maliciously and Kirk was neither arrested, detained nor charged.**

As regards the broken window, that is covered under Action 2 – Paragraph 9. This is another incident in which Kirk alleges there was "no good reason" for police actions. It is stated in the police's skeleton argument: "In the late evening of 1<sup>st</sup> December 1999 PC Kihlberg and PC Humphries observed a BMW being driven at speeds which they estimated to be well in excess of the speed limit. They pursued the car and eventually brought it to a halt. The driver was Mr Kirk. The officers attempted to speak to Mr Kirk, but he remained **sitting in his car, ignoring the officers**. The windows were closed and all doors locked. PC Kihlberg banged on the windows in an attempt to gain the attention of Mr Kirk. After a few minutes Mr Kirk **reclined his seat and began to eat a sandwich**. Thereafter he **closed his eyes and appeared to go to sleep**. The officers were concerned, in view of the manner of his driving and his conduct at the scene that he might have been driving under the influence of alcohol. They requested assistance from PS Bohun who arrived with PC Holmes. PS Bohun gave authority for one of the windows to be broken; Mr Kirk was warned, but there was no response. Once the officers had gained entry they could smell intoxicants. Apart from **shining a torch directly into the officer's face** Mr Kirk made no response. He was arrested for failing to provide a roadside breath specimen. He **failed to respond to any questions** asked by the custody sergeant." By the early hours of next morning the breathalyser reading was zero. Kirk told the officer he had been working with methylated spirits!!! He was told he'd be reported for the offence of failing to provide a specimen of breath. He made no complaint of malicious prosecution. Kirk was convicted by magistrates on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2000. The magistrates produced written justices' reasons [p295]. He was sentenced on 2<sup>nd</sup> Jan 2001 when he was disqualified for 6 months under

the “totting-up” procedure. The disqualification was suspended pending his appeal. It is stated: “The history of the appeal in the Crown Court is long and convoluted [see the Court log at A2, Vol 4 pages 78-79]. In addition there were a number of inter-related proceedings in the Administrative Court challenging various decisions made by both the Magistrates’ Court and the Crown Court. The Appeal came on for hearing before Judge Richards on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2001. The matter then came on for trial before Mr Recorder Seys-Llewellyn on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2001 when Mr Kirk failed to attend. The Recorder dismissed the appeal. The matter came back before Mr Recorder Seys-Llewellyn on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2001 when the Court considered letters written by Mr Kirk regarding the earlier dismissal of his appeal. Mr Kirk failed to attend this hearing.”

Kirk cannot claim any corruption in the courts or that he was treated harshly, as the evidence is that all justices and magistrates behaved lawfully and moreover were lenient with him after being very patient and reasonable, allowing his numerous appeals and other litigation. [In fact they allowed the piss-taking Kirk too much reign. For example in the police skeleton argument [no 125] Kirk managed to get proceedings shifted from the Vale of Glamorgan Magistrates Court to the Bridgend Magistrates Court because he was alleging that the Lay justices were racists and therefore biased against English people!] This is despite the fact he often didn’t bother to attend court and constantly played games by withholding requested documentation, for example his motoring documents or medical certificates until a later date of his choosing. He was forever causing adjournments. During these particular proceedings he was given time to apply to reinstate his appeal as well as further suspension of the disqualification due to penalty point calculations.

It is stated in the police’s skeleton argument: “Mr Kirk had available to him a medical certificate which may have been sufficient to have excused his absence on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2001, but had consciously decided not to reveal it. Instead he disclosed that document in February 2002, apparently as a device to force the Administrative Court to allow his conviction to be reviewed.” It is further stated: “This appears to be yet another example of Mr Kirk ‘playing games’ with the legal system and either intentionally or coincidentally prolonging the proceedings. The conduct of Mr Kirk generally was the subject of adverse comment by Judge Jacobs at a hearing on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2002. It will be noted that the Judge was concerned that the way in which Mr Kirk uses and/or insures vehicles was a device employed to avoid insuring vehicles which he owned.” It is later stated: “The position in respect of driving

without insurance is interesting; indeed insurance forms something of a recurring theme throughout Action 2. Mr Kirk has conceded he has deliberately obfuscated the true position.” **Obfuscation is the name of the game in the ‘dis-info’ business.** Eventually Judge Hickinbottom allowed the appeal against sentence. But, after recalculation of penalty points, Kirk was disqualified from driving for 6 months. Of course Kirk attempted to judicially review the decision of Judge Hickinbottom, but was unsuccessful. **As for Kirk’s continual complaint that police failed in their duty of care, he has never proven that. The evidence is that police acted lawfully at all times and in this particular incident PC Kihlberg had made arrangements for Kirk’s vehicle to be safely recovered and he had notified Kirk of its whereabouts.**

So we are seeing a pattern here of **Kirk goading and provoking the police and of his false claims, game playing and continual unmerited litigation.** Here’s another example: On 2<sup>nd</sup> January 1993 PC Phillips observed a Ford Escort with a defective rear light. He issued Kirk with a Vehicle Defect Rectification document and in the absence of Kirk being able to produce his driving documents he issued him with a HORT 1. **Subsequently** Kirk produced his driving license to Barry police station. Kirk did not produce a certificate of insurance nor an MOT certificate. **Subsequently** on 11<sup>th</sup> January 1993 Kirk purported to produce an insurance document in respect of the HORT1. As it happens Kirk had not produced a relevant MOT certificate or insurance and was summonsed – on 17<sup>th</sup> February 1993. **Kirk failed to attend** the Magistrates Court and was convicted in his absence on 19<sup>th</sup> April 1993. He was sentenced on 17<sup>th</sup> May 1993 when he was disqualified from driving. Kirk then made contact with the Clerks to the Justices and put in a notice of appeal. He **then produced an insurance certificate.** The CPS thus concluded that since the vehicle was registered in Guernsey, the MOT offence could “not be proved” so the appeal was allowed and his conviction was overturned. **The police’s skeleton argument reveals that there are many more similar incidents of Kirk being uncooperative, awkward and bloody-minded and bringing his various spells of detention upon himself. There are also many different allegations from Kirk that he has been unable to substantiate with any documentation.** But it gets better. The police’s skeleton argument reveals that Kirk is a most despicable creature – an arrogant antagonistic smug lying loathsome man. He is a menace on the road – has been found **guilty of a range of motoring offences including speeding, accelerating through a red light, reckless driving and drunk driving.** For example on 4<sup>th</sup> October 1993 Kirk “**drove round and round a roundabout stopping and starting, carrying out U-turns in the road and generally causing considerable**

inconvenience and hazard to other road traffic". His antics could have caused a fatal injury to someone.

He was also proud to be piloting planes which he boasted were unsafe [see details in his psychiatrist Tegwyn Williams' report.] He is also revealed to be an obnoxious git, for example as regards an incident on 9<sup>th</sup> August 1994 [see the police's skeleton argument for the details] when Kirk was granted bail, he refused to leave his cell, as a result whereof officers had to forcibly remove him from his cell. There had been numerous attempts by various police officers, including an inspector and chief inspector and his own solicitor to get him to co-operate so that he could be bailed asap.

Also on the same day he reveals himself to be a bully when he set about retrieving his dog. Tired of waiting to speak to an enquiry clerk he went to look for the dog himself. He barged past Inspector Davies and tried to make his way into the police station that way. He was warned that it was not a public entrance and the area was to be kept secure. He was asked to leave. Kirk refused. PC Venners came to Inspector Davies' assistance and after much difficulty they were able to take Kirk out into the yard. Thereafter Kirk continued to struggle, causing the wing mirror on a car to break. He was arrested.

More evidence that he is a liar and an utter drain on public services is in the 11<sup>th</sup> February 1996 incident. Kirk had flown to Ireland in a private aeroplane without adhering to the appropriate procedures necessary for the flight. No Special Branch light aircraft form had been submitted, no flight plan had been submitted to Cardiff Intl Airport Traffic Control and no permission had been given by a Special Branch officer for the flight. Statements were obtained from various people including officers in Customs and Excise, Immigration, Special Branch and National Air Traffic Services Ltd. Kirk declined to answer questions. On re-interview on 16<sup>th</sup> April 1996 he admitted he had flown to an airfield near Dublin. He claimed he had obtained permission from a Special Branch officer but was unable to identify the officer or the time he made the call. Kirk was prosecuted and brought to trial. But he managed to get the trial adjourned and then discontinued because the prosecutor was duty bound to protect the identity of the caller who had initially provided 'anonymous' info. See letter from the Court Clerk 13<sup>th</sup> May 1997. Kirk does not provide any evidence to counter the police argument. Nor does he prove any corruption at all within any of 'HM Partnerships'.

Neither is Kirk able to prove that anything stated [here](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/wales/2015340.stm) <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/wales/2015340.stm> is not true. And considering Kirk the Jerk is fond of litigation **why doesn't he sue for libel???** It states: A vet has been kicked out of the profession for "disgraceful" conduct. Which is proven. And Sabine Spin should be thoroughly ashamed of herself to suggest that Kirk was struck off for "flimsy reasons" such as his "apparent 'disrespect for authority'." **[More on this below.]** Then again since Sabine is a shill she has no conscience and therefore no shame. A committee of professionals at the Old Bailey ruled [Kirk] was unfit to practice. Mr Kirk has been fined £25,000 since 1995 for convictions including an attack on a teenage girl. The court heard he had previously been involved in police car chases. In 1995, he was fined £500 after leaving a girl, 17, bruised following an assault. He was ordered to pay her £350 in compensation, but insisted the teenager was a burglar. What a despicable lying little man. In Dr Tegwyn Williams' report Kirk is said to have hit and kicked the victim. Kirk says that no-one had seen or heard anything [due to witness intimidation?] and that the girl was a "mental patient" and "known to be a liar and a criminal." He had another conviction in 1999 for battery and threatening behaviour and of resisting arrest. In 1996, he was caught dangerously driving animals to his practice but sped off, leaving a police officer on his knees at the roadside. He hurled abuse at police while half-naked on a local beach after being called to treat an injured dog. Mr Kirk explained he was "stripped to the waist" as he had been treating a cow with a prolapsed womb. RCVS barrister Ailson Foster said: He "ranted" in an "uncontrolled" fashion about the call-out time and the inadequacies of other agencies. "He continued shouting and his behaviour shocked and alarmed members of the public," Miss Foster added "He stormed off with the dog and it is reported they saw him roughly put the dog in the car." The barrister accused the Bristol University graduate of "a wilful refusal to comply with the law [which] casts a serious shadow on the reputation of a professional." "His disdain for lawful authority, for normal social rules reveals a lack of control that renders him unfit to practise," she said. "His taunting of the police and provocative behaviour whilst they seek to carry out their duty brings serious discredit upon the veterinary profession". "His disturbing behaviour is shocking and apparently irrationally exaggerated". Mr Kirk insisted his antics played no part in his professional life as a vet and said he would lodge an appeal. **So the idiot admits he behaves badly, not giving a damn about anyone but himself.**

If you want to read some comments from **people who know him**, take a look here <http://www.pprune.org/archive/index.php/t-195184.html>



Comments range from “Extremely dangerous and a complete nutter” to “This is the second time he has tried this. He landed within 10 yards of four players. What he did was very stupid and irresponsible. He should be reported to the Civil Aviation Authority.”

More evidence [if it were needed] of the foul Kirk bullshitting lying and spinning, patronizing and threatening can be seen in this **video** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n01xm42mRP4> whereby Kirk is being interviewed at Barry police station on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2013. He claims that he has to use shock tactics, saying that police psychiatrist Tegwyn Williams [who he has a **million pounds damages claim** against] needs his **house burning down** “to get the police to take this matter seriously”, that he’s paid someone to find out where Tegwyn lives and that “if I do that it will wake these buggers up”. He says he’s exhausted all avenues... Referring to a police officer he patronizingly says that he knew he’d be arrested “it was written over her pretty face”. Later the arrogant pig tells officer Sinead his d.o.b is 12345 [this is a favourite game of his as is evidenced in the police’s skeleton argument]. He says “I’ve been banned from 4 GP surgeries. They threaten to call police”. **Who can blame them!** He says “they’ve all closed ranks cos they know that Tegwn Williams under the orders of the chief constable of SW police says we’re going to lose this machine gun case and get him sectioned to Ashworth”. He says he’s been subjected to the stench of corruption for 20 years. **The stench is coming from his lying mouth.** He drops himself in it telling officer Sinead **it isn’t urgent**. The interviewing officer reminds him that he’d alleged that the reason he’d phoned police making vile threats was because he was desperate to speak to a policeman to “get this taken seriously”. When confronted [the PC asks “so if it wasn’t that urgent why have you used those words which you knew would provoke something”] Kirk says he **doesn’t know**. The interviewer asks if it would be fair to say that by telling the police what he did there’s a chance it would get back to Tegwyn Williams ...

Further evidence of Kirk’s nasty and bloody-minded streak is revealed here

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Tape%20record\(1\)%2022\\_06\\_09.pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Tape%20record(1)%2022_06_09.pdf)

And here

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Privy%20Council%20Judgment%2019th%20Jan%2004.pdf> where he is convicted under the Public Order Act for threatening Clare Brown, a CPS representative in court, saying: "If you don't stop

being obstructive I will turn you upside down and use you like a moneybox.”

So too is evidence of him [putting it crudely] being up his own ass [he says that his website has many thousand dedicated readers each month! Yeah right d\*ck head, dream on.] Here [file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/09%2006%2019%20SWP%20Witness%20Statement%20of%20Maurice%20John%20Kirk%20final%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/09%2006%2019%20SWP%20Witness%20Statement%20of%20Maurice%20John%20Kirk%20final%20(1).pdf) the jumped-up loathsome little man says: “I would watch with amusement as the spineless or so I thought early on, would scurry away trying not to look at me straight in the eye. I later found out that well meaning reporters were gagged by the enemy.” And he lies again when he says, “High Court judges quickly had the website closed down, until I set up again ‘offshore’.”

Judges do not get sites closed; masons do. But they don't close sites like Kirk's down. He is a very valuable asset. Neither do you need to go 'offshore' for a web host, you go to an independent host [not a company], preferably a 'tech wizard' who is not intimidated by cyber libel threats.

The only people targeted by the 'enemy' are those who are the real opposition and who suffer for it. Fakes like Kirk don't suffer any hardship. They get rewards, hero-worship and Masonic protection. How much wealth has Kirk been allowed to keep, albeit under the names of his children? Has he actually coughed up any of the monies he's been ordered to by the courts? I doubt it.

More of his nonsense is evidenced here [file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Tape%20record\(4\)%2023\\_06\\_09.pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Tape%20record(4)%2023_06_09.pdf) The clown also threatens to lob his court witness statements, attached to a brick, through Dolmans solicitors' window.

Mrs Pat Braybrooks agrees that he has his head up his ass. In her letter to Dr Tegwyn Williams <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/MJK1Sept09Braybrook%20Report.pdf> she describes his 'statements' as diatribe, thinks he is a paranoid and grandiose man with

underlying psychosis and she wonders if there's something of a 'folie a deux' with the wife.

Of course all of this puts paid to the shill dream team's ridiculous and outrageous claims that "some 130 cases won by him, while the Police only won 12." Kirk with encouragement and support from his cronies has simply been taking the piss out of 'HM Partnership' for over 2 decades. He shamelessly makes things up or wildly distorts whatever truth there was in the first place of various incidents [which he deliberately brings upon himself] for the sake of unwarranted litigation against all sorts of officials which he makes sure leads to even more unjustified court actions. For example Kirk would seek to appeal a conviction but was often refused; he would then try to appeal/challenge that decision, perhaps by way of a judicial review. Quite often he would challenge the decision of various courts which stemmed from one incident. An example of this is in the police's skeleton argument [no 210]. I quote, "Notwithstanding the fact that he had pleaded guilty to the offences, Mr Kirk attempted to vacate his guilty pleas and enter not guilty pleas. On the 18<sup>th</sup> September 2000 the Cardiff magistrates refused to allow Mr Kirk to re-open his pleas, whereupon Mr Kirk issued an application for judicial review. Mr Kirk's application for judicial review was dismissed by the single Judge. He renewed his application and the matter was considered by the Administrative Court on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2001. It appears that Mr Kirk made a third attempt at judicial review. Mr Kirk sought to appeal his convictions in relation to this matter as well as appealing sentence. Mr Kirk sought to persuade Judge Hickinbottom to reconsider an application to appeal out of time. Notwithstanding the failed judicial reviews and appeals Mr Kirk wrote to the Cardiff Magistrates Court and sought to persuade it to re-open his pleas of guilty to these offences. On May 20<sup>th</sup> 2002 District Judge Watkins decided to set aside the conviction for no insurance and allowed Mr Kirk to change his plea, following which presumably having produced a certificate of insurance at a later date out of the required time frame a not guilty verdict was entered. Confirmation of the action of the Stipendiary Magistrate can be found in a letter of 20<sup>th</sup> May 2002. Having successfully re-opened his plea on that matter, he then sought to set aside his pleas in respect of the remaining three matters. On 21<sup>st</sup> May 2002 Mr Kirk finally produced to the CPS a valid MOT certificate. Further Mr Kirk confirmed to the CPS that he had previously produced a medical certificate which purported to excuse his wearing of a seat belt. The CPS having considered the matter, took the decision not to resist the matter being reconsidered by the Magistrates Court." So on that basis his conviction was set aside. This is all on top of the situation

which we all know occurs in cases concerning numerous other criminals whereby there are umpteen arrests and charges by police, only to be dropped by the CPS or magistrates for a variety of reasons. To add insult to injury the pompous pr\*\*k Kirk often didn't bother to show up at the numerous court actions he'd instigated. This is the smug git's dirty **game** which the sad f\*ck has been playing for some 20 years or more. He's been doing it for so long he's convinced himself, with some egging on by his tin hat McKenzie friends, that his actions are admirable and totally justified. Nothing could be further from the truth. This constant litigation is another sign that someone is a C/O agent, as all of it is devoid of any merit and is costing the likes of us UNTOLD MILLIONS, but more importantly it is costing us genuine 'truthers' our collective credibility. But that's the job of these despicable pretenders. The likes of Kirk just keep on serving their Satanic masters, enjoying all the attention and admiration it brings; safe in the knowledge that their dirty little secret will never be known. Well that's what they think. They are totally oblivious to **God's** plan.

Another example of Kirk antagonising and inviting arrest and with that the desired litigation is in the skeleton argument no 233. I quote: "On 8<sup>th</sup> September 2000 constables Kihlberg and Holmes were on motor patrol duty in a marked police vehicle, driving slowly along Church Street Llantwit Major, when, as they passed Mr Kirk, who was standing on the pavement, he made a v-sign gesture at PC Kihlberg. Kirk shouted that the officer was a "skunk". The officer arrested Mr Kirk for a public order offence. Mr Kirk said "you're a fucking bastard". Mr Kirk resisted being taken into custody. A struggle took place. Mr Kirk was handcuffed and taken to Barry Police Station. Mr Kirk was unresponsive to the custody sergeant and when called to be charged, he refused to go, saying he wished to make a statement. When an officer became available Mr Kirk refused to make a statement. He was non-compliant, refusing to allow fingerprints to be taken. Mr Kirk had been charged with using threatening or insulting words and behaviour. The charge was discontinued on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2000; the reason was that it would not be in the public interest to proceed. PC Kihlberg had been led to believe that because it was a relatively minor offence to prosecute would take up too much in time and resources. Mr Kirk the cheeky bas\*\*\*d attempted to have PC Kihlberg prosecuted for perjury but the CPS declined to prosecute." More on this below..

In another example, not only is it clear that Kirk is constantly asking for trouble with the authorities in order to trigger his much loved litigation, but when he is indulged he either becomes contemptibly awkward or

**beligerant or both.** On 19<sup>th</sup> August 1998 retired inspector Howard Davies was subjected to **unpleasant abuse** from Mr Kirk. 2 security guards – Mr Simon Turner and Mr Bryan Williams **attempted to calm** Kirk. They were unsuccessful. Kirk showed every sign of attempting to **follow Mr Davies** as the latter walked away from the confrontation. Police officers Inspector Patterson and PC Walters received a complaint from Mr Turner that he had **been assaulted by Kirk**. PC Walters warned Kirk about his conduct and **asked him to leave** the show. He **refused**. After receiving a further warning, he was **arrested in order to prevent a further breach of the peace**. He was placed in a police car but later **refused to move** from it into a police van. During resistance he **turned violent and delivered various blows and kicks** to the officers. Officers had to use **CS spray** on him. **And Kirk claims in his 'particulars of claim' 13/6/2002 2.3 that "the Defendant maliciously and without reasonable or probable cause, arrested the Claimant for breach of the Peace"!!!** He was **prosecuted on using threatening, abusive or insulting words, common assault on Mr Turner and resisting arrest**. Kirk was **convicted of all offences**. He sought to appeal them. He raised an abuse of process argument against the Crown. Judge Gaskell dismissed that argument. Kirk then alleged a conspiracy of representatives of the CPS and Clerks to the various Magistrates courts. Kirk sought to **issue summonses against representatives of the CPS for their alleged attempt to pervert the course of justice/conspiracy**. Judge Watkins dismissed the summonses. Kirk **sought to judicially review the decision** of Judge Gaskell but his application was dismissed. Kirk **sought to take that matter further and the matter was considered again by the divisional court** on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2001 when Kirk's applications were again dismissed. Having resolved the abuse of process argument, the **appeal was then heard by the Recorder of Cardiff, over a number of days**, culminating in a judgment given by him on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2000. The appeal of both conviction and sentence was dismissed. **See below for more.**

And on and on the nonsense continues ... all paid for by you and me the dutiful taxpayers.

And now onto more of Kirk's *allegations*; this time of *alleged* theft, of which YET AGAIN there is no evidence and where YET AGAIN the **evidence** points to Kirk lying, of making things up and of getting others to lie for him. On 19<sup>th</sup> September 2001 police received a complaint from Kirk that cheques belonging to his veterinary practice had been stolen and then cashed at Cash Generators. Kirk told PC Dilworth that **5 cheques** made out to Adam Baker, a **former employee** of Kirk's were missing. **CCTV footage showed that the person** who had cashed the

last cheque at Cash Generators was Mr Baker. Baker was known to the shop manager Mr Shaft who made a positive identification. PC Dilworth obtained still photos from the CCTV film. It is stated: "PC Dilworth showed the photographs to Mr Kirk and members of his staff.

Somewhat surprisingly, in light of Mr Shaft's very positive identification of Mr Baker neither Mr Kirk nor his staff were able to make a positive identification of the person cashing the cheque." Kirk's staff had obviously been persuaded by Kirk to go along with the lie about stolen cheques. Baker was obviously in on it too and must've been persuaded by the odious Kirk to go along with the scam, as he went into hiding!

The officer made thorough address searches and eventually found, via Mr Shaft, an address for Baker at Windsor Road, Barry. However despite calling there numerous times, there was no reply. It would appear that Baker's father [who was also resident at that address] had also been persuaded to lie for Kirk as he eventually spoke to the officer and told her that he had thrown Baker out of the premises some weeks before. There was no forwarding address and checks for Baker on a benefits/housing list drew a blank. On 6<sup>th</sup> November 2001 the officer circulated Mr Baker on the PNC as wanted in relation to these matters. 'And Kirk claims in his 'particulars' 3.2 that "The Defendant failed to interview and/or properly investigate". Utterly loathsome LIAR.

Kirk changes his story in his 'preliminary skeleton argument' dated 6/9/10. He says that two of his employees were thieves and that they stole "some £1,500, about three cheques in total". He doesn't mention any monetary value until 2010 i.e. 9 years later. He says that the police told him that "the likely offenders could not be traced". No they didn't, PC Dilworth was only looking for one offender. Kirk says he saw "the other one a few months ago outside his own house in Tynewydd Road, Barry but he escaped." If Kirk had told PC Dilworth about this other thief he might have been investigated. Why doesn't Kirk name this other thief, since he knows him as he is an ex employee? Kirk Lie Alot continues his nonsense BS, saying that he identified Mr Baker only this week in Barry post office carrying out complex time consuming transactions. There was no police officer and attempts to follow him with the claimant on crutches ... meant he also escaped an arrest. Well he didn't need to follow him; he could've just waited for him outside the post office and immobilised him with his walking stick, until police arrived to arrest him. And since we know Kirk happily goes around assaulting and battering people he could've also visited the other thief at his house and delivered sweet justice. In fact his track record shows that that is exactly what Kirk would have done to anyone if it was true that someone had stolen from him. So both appear to still live in the area

and neither has been arrested.” He continues: “The claimant, therefore, witnessing the thief’s **current identity?** was most likely being recorded by the lady at the counter and who knew the claimant or later did, **offered her £1000 for the information.** Regretfully, the lady declined.” **Yeah right, course he offered money for info!!! What info did he need??? He knows who the two thieves are, and he knows where one of them lives. F ... off with your outrageous LIES Maurice Kirk.**

More of Kirk’s disgusting behaviour is discussed here

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/B20090055%20-%20KIRK%20-%20PROCEEDINGS%20-%2025%2006%2009>.

... assaulting police on numerous occasions, drunk and disorderly, drunk flying an aircraft, damaging an aircraft liable for forfeiture, walking on the motorway, flying an unregistered aircraft over the UK, contempt of court in Guernsey in 1984. January 1989, assault police, four occasions, Guernsey ...

Of all Kirk’s claims of unlawful arrest, abuse of process, failings in duty of care or of any wrongdoing by any police officer or any official, he has **failed to prove** any. In fact they would have been failing in their public duty if they *hadn’t* acted in the way they did. I’d love to know how much this joker Kirk costs you and I the taxpayer, and on top of that what his reward is from the Masonic hierarchy for the wonderful work he does furthering the NWO. He must be being paid extremely well, after all it’s his full time ‘job’. He has nothing better to do with his time. This clever clown has been having a right laugh at our expense. And some people have suffered severe mental and physical abuse at the hands of this lying evil thug.

**People FFS ENOUGH of this fu\*king act by these evil pretenders - Kirk and his fellow criminal **actors** – his shill queen Sabine, no-balls Butlincat and others – Before It’s News, British Constitution Group, International Men’s Organization, UK Column, Escapee’s blog, Indymedia UK, TruthWars, Virtual World, Centurean, Inquiring Minds, Christopher Booker, Norman Scarth [another chronic litigant **pretender**] ... Folks WAKE UP and see these utterly ugly insidious vermin for what they really are. Kirk alone must be costing us MILIONS. In the police’s skeleton argument it is stated, “For whatever reason, Mr Kirk appears to take delight in baiting authority in general, and the police in particular.” Well the reason is simple, **Kirk is just another filthy agent and he’s not acting alone, despite us being given that impression. The likes of Kirk****

would not get away with all their abhorrent 'games' if they weren't under the control and protection of the Masonic high ups. Just you try behaving like Kirk and see how far you get. **THESE ARE THE 'PEOPLE' WE NEED TO EXPOSE.** If that doesn't happen then it's game over; we might as well lie down and let the NWO slave masters do their worst.

Remember the real power is in the secret societies; freemasonry being the largest and the one which directly affects us - Joe Public. We collectively must expose the NWO gatekeepers and their Masonic puppeteers. Anything that happens – whether good or bad - within any sphere of power, wherever in the world is due to Masonic influence i.e. *they* decide all policy, *they* decide when and where they start wars/uprisings etc and the ultimate outcome of events, *they* decide who they target and why, *they* decide the outcome of all litigation, *they* decide *everything*. **PUT SIMPLY ALL BODIES OF AUTHORITY AND ALL AREAS OF AUTHORITY ARE PLAYED BY THE SAME MASONIC HAND.** Hence it is not true to make blanket statements, such as 'the police are corrupt' [or that the government or any of 'HM Partnerships' are] because wrongdoing and cover up within any area of power only occurs when *high level Masons* [or other secret society high ups] decide it. **When you realise that the same hand plays all sides, it's easy to see how the deception, on such an unimaginable scale, occurs.**

Let's now look at the lying loathsome Kirk's allegations re **losing his veterinary license**. In his '**Particulars of Claim**' in his 'Fourth Action' dated 24/10/07 <http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/07-11-28-m-v-swp-4th-action.pdf> on pages 9 &10 it is stated that by 2001 the police had been made aware of the complaints directed to the RCVS by the 'Cardiff and District Veterinary Practitioner's Association' concerning the widespread animal suffering in South Wales caused by the police's 'donations' of public funds to an autonomous run charity implementing a rogue policy for the neutering of animals. It is stated: "Implications on the *other Barry veterinary practice* were not then apparent to [Kirk] as he had no way of knowing just who was responsible for the appalling state of the wretched animal." Also: "The [police] knew and were negligent in being silent when the RCVS ruled that failure by [Kirk] to divulge to the disciplinary committee the confidential client information regarding the 2 dogs, between veterinary surgeon and the SW police was the **substantive reason for his name being removed from the register.**" Also: "When the RCVS realised they were **prosecuting the wrong veterinary surgeon** they: 1) Falsified eye witness statements, 2) Gave [Kirk] false addresses of eye witnesses so



they could not be traced 3) Withheld witness statements 4) Refused all 30 odd witness summonses needed to be served on behalf of [Kirk] 5) Used their cronies in the Court of Appeal to block them again even blocking defence witnesses not even objecting to giving evidence or requiring a witness summons 6) fabricated the [police], members of the public and investigators to be their clients, in order to block both favourable and damning DISCLOSURE.” And: “The [police] were notified of this unnecessary animal suffering. It was spelt out in words of one syllable to the [police] and RCVS warning them of the obvious consequences if the wide spread animal suffering in the area was allowed to continue. It was **taped, photographed** and shortly to go on new website ...” **Notice no ‘witness’ names or addresses are provided, that the taped, photographed ‘evidence’ isn’t on Kirk’s site, also that the name of the vet that, according to the spin merchants, *should* have been prosecuted instead, is not given!**

**Folks these are truly outrageous LIES being propagated by the downright despicable pair Kirk and McNeill. Here are some more wild claims from these skills:** “Information under the control of Inspector Collins and favourable to [Kirk] was withheld from the RCVS legal proceedings. The conduct was unlawful.” Also: “Information supplied by the [police] and used on oath were known by the [police] to have been false. Failure to correct these anomalies was unlawful.” And: “The [police] knew the RCVS 'Learned Legal Assessor', Sir John Wood, retired medically unfit judge, Allison Foster QC, Geoffrey Hudson of Penningtons solicitors and many other lawyers cited in these 4 actions were thoroughly deceitful and their conduct was unlawful.”

In Maurice Kirk – MAPPA Reports @ Caswell Clinic  
<http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/10-09-30-gerald-quernsey.pdf> on p9 **we see that Kirk had 18 years of warnings to pull his finger out and behave himself, before he was finally struck off the register of veterinary surgeons in 2002.** He was first summoned to a disciplinary hearing at the RCVS in **1984** in connection with his conviction dated **1978 – ABH**. The issue was that the conviction was of a nature to bring the veterinary profession into disrepute. Kirk was issued with a warning. In **1988** there was a similar hearing where he was told, “Your conduct has brought your chosen profession into the gravest disrepute” and warned that “your prospects of being able to remain a member of this profession depend upon your own behaviour hereafter.” Another four convictions occurred between 1995 and 2000. Kirk was considered unfit to practice as a veterinary surgeon on the basis of any one or more of the convictions listed. Kirk appealed in 2004

but the decision was upheld. Lord Hoffman of the Lords of the Judicial Committee stated amongst other things that Kirk is “abrasive with animal owners and abusive – sometimes violent – towards any of the substantial number of people who he regards as enemies of justice.” Also that, “a long series of incidents have brought Mr Kirk into conflict with the law. They have also produced a succession of complaints to the RVC ... Now the college has had enough.” See <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Privy%20Council%20Judgment%2019th%20Jan%202004.pdf> for more details showing just how truly despicable this lying thug Maurice Kirk actually is. And this is the person who sad sick Sabine sucks up to and considers a ‘hero’. Jeesh!

Cheeky Kirky tries to **twist and spin** every sentence spoken by employees within ‘HM Partnership’ to give him ‘justification’ to trigger more litigation. It doesn’t matter the rank of employee – no-one escapes this time-wasting trouble-maker. In his ‘Statement of Case’ he focuses on an “Extract from Privy Council Appeal Judgement 19<sup>th</sup> January 2004 – But their Lordships permit themselves to hope Mr Kirk may yet be persuaded to offer **undertakings** to the committee which will enable him to be restored to the register ...” He says: “Mr Justice Collins erred in that on each of the 3 applications before him circumstances completely changed ... making ‘merit’ for each application even the more profound. 1] 1<sup>st</sup> refusal was without any demands required of the College for ‘undertakings’ to be offered by Mr Kirk. 2] Second refusal concluded with yet another confusing version as to what Mr Kirk had been struck off for in the first place with ‘demands’/‘grounds’/‘undertakings’ required of him written by Penningtons solicitors which were manifestly unlawful and plainly blackmail. 3] 3<sup>rd</sup> refusal was obtained now by alternative pre written ‘undertakings’ on offer by the Legal Assessor.”

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/ECRO%20Abuse%20of%20Process%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/ECRO%20Abuse%20of%20Process%20(1).pdf)

He makes claims that ‘**The Royal Prerogative** – The Queen and Her agents can do no wrong’ protect the RCVS from prosecution and all the other ‘players’ who he says are conspiring against him. Sabine says: “Royal charters: the ticket to Immunity from Prosecution”.

<http://mauricejohnkirk.wordpress.com/the-deeper-issues/hm-partnership/royal-charters-the-ticket-to-immunity-from-prosecution/>

Well the fact is it is only the Queen herself and other senior Royals who are immune from prosecution and that is because of her powerful position as Head of the ‘The Committee of 300’, the ultimate secret

society of untouchables. So when these dis-info agents make blanket statements that 'HM Partnership' are immune from prosecution, they're talking BS, because if high level masons decide that they want to 'bring down' a high ranking police officer or judge, for example, they can and they will. Even the Lord Chief Justice himself can be persuaded to 'stand down' if the brotherhood so desire.

Peningtons Solicitors for the RCVS reply here

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/RCVS%20JR%20Submissions%2011th%20Feb%202008%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/RCVS%20JR%20Submissions%2011th%20Feb%202008%20(2).pdf) and

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/RCVS%206th%20Refusal%2024th%20Oct%202008.pdf>

stressing repeatedly, the need for Kirk to concentrate on **relevant** matters only. They say, "It is an abuse of process and a **disproportionate use of resources** for you to request that irrelevant matters be considered and re-considered in this way." See also their 'Submissions' dated 11/2/08 here

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/RCVS%20JR%20Submissions%2011th%20Feb%202008%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/RCVS%20JR%20Submissions%2011th%20Feb%202008%20(1).pdf)

Their point number 2 is noteworthy:

The order was made in proceedings CO/734/2005 and provided that Mr Kirk be restrained from issuing claims or making applications "concerning any matter involving or relating to or touching upon or leading to the proceedings in which this order is made" without the consent of Collins J. Back in July 2003 it is reiterated in these minutes <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/HM%20Attorney%20General%20Steps%20In.pdf> that Kirk's constant court actions are completely lacking in merit. It is stated: There are already 36 applications for JR all of which are **devoid of merit and none of which enjoyed any success**. Collins J has made some caustic remarks as to some of these applications. However, I suspect that the picture is much broader and grimmer. Further enquiries could and should be made of/to all the relevant defendants, the courts especially, as to documents in all the civil and criminal matters in which Kirk has been involved. A remark by Justice Collins that, "This and other applications merely [and are, it seems, intended to] delay the appeals which should now be determined" leads me to suspect that Kirk is **vexatious in litigation in all possible arenas**.

Mickey taking Kirkey remarks that 'Merit' should have been awarded him for his "attempting their Lordships' wishes". If Kirk's antics didn't carry such grave implications he and his story would be frikkin hilarious. Read on. When you get your head around all this you too will be pulling your hair out. This guy really does take the f...ing biscuit.

The creep even says the RCVS asked for his second ECRO [Extended Civil Restraint Order] which he received in June 2009; his first ECRO was issued in 2006 which lasted 2 years. It is an order that prevents Kirk pursuing any legal action without going through the High Court first. Kirk claims the RCVS lawyers acted to restrict his applications for disclosure, stating that it adds further weight to proof of conspiracy. Kirky boy the only people conspiring here is YOU and your fellow filthy NWO troll team. You deserve more than an ECRO for polluting the courts for 20+ years with your sleazy games. Sick b\*\*stard.

Kirk complains that the "RCVS continued to ignore Court Orders to disclose their handwritten records, similar to police note books, of the original interviews of potential witnesses between 2000/2004, many now traced and favourable to Mr Kirk." Notice that he doesn't name these alleged favourable witnesses and he doesn't have their testimonies proudly published on his site! See this court transcript <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/RCVS%20%20JR%20%2016th%20June%2008%205th%20Refusal.pdf> whereby Ms Morris of Penningtons on behalf of the RCVS points out: "There never has been an order for disclosure of any kind against the College. It has been a **theme of Mr Kirk's litigation against the College that there has been an order for disclosure.** None of the individuals who have considered **this issue of disclosure take the view that there is any document to which Mr Kirk is entitled which he has not had**, and no one has ordered the College to make disclosure. There is an issue that has been considered by the Privy Council, McCombe J. You name the judicial body, and it has thought about it, and none has made an order for disclosure." This is after **Mr Justice Lloyd Jones constantly had to press Kirk to tell him where the orders were for disclosure.** After Kirk tried to say that the order for disclosure "is here in 66", the judge replied that it wasn't, that it "simply asks you to put in a list". Finally the judge reprimanded Kirk, saying: "You are changing your grounds. You are saying that the complaint is that they have not made an order, rather than failed to comply with it." More on Kirk's constant complaint of lack of 'disclosure' below.

And now on to Sabine's '**Chronology of Collusion**' taken from her 'Forensic Analysis – Maurice Kirk: Royal Charter Blocks His Right to Practice as a Veterinary Surgeon' and from here:

<https://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=Chronology+of+Collusion+REDACTED.docx> Some of the following has already been addressed; where that's not the case, I comment in red.

**1993** Crown Court ignored Witness Affidavit recording police at Magistrates Court saying "*We will get the bastard talking human rights.*" **What's the name of the witness and where's the recording?**

**1993** Magistrates sent me to prison until **Police identified me**. **Utter tosh.**

**1997** Crown Court ignored the CPS Barrister who summed up in his letter to the RCVS (Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons) of CPS/ Police / HM Court Service (Wales) conspiracy to alter or withhold documents **Where's this letter and what's the name of the barrister?**

**1998** Crown Court ignored Jury complaining of senior police officer signalling to each of his mates during their cross examination **Name these jurors and provide the evidence i.e. letters of complaint, statements ...**

**1999** CPS ignored proven Police conspiracy **No police conspiracy has been proven by Kirk**, on oath, to frame me under the Terrorism Act, of flying my aircraft to Southern Ireland

**2001** Current trial judge, in my damages claim, acting then as Crown Court judge, ignored my GP and surgeon's medical reports that I was unable to attend court, dismissing my motoring appeal and later, in 2010, dismissing it as part of my civil claim

**2001** Magistrates had to dismiss all charges, but ignore the fact that all four Police motoring allegations were fabricated. **Kirk has provided no evidence that police fabricated anything.**

**2001 [Vendetta?]** 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. **Kirk's criminal behaviour and numerous convictions are public knowledge. There is nothing confidential or 'dubious'.**

**2002 [Abuse of Process?]** 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. **This 'being denied' anonymous 'witnesses' old chestnut is used repeatedly by fake 'victims' to garner credibility. I recall Norman Scarth using the same tactic; and, for years, trusting old me fell for it, hook line and sinker. Notice the typical shill discrediting tactics and baseless allegations. As for a farce, Kirk is the one turning everything into a farce; and there is an overwhelming amount of evidence of that.**

**2003** County Court manager's clandestine activities **???** refuse my barrister sight of court files **what files?**, sending and losing some of my 130 files to HM Solicitor General's Office in Whitehall **Evidence?**, attempting to have me registered as vexatious litigant. **More on that here**  
<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/HM%20Conspiracy.pdf> **Kirk, you absolutely deserve that status you vile little man.** County Court staff later leak internal memos as proof that the investigation continued for at least 5 years. **Publish these memos.**

**2004** County Court appeal, heard in Swansea, refused me a Jury Trial for damages claim. **Not content with being a continual drain on the public purse you want to add insult to injury by trying to claim 'damages'. You insolent disgusting little man.** I'm refused a Jury for any combination of the 35 police incidents in the first three of my eight civil actions for damages. Appeal was heard by an earlier judge in 1987, in the civil proceedings, just to keep it in the family. **The justices have tolerated you for far too long. Go and crawl into a hole and take your comic website and your gang of McKenzie liars with you.**

**2005** County Court refuses to order Police disclosure of relevant incident numbers (I'd lost them) of around 100 Police Officers on their PNC (Police National Computer). **If you were genuinely exposing establishment corruption you would have all the evidence you need. Why don't you ask your fellow spin Queen Sabine to store copies of your important stuff?**

**2005 [Rule of Law or judge's discretion?]** 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. **The expense has been ours – the unsuspecting law abiding taxpayers. Kirk already has access to those 'records of evidence'; he chooses not to reveal them to us as they will reveal the truth, which is not compatible with his perversion of it.**

**2008** County Court refuses me access to Court building, unless in Court hearing. **There's no reason for you to be there at any other time, you clown. Anyway the reason you are banned can be found in the letter from Her Maj's Court Services dated 26/7/10**

<http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/blogs/legal/default.aspx> **2/5 of the way down. I**

**quote:** "I have been made aware by my staff that you have been communicating with them over a number of years. I am concerned at the amount of time that they are spending in dealing with you, particularly because visits from you are frequent, lengthy and distressing. On some occasions this has resulted in you having to be removed from the court building because your behaviour towards court staff has been derogatory, abusive and threatening. On 12/10/07 you proceeded to **light and smoke a cigar** within the court building. This incident resulted in **wasted time being placed upon the emergency services** to attend the court. On 16/7/10 you **brought a knife with you** into Cardiff Civil Justice centre which was confiscated. When you attended court to collect your knife you tried to serve documents on the Administrative Court by giving them to a security officer. You attended at the Crown Court on 26<sup>th</sup> July and was aggressive, abusive and allegedly assaulted a member of staff." County Court allows Police to continue withholding identity of now 150 Police Officers in some 70 incidents, all subject to litigation for damages. **You have no grounds whatsoever for any litigation against the police or any of 'HM Partnership'. If you were genuine you would already know the identity of everyone you allege is corrupt. People are starting to see through you Maurice Kirk and are taking the piss out of you now; just so's you know. As for damages, you'll be damaged – severely – when folk en masse wake up to the truth about skunks like you.**

**2009** Magistrates refuse 'due process' **magistrates have humoured you for far too long** of my private prosecution, following Chief Constable's **false you have not proven it is 'false'; there is no evidence it is 'false'** sworn Affidavit stating she was 'unaware' of Police break-in to my

veterinary surgery, identification of Police at 35 recorded incidents and Magistrates hearings, all supporting the evidence of a conspiracy to pervert the Course of Justice. **The only person perverting anything here is YOU and Sabine Lie Alot and the rest of your McKenzie Mafia.**

**2009** Crown Court, HM Court Service and CPS all withhold prior knowledge of MAPPA conspiracy, weeks before my June arrest for being in possession of a machine gun that Police were aware their conduct was likely to get me shot. This was later confirmed by MAPPA minutes leaked from Caswell Clinic, Psychiatric Prison, Bridgend. **You're talking tommyrot again Kirk.**

**2009** 60th law firm refused to represent me, while Crown Court judges tried to get me to employ their laundered variety of independent legal representation. **More tosh. Kirk was repeatedly offered FREE legal representation of HIS choosing. He preferred to be a LIP. Read on.**

**2009** Nine Crown Court judges knew or should have known, when refusing bail, that the Police forensic history was false and had employed a rogue Dr [REDACTED] to falsify a psychiatric report without patient examination and later stating I had 'significant brain damage' and possibly brain tumour with neither qualification or evidence. **More on this below.**

**2009/10** Successive Crown Court judges deliberately ignored my applications for proper disclosure which would have shown Police painted the 'machine gun' a different colour to fool the Jury, leaving me to cause the Jury to ask "Just how many machine guns feature in this case?" **See below.**

**2009** During my custody, my trial judge for civil action hands down a £50,000 compensation judgement on my 2008 false imprisonment only for it to be overturned in a lower Court, by a District Judge. He accepted, if you wish to believe it, that the same HM Court Manager as in 2003, 'forgot' to serve the Particulars of Claim despite Police, the 2nd Defendant, admitting receiving it, with prisoner not allowed to produce any affidavit or record from the then Governor, in rebuttal. **More on this below.**

**2010** Crown Court refused to order NHS / Caswell Clinic / South Wales Police to disclose my full medical records during my custody. I am sent to prison for arguing. This leads to nine months of litigation delay, due to ill health and refused medical County Court trial judge refuses to



prosecute Police lawyers who, despite his previous order to disclose, continue to this day to refuse to reveal their joint statement of complaint with the Chief Constable to have me arrested by armed police unit with helicopter of that year. **See below.**

**2011** Both Crown and Magistrates Court block ongoing private prosecution first accepted in English Court with both Welsh Courts ignoring my correspondence and now blocking my access to their public counter. **You should have been blocked years ago. Fraudster.**

**Sept.** Magistrates oppose my bail accepting South Wales Police PNC printout falsely identifying under 'Warning':

**firearms, weapons, violent, escaper, sex offender and long list including 08/09/11 "states concealed items in his rectum in 2008 to effect escape."** Scroll down to about ¼ way here

<http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/blogs/legal/default.aspx> Kirk you are one hell of a sick pr\*\*ck. You impress no-one but your equally sick soul mate Sabine and other fellow fakes.

**Oct.** Both Crown & Magistrates accept HM Prison lying that I refuse to attend Court for bail applications. Both Courts are aware I am refused proper medical attention for over 7 days in prison, have refused me letters, stamps /canteen from private cash, access to telephone or appropriate staff to liaise with courts. **Kirk, the only one lying is YOU.**

**Oct 12th** I will continue my hunger strike **I'm laughing so much now I've given myself the hiccups** until I have return of my legal papers from Police, I obtain appropriate medical attention, a writ of Habeas Corpus **Umm, let's see, who else do I know who's fond of Habeas Corpus? Oh yes the other elderly game-playing fake NORMAN SCARTH** appropriately filed in the right Court, a successful Crown Court appeal for bail, Welsh acceptance of filed private prosecutions and / or proper Police disclosure in my civil actions to allow my lawyers **you just said you couldn't get a lawyer; IDIOT** to serve on Dr [REDACTED] appropriate Particulars of Claim for punitive damages with Police as Co-Defendant.

**European Conspiracy?** The ECHR has already informed Maurice that it will no longer entertain any further Applications from him concerning the RCVS. **Quite right too, for perfectly legitimate reasons; yet the community of C/O agents call it a conspiracy. The only conspiracy is the one being cooked by the dirty dealing devil worshipping disinformation supremos.**

As for the screams of a “**shoot to kill**” policy. Elsewhere it is a ‘**license to kill**’. Note the inflammatory language, so typical of shill speak. Kirk says South Wales Police policy is that he will “likely to be shot, should he attempt ‘mutual exchange of documents’, of witness statements, in his eighteen year running civil action, against the South Wales Police Chief Constable, Barbara Wilding, for malicious prosecutions, false imprisonments and failure to investigate crime against himself, his veterinary business and his family.” Dream on Kirk, police don’t kill clowns like you. Anyway Kirk has had plenty of warning to stay away from Barbara Wilding [and to make sure that his McKenzie henchmen keep away too]. He has no reason to go anywhere near her and no justification whatsoever for his actions against her. If he chooses to breach the order he should be prepared to accept the consequences. The prize prat declares that “Dolmans solicitors had drafted her [the chief constable] Feb 09 sworn affidavit following His Honour Nicholas Chambers QC **ordering she sign it**”!!! Elsewhere he says: “This was all dreamed up by once Chief Constable, Barbara Wilding, had been made to sign, His Honour Nicholas Chambers QC, bless him, a false Affidavit on 25th February 2009. False as various court cases, police deny now ever happened, identify some of the covert police on me and my veterinary business from as far back as from 1992.” According to Kirk the clown *everyone* else is fake and all the documentation is false. Well the only one dreaming things up is the liar Kirk; but he wouldn’t be doing all this if he wasn’t in cahoots with the rest of the C/O cabal. ALL shills make wild claims that ‘HM Partnership’ is in on the ‘cover-up’ but none of them can substantiate anything they say.

As for his so-called ‘**hunger strike**’ that’s just another pretence from joker Kirk the jerk. He hasn’t got the strength of character to conduct one. He cheated [no surprises there] and couldn’t even endure more than a few hours!!! He and the rest of the McKenzie clan state that he starved himself for 35 days!!! He was eating kiwi fruit and cake and food brought in by visitors **shortly after admission**. The lying little sh\*t even declares that the reason he didn’t communicate at Caswell at first was because he was “physically and psychologically weak following his hunger strike”. Well he is right when he describes himself as weak – he is extremely weak and pathetic. And the reason he decided to start co-operating would have been because he was forced to, as there was no other way he was getting out. He was probably surprised and alarmed that the clinic staff made it clear that they were not going to tolerate his bullshit.

Dr Tegwyn Williams reports that Kirk “appears to be in good overall physical health”, which of course he would not have been, had he really been starving himself. Kirk, the pathetic pr\*ck, even pretended that he was frail on arrival at Caswell - he made a showy entrance in front of staff, arriving in a wheelchair, supported by two prison officers. Soon after it was evident that he was not frail ... he was told to walk to his room and did not show any mobility difficulties thereafter. Notice how the contemptible creature can only ever **act**. When the going gets tough and **he** feels real pain i.e. from hunger or from his anal fissure, the wimp cries out for help; but he doesn't give a sh\*t about the real pain he causes others. Dr Williams describes his “ambivalence to the risk to himself and others” when referring to his habit of flying unsafe aircraft and of leaving international airports speedily to avoid airport inspections.

As for **proper disclosure**, Sabine Spin says: “Kirky’ was fair game. That is what this is really about but, again, disclosure orders and rules have been ridiculed due to forces outside the law.” Well, she being very well connected to government would know all about those Masonic ‘forces’. She and Kirk and the rest of his lying lay legal team say that ‘HM Conspirators’ have been losing/hiding/shredding the audit trail for disclosure needed to draft any claims for compensation. That is just another lie. Kirk has in his possession everything that he is entitled to. There is no evidence to suggest otherwise. Kirk states in his ‘Preliminary Skeleton Argument’ dated 6/9/10 that the “overhead video of, at least, one of the assaults **deliberately destroyed** following the claimant making his routine, in cell and after release, request for full disclosure of evidence”. Well where is his evidence that this and other videos were destroyed? Chances are he has all this evidence, but he won't show it to us cos it'll further expose him as the **evil liar he is**. He says the police refuse to disclose clear videos and instead produce “grainy, out of focus ‘stills’” as in the so-called Baker theft of cheques and the “St Nicholas ‘speed camera’ case.” Again this is all just hearsay from a **proven porkie pie telling** Kirk. Here's another of his unproven wild claims, on the last page of his ‘PSA’: “ ... Particularly malicious in that police took details of witnesses and their car registration, at the scene and **promptly buried them.**” **He is the one who refuses disclosure.** Read on.

First of all let's take a look at **Kooky Kirk's idea of 'disclosure'** which ties into his allegations of being **denied his medical records** for the purposes of his **hip operation**. Kirky says he has lots of evidence to

prove his allegations. I've been all over his shite [no, not a typo!] <http://kirkflyingvet.com/files/> in search of the truth but have found **nothing to support his story**. He and his McKenzie chimps unashamedly and regularly make **unfounded and defamatory** allegations; any attempt to back up anything stated is in the form of part or blurred official documentation/photos, which prove nowt. Any full documents that he does publish – transcripts/letters etc or recordings **do not back up his allegations, but rather reveal more of the truth**. See Kirk's 'Preliminary Skeleton Argument' for some more examples of his umpteen baseless allegations. For example it is claimed that "one of his veterinary receptionists [no name] heard the police say, to the effect, "Mr Kirk drives around in his white sports car, quoting human rights, we will eventually get the bastard". Also Sabine stating: "Another malicious aspect of this incident, apart from the usual police lies in court, a common theme throughout ALL these incidents, in Actions 1,2 and 3, was that the insurance certificate was delivered to Ely police station, confirmed by a Cowbridge police officer, but denied by the Defendant." Another example is Sabine stating that tape recordings are requested and refused, because "the transcript bears little relationship to what had been said". All of Kirk's writing and that of his shilly chums is full of misrepresentations and outright lies. See his letter to Dolmans for another pile of steaming bullshit

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/SWP%208th%20May%202009%202nd%20oschedule.docx.pdf>

Kirk says lots of evidence is withheld. For example he says, "not only at the original 4<sup>th</sup> May 2012 jury trial was I not there to give evidence or call witnesses, based on medical grounds, but CPS barrister prosecuting, **David Gareth Evans, had deliberately misled the court** over the simply proved fact that it was a **part hand written draft of the Restraining Order that was taken down to my cell on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2011** all caught **on CCTV but, of course, is being withheld**." In this example there was no CCTV evidence. The jury came to a 'guilty' verdict with a 10 to 2 majority based on other evidence. See the 4/5/12 court transcript below. It is not the 'HM conspirators' who are withholding anything. Considering the fact Kirk has been conducting a massive amount of continuous litigation over 20+ years, the law of averages suggests he has a vast amount of official documentation/video/audio recordings in his possession. I submit that **he is the one who refuses to reveal it** because it does not substantiate his version of events and instead reveals the truth. He actually publishes only a comparably small amount

of official documentation, and much of that is not easy to find – I have only accidentally stumbled upon some of it via other shill sites. See also <http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/news/default.aspx> where reference is made [in shill speak] to Kirk's conviction of assault against barrister Evans ... and his appeal against conviction. No official documentation is provided.

Why doesn't Kirk publish the transcript of the 'machine gun' trial? He's happy to publish this trifling letter though.

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%206%2014%20SWP%20Refused%20Any%20Costs%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%206%2014%20SWP%20Refused%20Any%20Costs%20(1).pdf) [More on the machine gun case below.].

On this page

[http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south\\_wales\\_police/entry1457.aspx](http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south_wales_police/entry1457.aspx)

Kirk alleges: "HM CARDIFF PRISON DENY MAPPA (LEVEL 3) SURVEILLANCE, ACCESS TO A LAWYER, LEGAL AID OFFICER OR MEDICAL RECORDS FOR GP" and uses this document

<http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/1457/download.aspx> as proof. Well

why doesn't he publish the whole report? And what is the logo of his fellow controlled opposition agents 'Lawful Rebellion' doing on it???

<http://www.lawfulrebellion.org/2012/01/29/lawful-rebellion-in-2012-the-clock-is-ticking/> It looks like this document has been doctored [pardon the pun!]; it looks like Kirk has erased the original writing, written over it and slapped the LR logo on.

Another example is here:

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/N%20Request%20to%20AustinUSA112%20\(5\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/N%20Request%20to%20AustinUSA112%20(5).pdf) Why doesn't he publish this document in full?

Here's another. Take a look at this 'witness statement of truth' by a Mrs Hutchinson

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/SWP%20Llantwit%20witness%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/SWP%20Llantwit%20witness%20(2).pdf) Notice we are

not given the full date that this letter was penned. Notice also that Kirk chops off the last bit which goes on to say "ago". The letter ends: "This statement was made to the best of my belief and is true concerning an incident that occurred about 10 years." TEN YEARS AGO??? CAN ANYONE REMEMBER DETAILS OF SOMETHING THAT OCCURRED LAST YEAR, NEVER MIND TEN YEARS AGO? If the LLantwit incident occurred in the way Kirk wants us to believe, that statement would have

been obtained on the same day or not long after and Mrs Hutchinson would have been in court to testify. This is the incident which occurred on 8/9/2000. Scroll back up to p20 for the facts. See also the section below on Mark Davenport.

Here is a heavily redacted document produced by Kirk [file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%209%202%20GP%20medical%20records%20redac%200002%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%209%202%20GP%20medical%20records%20redac%200002%20(1).pdf) His lying mouth says: “Fabricated medical records, used to obtain Maurice's incarceration in Bridgend psychiatric prison, still withheld despite Judge Cooke QC's Order. This Download, of Maurice's current GP records, indicates only too well, the insidious world of HM Partnership and their stranglehold on Drs Tegwyn Williams and Professor Roger Woods.”

Dream on Kirk, you lying little old man. Why the overuse of the black marker pen? What TRUTH are you trying to hide? The bits Kirk does allow us to see reveal that at his previous GP surgery the doctor stated staff felt very frightened and vulnerable with him. It is also stated in these records that he is a “very difficult man to deal with as he has a very odd perspective on things but also mixed with intelligence of a nature so very dangerous ...” and the rest is redacted! More piss taking is revealed in these medical notes; Kirk asks his GP for tablets from his bag as his “friend who is an alcoholic has [made off] with his script ...” I would have thought a super intelligent bloke like Kirk would know that doctors don't carry tablets around! At least he's being honest about one thing tho – his script; Kirk and his fellow agents of the State are all actors following a script.

Also in his medical records it is stated that all copies of his medical records are available for him to collect. It is also stated here that the orthopaedic consultant states that his operation cannot go ahead until he's had a report from Caswell. Dr Tegwyn Williams provided that report. It is stated there is no evidence of a brain tumour; brain trauma yes. Dr Tegwyn Williams confirms to the GP that Caswell is happy to provide his medical records; Kirk is to contact Caswell direct with his new address.

As for his complaint that Cowbridge doctors refuse medical records, what is actually stated is that there is no correspondence from doctors Silvester and Bagshaw of Caswell Clinic. The doctor and director of Caswell Clinic who wrote a few comprehensive reports is Dr Tegwyn

Williams. Professor Wood also wrote a report. Kirk has been sent copies of all his health records.

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%205%2026%20NHS%20admit%20no%20Rpts%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%205%2026%20NHS%20admit%20no%20Rpts%20(1).pdf)

This is the statement from solicitor Tina Whitman in Cardiff County court  
<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/11%2001%2017Dr%20Te3gwyn%20Williams%20signed%20statement.pdf> :-

5] The court will be aware that the Defendant asserts that the Claimant has received disclosure of his medical records on 18 November 2009 and 9 June 2010.

6] These documents were sent by courier to the Claimant's current address in France under cover of a letter written by me dated 7 January 2011. I am advised that these documents were received by the Claimant during the afternoon of Friday 14 January 2011.

7] ... also advised the Claimant that any other information held by the Defendant or the LHB relating to possible brain damage and/or a brain tumour would have been included in the records previously disclosed to him in November 2009 and June 2010. The Claimant was asked to advise if he felt he would be assisted by a third complete disclosure of the records.

8] The Claimant advised me that he had seen these documents previously. He also informed me that he did not want further disclosure of the entirety of his records. I advised the Claimant that I was not aware of any other documents held by the Defendant or the LHB which could provide him with the information he sought and that, therefore, he had already been provided with everything of relevance by the Defendant and LHB.

Kirk says: "Williams obtains my USA records, but refuses to let me see them just part of my medical records needed for my anaesthetist for my much delayed hip replacement operation."

[http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south\\_wales\\_police/entry1448.aspx](http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south_wales_police/entry1448.aspx)

Well actually his link shows that Dr Tegwyn Williams had only **requested** them.

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/N%20Request%20to%20AustinUSA112%20\(6\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/N%20Request%20to%20AustinUSA112%20(6).pdf)

Dr Tegwyn Williams says: "I attempted to gain access to Maurice Kirk's medical records following his compulsory admission to psychiatric hospital in the United States, however the hospital has not provided these records, and **though Maurice Kirk has a copy, to which he refuses**

to give me access.”

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Interim%20Psychiatric%20Report%20August%202009%20Caswell%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Interim%20Psychiatric%20Report%20August%202009%20Caswell%20(1).pdf)

Who are we going to believe, the proven liar and evildoer Kirk or the upright psychiatrist who is now, together with his family, being persecuted for reporting the truth about Kirk?

<http://mauricejohnkirk.wordpress.com/2013/11/11/paving-the-way-to-high-security-prison-ashworth-again/> See below for more re Dr Williams' harassment case against Kirk.

It is clear that the medical profession has done more than enough pandering to Kirk's incessant demands.

Kirk publishes part of the first page of a letter from Professor Wood to Dr Bagshaw

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/2010%20Prof%20R%20Wood%20Re%20Written%20Rpt.pdf> and states: [My comments are in red.]

Just the first page as a sample of a **cleverly 4 page redacted and re-written 2010 letter**, first written in September 2009, following Drs Tegwyn Williams and Professor Roger Wood's **failure**, on 2nd December 2009, when they presented, in the absence of Maurice, locked up below, their **false account** to His Honour Judge Bidder QC, as to Maurice's then current 'mental state' in a **bid to lock him up in Ashworth High Security Prison, IPP, for an indeterminate length**. Here [http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south\\_wales\\_police/entry1866.aspx](http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south_wales_police/entry1866.aspx) he says: “Court transcript reveals I had a **brain tumour and therefore too dangerous to be released** and must be sent to a High Security Prison, like **Broadmoor**.” **Elsewhere his fanciful notion is that** ‘HM Taffia’ set about the task of obtaining two required signatures, of level 12 forensic psychiatrists, for a Section 41 or similar, to imprison him for life. This was necessary to avoid the machine gun trial and the pending civil action, requiring the cross examination of well over one hundred witnesses, mainly either serving or retired policemen.

**That is just another wild claim by the attention seeking, story-telling Kirk. The lying fuckward claims** ‘HM Crown Prosecution’ asked for imprisonment for Public Protection [IPP] which carries a prison sentence, without trial. **He's the one constantly causing his own incarceration cos he wants everyone to see him as some kind of hero. Sad bast\*\*d. No one has ever hinted at locking him away for good;**



more's the pity for we real activists. All justices have bent over backwards to try and help Kirky **stay out** of prison/lunatic asylum. It is evident just by reading the court transcripts that Kirk has published that the justices have tolerated far too much of the crusty cantankerous depraved Kirk. More on this and the 'machine gun' below. Kirk also says [in the above link]: "But **fresh medical evidence**, on the 17th December 2009, given to the MAPPA (Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements) of police, prison probation and social services, hosted by Dr Tegwyn Williams, in the Caswell Clinic Bridgend, **found his evidence had been proved false** so the Prison casually told me, that same afternoon, nothing other than I was no longer MAPPA level 3, terrorist level and likely now to be eligible for bail!" Kirk, why don't you specify what this 'fresh medical evidence' is and **substantiate** your claim that anything Dr Tegwyn Williams has stated has been proven false. Why don't you publish the case management conference notes, where we will find some truth and the arguments for your removal from MAPPA status.

If it had not been for someone switching on the court tape recorder, some 30 odd minutes **Are you going to prove that statement Kirk? No, are you hell, cos you can't, cos it didn't happen** into this typical HM Partnership conspiracy, hatched by Barbara Wilding, the then Chief Constable, Maurice would never have known that now the doctors were even suggesting that not only did Maurice have 'significant brain damage' he was likely to have 'cancer'. **You claim that you had an MRI scan whilst you were held in Bristol prison and that it had revealed a mass on your brain. However no doctor has stated that you have a brain tumour.** As for 'significant brain damage' and 'cancer' see below.

Maurice had to 'act the fool', **Maurice tries to fool others but he's too self-centred and stupid to realise that others regard him a fool** a difficult manoeuvre at the best of times and storm **who're you trying to kid Kirky? You're antics impress no-one** Caswell Clinic, immediately from leaving prison, four times, in fact, simply to obtain this outrageous **why? Cos it's the truth?** 'Psychiatric Report', only to be jailed, **again you wouldn't be in such a hurry to get yourself repeatedly locked up if you weren't getting kid glove treatment** for 'attempted burglary', magistrates acquitted with CPS offering 'no evidence' and refusing, again, Maurice's costs. Then twice escorted off hospital grounds by police, Maurice being caught, 'banged to rights' with ladder, tent and megaphone, 'Rick on the Roof' style. **Do us all a favour; shut up and disappear. A\*\*\* hole** Despite DP and FOI Oct 2009 applications and numerous pleas to Cardiff Judges to intervene, Maurice having read the original 18th Sept 2009 letter, within days of its creation, has confirmed public

demonstrations are still the most effective way in dealing with this lot. When the wider public know your filthy **game** you'll be peg-legging it away from them and scurrying off into hiding as fast as your little legs will take you. The original letter referred to such things as Oliver Reed having assisted in Maurice's brain damage etc etc well you are a known drunkard, with a history of heavy drinking, referred to in the radiology report here

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/I9thJanIIMedicalTWpetty%20Debt.pdf> Also, during testing

at Caswell, your score indicated the presence of **Alcohol Dependence** now, were either redacted evidence please BUT most importantly, new paragraphs as a complete reversal to the Professor's original opinion on his own ability to interpret the August 09 brain scans! WTF you on about here Kirky? You say "Dr Tegwyn Williams complete reversal of his evidence at in his hurriedly arranged Caswell Clinic meeting of 17th December 09 with the prosecution, South Wales Police in attendance." Explain what you mean by his 'complete reversal'. He states [in his interim psychiatric report dated 30/9/09] that there is evidence of significant brain damage. His opinion doesn't change. If you have documentation saying otherwise, please produce it. Dr Kemp on the other hand says, "My visual interpretation of the HMPAO SPECT scan undertaken on Mr Maurice Kirk does not show any convincing evidence of abnormality." And, "Mr Kirk has not previously suffered from any severe head injuries."

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/9%2012%201%20medical%20Kemp%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/9%2012%201%20medical%20Kemp%20(2).pdf)

2nd December 2009 Dr Tegwyn Williams attended the crown court judge who was told it was now believed that MJK had a brain tumour. Is this what you mean by Tegwyn Williams' 'reversal'? Read on. To prevent Maurice ever getting DISCLOSURE, for his 18 year running civil damages claim for police harassment and deliberate 'inactivity' into investigating crimes committed against him, the police needed the introduction of a Lewis Machine Gun and Dr Tegwyn Williams. The evidence shows that the RCVS, police, doctors and justices have disclosed everything you are entitled to. This is confirmed by Morgan Cole LLP

[http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south\\_wales\\_police/entry1866.aspx](http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south_wales_police/entry1866.aspx)

saying, "Further, as you accept, you have already received all of your records as held by the LHB. As we understand it, the period which you, and your consultant, are interested in relates to December 2009 to February 2010. These records were disclosed, in their entirety, to

**you on 9 June 2010. Therefore, you already hold all of the relevant records.”** The fact is YOU Kirk are the one who is not disclosing to the public the documentation and recordings that you have because they will expose you as a LIAR. Why don't you publish the **full** letter that Professor Wood wrote? Is it because it reveals too much truth???

As for Kirk thinking he has cancer, that is just another of his **sick fantasies**. Take a look at this 24/6/'10 court transcript <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%206%2024%20SWP%20Cooke%20transcript.pdf>

THE RECORDER: I have been shown a letter from a consultant anaesthetist in which he makes the reasonable point as follows: “I am not able to undertake his anaesthetic care because of the conflicting medical information that I have received. I received conflicting information from Mr Kirk who has “heard” from the Crown Prosecution Service. This information includes words such as **tumour and cancer in the brain**” I interrupt my reading to indicate straightaway that **there is absolutely nothing about any cancer or tumour in the brain in any reports which the court holds. I have seen no such material.**

MR KIRK: **I have the transcript here saying that I have cancer.**

THE RECORDER: I have not seen that, Mr Kirk.

MR KIRK: No, you have not seen the neuropsychologist's report, who has **rewritten** the document, **trying to hide** the information that Dr Tegwyn Williams told the judge on 2<sup>nd</sup> December, his Honour Judge Bidder QC, for half an hour, saying that I was **mad, bad and dangerous to know** and that I was to be **transferred to Ashworth Psychiatric Hospital** ... I am giving you what he has not got.

THE RECORDER: **Well, if you have got it, you do not need it from me.**

MR KIRK: ... because the transcript has been **doctored**. The **official Cardiff transcript has been doctored**. They waited until Tegwyn Williams stopped talking and then they switched it on. But this Mr Tumbledown, CPS Tumbledown, **he says that Mr Tegwyn Williams believes I have cancer.**

Kirk accuses everyone within his 'taffia mafia' of doctoring documents. The fact is it is he and his McKenzie cronies who are the ones doing the doctoring.

Despite the fact the judge is doing all he can to assist re Kirk's hip operation, Kirk **gets abusive and throws a file at the judge** ... and gets himself arrested and thrown in the cells ... AGAIN. NO-ONE SHOULD HAVE ANY SYMPATHY FOR THIS UTTERLY ODIIOUS TIME-WASTING, GAME-PLAYING, BARE-FACED LIAR MAURICE KIRK. **Why don't you publish the transcript that says you have cancer, Kirk???**

He doesn't. And he never will; because he can't; because no such transcript exist; because he doesn't have cancer; he just lies about that; just as he lies about everything else. More on his phantom cancer in this 20/4/10 court transcript, where he is again insisting that he has *the transcript*. Incidentally he says that the transcripts that he has been sent are redacted; but there's no evidence of that either.

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%205%204%20SWP%20Transcript%2020th%20April%2010%20costs.pdf>

Kirk constantly lies through his teeth playing his warped games. Medics and judges were trying to help him get his hip replacement asap, so that he would be relieved of his pain, but all he does is **deliberately delay** it. Then he lies and twists the facts to present himself as some sort of victim of persecution. There are genuine people who are in constant misery with pain and in desperate need of an operation and you get this self-obsessed scum bag behaving like this. Argghgh ...

See the spin here

[http://kirkflyingvet.com/files/folders/south\\_wales\\_police/entry1439.aspx](http://kirkflyingvet.com/files/folders/south_wales_police/entry1439.aspx)

See some truth here

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%208%202%20SWP%20Dr%20letters%20no%20lawyer.pdf>

Here

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/19thJan11MedicalTWpetty%20Debt.pdf> the monkey

breathtakingly says, “my medical record would not be disclosed to the patient, using the excuse 'it would be too distressing for him'.”

Also in the above link it is stated by Dr Tegwyn Williams that *if* Kirk requires in-patient hospital treatment he has concerns that a **High Secure** hospital would be required purely **because of Kirk's encouragement of others**. He is of course referring to possible violence from Kirk's McKenzie thugs. These people call themselves 'McKenzie friends', but they are the total opposite of friendly; they are the ones who yell abuse and make disgusting threats to totally innocent law-abiding people; while *pretending* to be heroic anti NWO activists. Such threats are directed against, amongst others, Dr Williams himself and other Caswell Clinic staff.

In this 2/12/09 court transcript

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/09%2012%2002%20Transcript%20Crn%20Cr%20REDACTED.pdf> Kirk voices more of his complaints that 'they' are **deliberately withholding** the court transcripts that he's been promised [funded by the taxpayer] “that is called **proper disclosure**, discovery, evidence”. He claims he's only had *some* of the transcripts. Well knowing what an utterly vile low-life liar this weasel is, it is almost certain that he's lying about that too. And there would be only one reason why he would **not** want certain court hearings transcribed; and certainly not available for public scrutiny – they would reveal too much of the truth. Anyway he's got thousands of pounds to give to 'witnesses' [see below] so he's got enough money to fund them himself, rather than asking the taxpayer to do so.

Take a look at this

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%2009%2018%20Medical NHS Sissling 15 plus 18.pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%2009%2018%20Medical%20NHS%20Sissling%2015%20plus%2018.pdf)

The vile man says: “This week the trial judge adjourned the evidence from being heard from a near hundred police officers for about six months, in order that I may have my hip replacement and suggested I had another brain scan, thus avoiding the criminal weighted proof **of NHS and private doctors having to disclose their incriminating evidence. Pompous arrogant smug prat. The incriminating evidence is against YOU. It is plain for all to see. YOU are the f..ing criminal.**

...the false medical evidence that blocked my planned July operation to have been carried out **in order that I might be ready for ten weeks of very enjoyable cross examination of those that caused my name being removed from the veterinary register, effectively, for life.”** **The**

unbelievable gall of this lying sh\*tbag. Kirk YOU alone have caused your removal from the veterinary register, because you craved hero-worship as a celeb 'truther'. You befriended Satan's servants such as Sabine and Butlincat and you sold your soul to Satan. Now you and they are in hell - forever. Enjoy.

This all puts paid to Kirk's claims of '**rogue**' doctors and **falsified medical reports**.

See the following link if you can stomach any more bilge from his filthy LYING mouth. This sad bas\*ard lies so much that, for him, the lie has become the truth. Kirky, old boy, your soul is in the sewers. Was the price worth it?

[http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/10%2006%2007%20One%20Million%20Pound%20Claim%20against%20NHS%20\(Wales\)\\_only%20R%20\(1\).pdf](http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/10%2006%2007%20One%20Million%20Pound%20Claim%20against%20NHS%20(Wales)_only%20R%20(1).pdf)

I'll refer to a couple of his skewed points: In point [17]: "To the contrary the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant [Dr Teg Williams] wrote his 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2009 report without even examining the claimant, recommending the claimant serve a further prison sentence, whilst unconvicted in his **experimental unit** thereby furthering delaying the machine gun allegations coming to trial." Dr Williams states in his 3/8/09 interim psychiatric report: "I attempted to interview Maurice Kirk on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2009. I had previously contacted him on two separate occasions via prison staff at which he confirmed his willingness to see me. He attended to see me accompanied by a prison advocate, but then **refused to be interviewed**." For more truth, see the court transcripts referred to below. As for his accusations of delay, we have seen more than enough evidence that Kirk is the one guilty of obstruction, non-co-operation and delay. Read on for more proof of that.

In point [37] he says: "The first from HM prison Ashworth found no apparent mental disorder, while the 2<sup>nd</sup>, likewise, from a leading specialist in nuclear medicine, **went so far as to castigating** the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant [Teg W] for the unnecessary use of a SPEC scan when a non intrusive scan was all that was needed." Well let's take a look at what this 'nuclear medicine' expert, who Kirk **hired and paid for himself**, is saying. Kirk is referring to Dr Kemp who reports here

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/9%2012%201%20medical%20Kemp.pdf> First of all he says, " I must point out that I have **not been sent any clinical**

information pertaining to the neuropsychiatric state of Mr Kirk and therefore my interpretation of these images is in isolation from any medical details. There are concerns by the prosecution at Mr Kirk's sanity and fitness to plead. In particular this claim has evidently been supported by an HMPAO cerebral perfusion SPECT study that has evidently shown reduced activity/perfusion in the frontal lobes. Please note that I have gleaned this information from the letter of instruction by Yorkshire Law Solicitors and I have not seen any formal reports issued by the Radiology Department at the Princess of Wales Hospital, Bridgend. The letter of instruction states that the MRI and SPECT scans were undertaken on Friday 25th August 2009. Although the SPECT images forwarded to me are labelled 'Mr Maurice Kirk' they appear to have been undertaken on the 18th September 2009. On the basis of these CD images, I do not believe that there is any convincing evidence of abnormality of cerebral perfusion to either the frontal, parietal, or temporal lobes of the brain. In particular, I believe that the visual appearances of the frontal lobes are within normal limits. It must be borne in mind that interpreting images from another centre is difficult as there is no standardised way in the United Kingdom of displaying these scans. The American Academy of Neurology recommend that SPECT brain imaging has a clearly defined clinical role in dementia, cerebral vascular disease (stroke) and epilepsy however this learned Academy felt that the role of SPECT imaging in head injury remains a research tool and, as yet, is not proven as an established clinical tool<sup>1</sup>. This viewpoint is also shared by the Royal Colleges in the United Kingdom and NICE whereby HMPAO SPECT imaging is only indicated in patients with either dementia, epilepsy, or vascular brain disease."

Dr Kemp continues: "Research studies using this type of imaging technique generally agreed that functional brain imaging (SPECT or PET imaging) is more sensitive at demonstrating abnormalities than structural brain imaging (CT/MRI) in patients with moderate to severe head injury. However there is controversy about the role of functional brain imaging in minor head injuries, which, I believe, is a reflection of the considerable overlap between the wide variation of normality and subtle pathological abnormalities<sup>3</sup>. It would appear that Mr Kirk has not previously suffered from any severe head injuries and if he should have possibly suffered from any minor injuries, then the role of SPECT brain scanning in his particular case is highly controversial." He also says: "In my routine clinical work in Southampton using HMPAO SPECT imaging, I would not use this technique in patients with head injury. In my national teaching role, I emphasise that HMPAO SPECT has, as yet, no proven clinical role in head injury." Finally: "My visual interpretation of the HMPAO

SPECT scan undertaken on Mr Maurice Kirk does not show any convincing evidence of abnormality. I believe there are major shortcomings in visual assessment of these HMPAO SPECT studies. HMPAO SPECT brain imaging is a powerful tool in the investigation of patients with dementia, epilepsy, and vascular brain disease, however it is not advocated as a clinical tool in patients with proven, or suspected, head injury. So, hardly 'castigating', just an honest medical opinion. This is, of course, more proof [if it were needed] that there is **absolutely nothing wrong with Kirk's brain; that the only thing wrong with him is that he is an utterly loathsome lying individual who buzzes off the opiate of play acting, along with his McKenzie co-conspirators.** I would say it was unnecessary for him to have had any type of brain scan. If there were no such thing as his evil C/O associates he would not have dared behave in the abhorrent way that he has and is still doing. Bullies are cowards and never act alone. Of course it is easy to see how Dr Tegwyn W formed his conclusion that Kirk suffers from 'paranoid delusional disorder' from the test results. Sabine somehow manages to twist that to accuse Teg of falsifying medical records *pretending* he suffered PDD.

Kirk goes on to declare that he suffered significant alarming side effects, but he doesn't specify what and, as always, he doesn't provide proof. He continues his nonsense, saying that Dr Teg W would not allow him to be examined by his own GP. No GP wants anything to do with the lying thug anyway. Kirk himself says that 4 GPs have banned him from their surgeries!

Under point [44] he declares that the 3<sup>rd</sup> Defendant [director of the south Wales NHS] refused to disclose the full medical records, yet again under a repeated claimant application but included by mistake a **backdated falsified copy** again signed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Defendant [Dr Roger Wood] as if to be a copy of the original one seen by the claimant handed to him during his custody... Well obviously there is no evidence of this. Kirky the clown just keeps **making things up**. This is what ALL NWO gatekeepers do. They make all sorts of wild allegations and they claim that *everyone* is part of the conspiracy, but they can **never back up anything they say with evidence**.

In point [46] the pr\*ck says, "This report was clearly designed as with the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant's psychiatric reports to **injure the claimants reputation and good name**." Further down he says the failure by Teg to correct and clarify his medical records is gross professional misconduct which has caused defamation of his name and good character. Good job I



wasn't taking a slurp of my brew when I read that or it would be all over my computer screen now. Who knows whether he ever had a 'good' name. Perhaps he did, but allowed his lay pals to persuade him to work for the dark side. BIG mistake. He should've listened to his conscience and God and not the shills and Satan. Too late now. He's made his bed, so he must lie [excuse the pun!] on it ... forever. And it is forever.

He and Sabine say that the NHS refused him a brain scan. Well we can see that that is not true either. He himself states that he had a MRI scan when he was at Bristol prison, he had MRI and SPECT-CT scan whilst at Caswell and it is confirmed in a letter from HMP Cardiff that he had a CT Scan of his head which states that there is no evidence he suffers from PDD or significant brain damage or that he has cancer.

See also this

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%2010%2017%20SWP%20Medical%20Welsh%20GM%20C.pdf> nauseating letter of complaint against doctors Williams and Wood.

And this

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Complt%20re%20Psychols%2013th%20Jan%2011.pdf> official complaint against Professor Rodger Wood & Ruth

Baqshaw, Profession Psychologists.

Kirk is refused disclosure of certain documents such as the **MAPPA minutes** due to reasons adequately explained in Judge Seys Llewellyn's 25/7/'07 note of judgement here

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/11%2007%2025%20SWP%20Note%20of%20Judgment%20re%20MAPPA%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/11%2007%2025%20SWP%20Note%20of%20Judgment%20re%20MAPPA%20(2).pdf)

In summary the judge says: "I ruled that the Executive Summary itself should be disclosed to Mr Kirk ... I directed that any application by Mr Kirk seeking disclosure of any MAPPA minutes themselves should be issued on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011 together with supporting evidence. **No such application was ever issued nor has supporting evidence as such been served.**" He further says: "First, I record that the Minutes are anonymised as to those who attended the meetings and it appears to

have been a matter of policy from the first meeting for the Minutes to have been so anonymised. Second, I record that I could detect no inconsistency between the Minutes as produced to me and the Executive Summary. Third, there is nothing in the Minutes or arising from the content of the Minutes to indicate that Mr Kirk was subject to MAPPA arrangements before, or had been subject to MAPPA arrangements before 8<sup>th</sup> June 2009.” More on this in Detective Inspector R A Holder’s letter below. See also Dolmans’ statement 31<sup>st</sup> August 2010

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%208%2031%20SWP%20MAPPA%20Disclosure%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%208%2031%20SWP%20MAPPA%20Disclosure%20(1).pdf)

As for ‘framing’ him under the ‘**terrorism act**’ [Sabine categorises him as ‘highest level terrorist’] ‘Kirk says: “MAPPA meant Bullying Tactics for Indefinite Harassment and Political Asylum. Withholding Medical Records is the Result of “Multi-Agency Collusion”.”

<http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/10-12-20-permission-to-appeal.pdf> Kirk and co are dolly daydreaming again.

**MAPPA** meant nothing of the sort. It is simply a set of arrangements which exists to assess and manage risk. Dr Tegwyn Williams reports <http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/10-09-30-gerald-guernsey.pdf> that Kirk was given Level 3 status partly because of the risk of attracting media attention, but also **because of the risk he posed to himself and others by his actions**. Well that’s perfectly reasonable. What else could the authorities do? It is true that he poses a definite risk to the Chief Constable and her family, who all now have enhanced protection [which is all paid for by you and I the decent law-abiding citizens]. The nutter barges into her office and tries to arrest her for fraud and perjury. Who the f\*\*k does he think he is? He has absolutely no grounds whatsoever to arrest anyone, least of all Barbara Wilding. He has over a hundred totally **unjustified** civil actions pending against South Wales Police, focused on a number of individuals. He has their names and personal details on his ‘wanted’ posters.

Take a look at the following 1/10/’09 court transcript. I comment in red. <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/T20097445%20KIRK%20PCMH%20%2526%20BAIL%20APP%20%2001.10.09.pdf>

THE RECORDER: It says, “£10,000 reward for information leading to prosecution. Here

[http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south\\_wales\\_police/entry911.aspx](http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south_wales_police/entry911.aspx)

he says he has “thousands of pounds waiting for witnesses to come forward.” So he has that kind of money but thinks he’s entitled to legal aid! <http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/blogs/legal/default.aspx> See most recent (Inaudible) legal battles” and then it says “A substantial reward is offered on website (1) Barbara Wilding, Chief Officer South Wales Police. Your cell home and social addresses. (2) Inspector Jenner, my past veterinary client, living in St Athan. His daughter, Alison Jenner and Alison Gafael (sic), **drug dealer, tenant over my surgery** and well known to the defendant, the South Wales Police. Paul Stringer, his brother, PC 973 Johan Johnson and occupants of 52 Ty Newydd Road, interviewed by police several times in 1993. (4) Inspector Twigg, 1993 at Barry police station. (5) Inspector Webster, Chief Inspector Brian Greaves, Supt Colin Francis, senior CPS prosecutor MG James, EB Brignall, Special Constable 7781 O’Brien, Special Constable 778 Martin and PC Swirson. Divisional Commander Colin Jones, Chief Inspector James H Moore, Inspector Rice, Police Constable Pete Lovell, officer in charge central ticket office Treforest. PC 3719 Killick, RA Prickett CPS, Mr Stopper CPS and JA Caris, clerk of the Barry Magistrates’ Court. EB Brignall, PC 973 Johan Johnson, Paul Stringer, his brother. Inspector 913 Griffiths, Inspector 2947 Coliandris” and then it goes on, “Car numbers of all of the above, home and social addresses of all of the above. Details of their families and schools attended.”

THE ACCUSED: On the 4th October last year I asked the police to give disclosure of 43 different police incidents, some of which relate, most of them relate to the civil action. The police have repeatedly refused to disclose the identity of the police officers. Now, the problem now is that this court case started 16 years ago and most of those named people on that list, which is a sample, have retired and they have told me that they refuse to disclose where I can serve witness summonses for the action in January. I have to call 150 retired or police officers in service to give evidence in the prosecution. Now, His Honour Nicholas Chambers QC, bless him, ordered, under an abuse of process application in November of 2008, to make Barbara Wilding, the Chief Constable, disclose whether they had the information on this.

THE RECORDER: Mr Kirk---

THE ACCUSED: Please let me finish.

THE RECORDER: You are not answering the question.

THE ACCUSED: I am coming to the relevance of it.

THE RECORDER: Well, please hurry up to it. **These are children.**  
**Answer the question.**

THE ACCUSED: Because these police officers have now retired and because her 25<sup>th</sup> February **affidavit denies that some of these court cases took place**, like Stopper CPS, I arrested him and called the police because of what he did in court. Now, I want his home address because the CPS system will not give it. Because people who, **if you are trying to find out their home address in order to serve a witness summons on them, you sometimes have to resort to the most extreme circumstances and that is to find out where their children go to school, identify them and get someone to follow them back to the address where they live.** **Kirk, you are a truly disgusting creature.**

Others believed to be at risk are his own kids - daughter Genieve and his younger son, both of whom their mother believed were “disturbed” by Kirk. It is stated that part of the ‘Risk Management Plan’ entailed social services investigations to confirm these kids’ ages and whereabouts. Notice that Kirk doesn’t volunteer any info in this regard. He doesn’t want busy bodies anywhere near his family, lest they inadvertently spill the beans and drop him in it. Kirk reminds me of my control freak of an ex, as he too refused to allow his teenage kids to be interviewed by welfare agencies, for the very same reason. Men like my ex and Maurice Kirk are truly loathsome lying evil-doers. See below for more on Kirk’s family. Staff employed at police HQ and at police stations where MK might try to gain entry to arrest officers were also considered at risk. So too were staff of the solicitors responsible for contesting his legal actions against the police. As were court staff in the County Court and Royal Courts of Justice.

Because of his numerous convictions, some for assault, including assault of police, it was rightly felt by all agencies and medics that Kirk has the potential to cause serious harm. It was therefore of great concern that Kirk was not only pictured with a section 1 firearm, for sale and making threats but also that he had access to other firearms lawfully held by his wife – two shotguns and three humane killing firearms.

Kirk says MAPPA is a very good organization whereby prisoners on release or people on remand who are dangerous are under surveillance. Stupid idiot. It’s not an organization; he is not a genuine whistleblower and therefore he’s not under surveillance; nor is he ‘dangerous’ to the authorities. He is dangerous only to people who seek truth. He is a dis-

info agent and a valued Establishment asset. He also says he didn't know he was "under MAPPA surveillance"!!! Also that he represents a lot of people. Dear God.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zPQxO5WW7s4>

Solicitor Horsey Lightly crawled out of the sewer of society to pen his pretend letter on behalf of the repugnant Kirk. He writes on 7/12/09 to Mr Nigel Rees, MAPPA co-ordinator: "We understand from our client [Kirk] that he has been informed that he has been given a Category 3 MAPPA classification which, as you will know, is reserved for offenders who pose a risk of serious harm and it is considered that they require multi-agency management. The first point that we should make is that **our client is not an "offender"**. Second ... which clearly does not apply, since there is **no offence**. Third ... Kirk has **not been convicted of an offence**."

If Horsey had done his job properly i.e if he'd done what he's paid to do and not taken it so lightly, he would have realised that his client is a monstrous confidence trickster. Anyone who defends a flagrant liar and out of control bully like Kirk is no different to that person. Horsey Lightly must be just another loathsome lying mason. Either that or he's on drugs.

There is a deep spiritual malaise and decay amongst persons, public servants and other leading figures in society. They can only be described as a slime pit of snakes.

Nigel Rees explains the obvious in his reply on 15/12/09 that, "Offender' does not refer only to the current offence charged but to any relevant previous convictions. The Responsible Authority has determined that Mr Kirk meets the criteria as a Category 3 case."

Kirk the kook is one sad bast\*rd. He's got such unbelievable delusions of grandeur he thinks he's a 'political prisoner'. Someone should tell him to ditch Sabine Shill and to stop hanging round all the other NWO trolls. Then again if he does that he won't have any friends left. Best thing he can do is find Jesus, grow some balls, tell his Masonic protectors to go f\*\*k themselves, pray ... hard ... and FESS UP. Then he'll be free.... And a real hero. But he won't cos he's a snivelling lying COWARD. Just like all the other PATHETIC LYING SATAN SERVING 'CELEB TRUTHERS'. Dr Tegwyn Williams makes reference to Kirk's grandiose delusions. For example the MK fool fantasizes that he is "being held in the Caswell Clinic as a subject for genetic research, that medication is secreted in

the food within Caswell and that microphones have been placed, within his room". Another example is that Kirk "shows his knack for dramatic licence, stating that clinic staff would soon be arriving with "riot shields and tear gas" in order to move him from the telephone room". [He asserts clinic staff deliberately prevent him using the phone in order to hold up his litigation.] And that "On 18th June 2009 I was surrounded by tin hatted police sporting flack jackets, studded with stun grenades whilst brandishing sub machine guns but too many CCTV cameras and members of the general public saved my life". Also in reference to when he crashed 'Liberty Girl', Dr Williams quotes from Kirk's website: "The local police who attended the crash site were wholly unprepared for such an event, more so Maurice who later escaped custody in nothing other than a kimono and neck brace. Lucky for Maurice they soon recognized the **folly of holding him** and allowed him out of the country."

Dr Williams also describes Kirk as an "**entertaining storyteller**" who has a "tendency to **romanticise his position**". Also that he is a "**skilled self-promoter**" with a "tendency to **embellish certain details for the sake of a good story**". That of course is a polite professional way of describing Kirk as an **ugly liar**. It is reported that Kirk boasts that laws don't apply to him, that he doesn't follow them if "they did not fit with his own *moral* code". He is reported to have "broken a number of laws". Well, Kirk has no moral codes. He doesn't know the meaning of moral. He's a depraved monster, who willingly and **unconscionably** receives his pay-check for the part he plays in the **mass public deception**. The psychiatrist reports that Kirk's test scores for being 'Domineering/Controlling' showed up as "significantly elevated". Reference is also made to the scales linking him to "narcissistic" traits. He is also described as 'hostile' and of course 'paranoid'.

Also revealed in Dr Tegwyn Williams' report is the fact that Kirk keeps his rental properties in a **state of disrepair**. He **breaches environmental health** but the irresponsible selfish b\*\*stard states he only cares about his own predicament; that the tenants are living off the State [no-one else would rent from a nasty individual like him if they had the choice and Kirk would be happy with such tenants anyway as he gets his rent paid direct from the State]. Wonder how much money he makes housing people in squalor in his multiple occupancy properties

which he keeps in his daughter Belinda Kirk's name! And this evil f\*\*k Kirk has the audacity to claim legal aid!

Dr Tegwyn W reports that Kirk refused to take the contact details from the EHO stating that he couldn't phone her, even though he was allowed access to the phone. His response was that he had more important calls to make. [Yeah to his fellow NWO gatekeepers to spread more of his evil lies in order to hoodwink the public.] Here <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%2010%2004%20SWP%20Claimant%20Rebuttal%20to%20Strike%20Out.pdf> he states: "The attempt to "get the b\*\*t\*\*d" means economic ruin of earning status as veterinary surgeon, private pilot, businessman and property owner." He asked for all this. Not that he's lost anything monetary wise as his properties are 'safe' [well in the sense that they earn him money; not in the literal sense] and he's doing good business shilling [Kirk prefers to describe it as earning a living "by taking on litigation and exposing technical flaws".]

As for his tenants, in his 'PSA' 6/9/'10 he talks about "an almost weekly occurrence of trouble with tenants and the Defendant, but repeated failure to disclose crime reference numbers of each incident, as with some **forty others** means the deliberate withholding of identities of police at the scene and indicate, it is submitted, conduct by the Defendant that follows the same pattern, throughout all three Actions and therefore unlawful." This is just more of the same hot air from Kirk.

Let's examine what he says about one of his ex tenants - **Anthony Glen Gaphael**. Kirk states that he is informed that Barbara Wilding, former Chief Constable of SW police, will sign an affidavit that her police did not break into his veterinary surgery with a crow bar and sledge hammer and put back the daughter of one of their inspectors in the overhead flat with a local drug dealer [Gaphael], nor does she have any knowledge of the incident, which occurred in **June 1995**. Scroll back up to pages 8 & 9 of this PDF for the facts of this matter. It is interesting to note that it is stated by the solicitors for the police, Dolmans, that **Kirk produced a statement in 2009 from Mr Gaphael**, however this **was not a document which had been disclosed by Mr Kirk previously**. This suggests that this 'statement' was an **afterthought**, produced in an effort to give Kirk's version of events credibility and to further bolster his stance that the police are corrupt and have 'got it in' for him. [For example, number 14 of the statement: "As an 'aside' sergeant Roe said to me, "I will be a witness to your entry. You can use reasonable force [wink, wink], do what you want".] Number 24: "It was obvious to me that

there was some obvious agenda re police against Mr Kirk.” Number 25: “It was not going away. The police were indicating that a lot was going on than I was being told about.”]

I surmise that this ‘statement of truth’

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/archive/2013/05/13/all-key-witnesses-refused-oh-what-a-surprise.aspx> has been **written by the fraudster Maurice Kirk**. It is unclear when it was written. Either it was written in June 1995 and, for reasons only known to Kirk himself, he didn’t think to disclose it until 14 or so years later, sometime in 2009. OR it was written in 2009. I’ll assume it is the latter. [We know that game-playing Kirk likes to produce his motoring documents late, but they’re not produced **years** later!]

My observations are as follows:- If this statement was genuine it would be **dated around the date of the incident** i.e. June 1995 and it would be in the form of a **signed hard copy** which Kirk had scanned and uploaded to his site. It is none of these things. Kirk has just typed it up onto his site. In the police’s skeleton argument it is stated: “The overall effect of the statement from Mr Gaphael, is that he subsequently discovered that items in his property were broken and/or missing, and that he was holding Mr Kirk responsible for this [see Mr Gaphael’s statement at page 137].” Gaphael had written a long statement for the police [see No. 27] but no copy of it has been provided. Also he had allegedly gone “back to Ely police station with Sergeant Roe **in the dark at about 8pm and signed a document re proposed breaking in**” [No. 21]. There is no copy of that document either. That allegation is hard to swallow. A signing of a document would be done during office hours. Also at 8pm it would not have been dark in June ... bang in the middle of summer. And why would Gaphael incriminate himself that way? [In No. 23, he says: “I used the sledge hammer and crow bar to break in.”] According to him, and backed up by the police [such that Kirk was arrested and detained for criminal damage] Kirk had broken and/or stolen some of his stuff. This version is supported in the ‘Gaphael’ statement [point No. 26] where he recalls that he’d gone into the surgery and had complained to the receptionist’s boyfriend that Kirk had nicked his belongings from the flat. [Ironically that small point is another hint that this statement is false, as it is doubtful that anyone would bother mentioning such, 14 years or so later.] In light of all this why would Gaphael say [No. 30] “When asked for what Mr Kirk was arrested (by Mr Kirk) I said: **Eviction and sub letting property not even Mr Kirk’s. (Not arrested for criminal damage or theft).**”? [Kirk’s position is that



he was arrested unlawfully for the illegal eviction of a tenant.] Why anyway would Kirk ask Gaphael why he was arrested?

Another hint that this statement is forged is that for a statement that was written at least 14 years after the event it contains **remarkable detail**. Gaphael must have a razor sharp memory to recall that it was “on the day after the 6<sup>th</sup> June” when he “went into the surgery alone” [point No. 26]. There are many examples of such detailed recollection. However, for some reason, Gaphael doesn’t remember whether or not his parents carried some of his bags home! [No. 18] Point number 2 also reveals a hint that this document is a forgery. Gaphael allegedly states: “I hope to re visit the premises before I give evidence.” What would be the point of doing that 14 or so years on. And why would he be giving evidence so late in the day??? Take a look at point 21 where it is stated: “Why not tell me Kirk asked. People in the group trying to get hold of me, possibly Mr Jenner.” Why would Gaphael tell Kirk? Kirk has locked and barricaded the door, dumped his belongings in an alleyway, broken/stole some of his things to the tune of a 2 grand loss and the conflict has unsurprisingly escalated to such an extent that police were called ... Did he think after all that Kirk was going to produce a key and, like a gentleman, let him in???

According to this

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/13%2005%2004%20Gaphael%20Statement.pdf> **undated and unsigned** ‘Witness Statement’ Gaphael allegedly states that his parents “**possibly supplied the sledge hammer** used to break in”. Well considering the fact that this is supposed to be a police witness statement, to be used in court, why didn’t he get his facts right and check with his parents? This is another statement that could have been written by Santa Clause. In the signature area Kirk has written: “(Not yet signed until Mr Kirk gives him £1000 cash).”

Notice how Kirk tries to give the impression of himself being the decent landlord and of the police being the thugs in point 3 where it is stated: “The week before the water damage Mr Kirk stated the tenancy was not going to work and too dangerous to inhabit.” Kirk doesn’t give a fig for his tenants; his properties are in a shoddy state and he is wanted for questioning by Environmental Health officers.

Just after the statement, Kirk states: “**It has been commented upon** that where my witnesses who came from South Wales, all but all were terrified of likely repercussions with several not even answering to a

summons, while those from England simply came and not even needing a summons.” Yeah ok. What a steaming pile of bull this lump of faeces comes out with! Maurice Kirk, you have no ‘witnesses’; you have only your bullshitting and equally cowardly bunch of McKenzie baboons. I hope and pray someone soon pays all you disgusting pieces of excrement a visit and shuts all of your lying mouths up. The only people who have genuine reason to fear repercussions are the *real* heroic freedom fighters; the ones who stand up to odious liars like you and your merry band of enemy agents.

Now let’s look at the story surrounding another ex tenant - **Mark Davenport**. My comments are in red. Kirk says: “On 20th July 2013 I am just released after another night in police cells because of liar, MARK DAVENPORT, ringing police to **block my getting into the flat for my legal papers** required for the final day of my twenty year running damages claim against the South Wales Police. **DAVENPORT** had switched off the electric and had **changed the locks** whilst employing staff who were drawing the dole to help him **allow fly tipping on my land.**” **Kirk does not give details, such as the dates of events, length of time he’d been prevented accessing his own flat. Neither does he produce official documentation, such as Davenport’s witness statements. Incidentally notice how the idiot slips up here and reveals the truth about who actually owns those properties – him!**  
<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/archive/2013/07/19/maurice-jailed-yet-again-by-south-wales-police.aspx> He continues: “After I had heard the usual *evasion of the truth* **that’s rich!** and shouts of almost, "liar, liar, your pants are on fire", Her Majesty's Representative, as prosecutor, eventually was **made to release, albeit far too late, my custody record including the video made under caution** that will knock this new bit of trumped up nonsense right on the head.” **Why doesn’t Kirk show us this revealing evidence? Further down this page we see more of Kirk’s tactic of publishing only a tiny portion of a document - of constable Martin Charles’ witness statement. Kirk says: “The release of these 13th July 13 custody records together with the video record of my 'Defence Statement', in rebuttal to an allegation of **two common assaults on DAVENPORT and another**, are needed as exhibit ...” Why doesn’t Kirk publish this document in full? Because it will reveal the truth and expose Kirk’s LIES. Further down Kirk says: “I am now told MARK DAVENPORT had reported me to police for **fraudulently drawing up a falsely represented lease** causing the severe banging on my door to occur recently and **my camera to recording from my window**, a 'paddy wagon' sitting patiently outside following my subsequent arrest. Despite my repeated visits to Ely, Fairwater and Barry police stations, in an**

attempt to establish just what is going on and to file a statement of complaint, I am ignored.” **So why doesn't Kirk show us this vital evidence that he has recorded that will support his statements? Why doesn't he publish Davenport's police statement? Why doesn't he publish his statement of complaint to the police? Kirk is ignored by the police because he is a time wasting, trouble making crook who talks a crock of horseshit.**

As an aside, also on this page on Kirk's site, he publishes more **part** documentation in a desperate attempt to prove he's telling the truth. But actually all he does is reveal more of the truth, which is not his perversion of it. More on this below. One of these part documents outlines his particulars of offence, count 3 and 4, that “MJK on 31/7/13 knowing or believing that Nathan Kingsley [and Mark Davenport] was a witness for an offence, did an act, namely made a threatening hand gesture, which intimidated and was intended to intimidate Nathan Kingsley [and Mark Davenport], intending thereby to cause the course of justice to be obstructed, perverted or interfered with”.

See also <http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/blogs/legal/default.aspx> where Kirk says: “20. Police withheld disclosure of CCTV, telephone and computer records created by the **two complainants, Mark Davenport and Nathan Kingsley**, before, during and after, alleged assault and subsequent 'intimidation of a witness' alleged incident.”

In number 25 Kirk says: “I humbly submit that only the Cardiff Crown Court can vary the bail restrictions following **twelve police officers threatening to arrest my daughter's Bristol based bailiff** carrying out his lawful duties in eviction of the said squatters.” **Where is the evidence that police threatened this bailiff? You'd think that 20+ years on Kirk and his chums would have lots of real evidence in the form of official documentation and secret tape recordings. He says** <http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/blogs/legal/default.aspx> “One of the twelve Cardiff policemen, at the incident, quietly told the shocked Bristol Bailiff *“If the owner did not have the same surname as Mr Maurice Kirk we would not even have needed to be here”.*” **But, as always, there is no evidence of this.**

At almost the end of this page is another **part** document outlining the charges that “On 13/7/13 at Cardiff you assaulted Mark Davenport by beating him” and “On 10/7/13 at Cardiff you assaulted Nathan Kingsley by beating him”.

As for fly tipping there's no evidence that Davenport is guilty of that; just as there is no evidence that he is guilty of anything Kirk alleges. Illegal dumping is a crime that Kirk was convicted of though. See <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Privy%20Council%20Judgment%2019th%20Jan%2004.pdf> page 8.

See

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/13%2007%2028%20Emergency%20Application%20%20re%20Maurice%20Kirk%20v%20South%20Wales%20Police%20%20BS614159.pdf> for a list of demands, dated 28/7/13 that Kirk puts to the Court. In point iv he states: "The defendant [police] and Mark Davenport to uphold the 19/7/13 magistrates order giving the claimant continued lawful access to the above names flat." Why doesn't Kirk publish this judgment and court transcript? In point vii of his list of outstanding cases against the police, he says: "Regina v Kirk 17th September 13 Cardiff magistrates hearing re 'common assault' allegations by Davenport and Kingsley." Why doesn't he publish this court transcript and judgement? He requests the videos – of the 10/7/13 coverage of alleged assaults, of the 1/6/13 coverage of his motor vehicle break in and theft and of the 19<sup>th</sup>/20<sup>th</sup> custody suite recordings. He also requests the custody records relevant to assault allegations by Davenport and Kingsley. My guess is he already has all this evidence but he won't disclose it because it will expose Kirk as the thoroughly evil lying lump of turd that he is.

Kirk states in his 29/7/13 'Statement of Truth'???

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/13%2007%2029%20MJK%20Statement.pdf> number 2: – "Whilst there it has become all too apparent that neither the police nor CPS intend to cease in their course of conduct of harassing me deliberately, this time, to prejudice my closing submissions in court and conspiracy to protect one of their agents, the occupant of the shop below my flat." That's rich, Kirk accuses Davenport of being an agent [of which there is no evidence], yet that is exactly what Kirk is! Classic pot calling the kettle black. Everything Kirk and fellow shills accuse others of, they are in fact guilty of themselves. In number 5 he states: "The police's resistance to allow its own 2000 custody video record of the Llantwit Major's brutal arrest of me, in the town square is fanciful. I clearly left it with the court as an exhibit and just because it was not 'played' to Sgt Khilberg is wholly irrelevant as it still remained my exhibit of the police's own making. Davenport has record of the exhibit of Khilberg lying." Chances are Kirk already has that video firmly under lock and key, never to see the light of day, because it will reveal

the truth and not his warped version of events. In number 6 he states: “The fact that legal papers are now missing from my flat and from my motor vehicles, due to the numerous break-ins, compounds the need of immediate intervention from an outside police force.” There is no evidence that anyone has broken into anything of Kirk’s or stolen anything from him. I don’t think anyone would dare to. He’d batter anyone who tried. He is full of hot air. As for his so-called ‘legal papers’, more on them below.

See

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/13%2009%2004%20BS614159%20Judgment.pdf> for Judge Seys Llewellyn’s response [dated 27/8/13]. I comment in red.

In point 2 he says: “I was conscious that the scale of the task was considerable, in particular for Mr Kirk as a L.I.P and hence allowed a substantial period to prepare their written submission.” Here we see the judge being extremely considerate and helpful towards the **undeserving joker** Kirk. See more on this below.

In point 3 he points out that Kirk’s statement, lodged on 16/7/13 was far from being as methodical or comprehensive as it would have been if he’d been legally represented. That comes as no surprise. If it was anything like his 29/7/13 ‘statement of truth’ it would have been full of obfuscation and crazy conspiracy theories, with very little to do with relevant matters and even less to do with truth. If he’d used a solicitor he would not have been allowed to use the court as a platform to spout off about a ‘Taffia’ conspiracy; of which he has no proof. More on this below.

In number 4 the judge says the parties appeared before him on 23/7/13. He says: “Mr Kirk informed me that he was without his papers since he had been excluded by his [in effect] landlord Mr Mark Davenport from the flat at 175 Cowbridge Rd West where he Mr K was living.” Why didn’t Kirk make clear that Davenport was a tenant? The judge continues: “He also informed me he had been arrested on two separate occasions. On at least one occasion he had been arrested in connection with allegations made by Mr Davenport against him, which Mr Kirk denies.”

In number 7 the judge says: “It transpires that Mr K has been remanded in custody. I presently confine myself to the effects of his incarceration, and what steps may be available to mitigate those effects in the present

civil proceedings.” **Here is more evidence of the judge trying to be accommodating.**

In number 8 he says: “On 23 July 2013 I further informed Mr K that if he sought any order to permit him to **re-enter** the flat to retrieve his papers or permit him to reside there he must file with the court an application for such an order with a witness statement supported by a statement of truth setting out the history and circumstances of any agreement that he be entitled or permitted to live there and of his exclusion.”

In number 9 the judge says he informed Kirk he would be willing to consider such an application **urgently**, if made. **Here’s more evidence of the judge pandering to the piss taker Kirk. This is not the only judge to do so. Read on.**

In number 10 the judge says: “Mr K **informed me** in court on 23/7/13 that there was no need for me to do so, since **‘he had a Magistrates Court order that he be re-admitted’**. It was unclear why there should be such an order from the criminal court, or **why it remained un-acted upon** since he told me that the date of this Order was 13/7/2012.” **We only have Kirk’s say so that he has such an order. Why doesn’t he publish it? Why didn’t he at least show it to the judge? Why wasn’t that ruling acted upon? If it is true that he has such an order, he would be well within his rights to call police to enforce his right of entry to his flat. However, he has not said anywhere that he tried to do this.**

In number 11 the judge says: “Enquiry established that Mr K had been granted bail with a condition not to contact Davenport or Kingsley, he must not enter The Pitstop ... save the communal area. This did not itself amount to an order that Mr K be permitted to re-enter the flat.” **Why doesn’t Kirk publish this judgement? For the same reason he won’t publish all the other official documentation that he has - because it will reveal too much truth.**

In number 12 the judge says: “In the days succeeding, Mr K indicated by email that he did wish to avail himself of the civil court’s jurisdiction to make injunctive order in respect of access to the flat. **More time wasting ‘games’, paid for by you and me** In order to deal with this I need an application in the proper form, plus the court fee and witness statement i] identifying the premises ii] stating that he has been resident at the premises by agreement with [name] and that on [xyz] **the locks were changed without the consent of Mr K** and that he has since been excluded from the premises [by names] and requires access to retrieve

his papers and to resume residence [if ordered by the court to be permitted].”

In number 13 he says: “Mr K did submit a short form of written statement but one which **did not set out the factual matters** which were necessary to consider making an order.” **No surprises there from the piss taking MK.**

In point number 15 the judge states: “I wrote to the Governor of HMP Prison relating the civil proceedings and stating that it is essential to know **whether facilities can, and will, be made available to Mr K to work while in custody upon the preparation of his final submissions and for him to work on a laptop.**” **This shows that the judge is going out of his way to ensure that Kirk can continue his court actions whilst being incarcerated.**

In number 16 the judge says: “The Assistant Governor replied that Mr K had been remanded in custody on 13/8/13 but he states **he requires approximately 200 lever arch files from his flat** to properly prepare his final submissions. As discussed I am unable to access these files, however **if they could be retrieved and delivered to the Prison then we could organise his access to them.** We have agreed with Mr K that **we will supervise access to his Laptop to copy the relevant files onto Disc which he can then access on a prison computer.**” **Here we see the judge bending over backwards to assist the conman Kirk. Do you think you or I [who do not work for the ‘dark forces’] would be so indulged? As for his access to files, since he accuses everyone else of non-disclosure, we can take it that *he* publishes everything that he has. On that basis everything that he needs for his litigation can be accessed via his site. So his claim that he needs access to his ‘legal papers’ is obviously a load of bull and is just an excuse to continue his wicked judicial ‘games’. In any case whatever he has in those arch files, they are not ‘legal papers’; Kirk’s papers are a never ending flow of his wild distortions of truth. If he was a genuine whistleblower he would have all important notes/documents stored on a memory stick, with copies stored with trusted friends. See below for more on this never ending mantra about ‘legal papers’.**

In number 18 **the cosseting continues**, the judge says: “I do not know whether there is a person whom Mr K is willing to trust and authorise to collect his files and deliver them to HMP Prison. If he does, I will institute inquiry by this court whether access will be permitted without court order to an authorised person to collect papers and files and if

permission is refused I will consider what exceptional course may be required.”

In number 19 the judge says: “In addition the court has received brief written communications from Mr K, some of which are **difficult to follow.**”

This is followed by the judge saying in 20: “If there is to be a fresh application it needs to be one clearly formulated and supported by a witness statement. **No such application is before me.**”

What was Kirky Clown saying about ‘HM Conspirators’ being intent on locking him up for life to prevent him progressing his civil action against the police? It is clear that being incarcerated would not impede such proceedings. Kirk laughingly portrays himself as some sort of David, up against the mighty Goliath. What a pathetic creature this guy is.

Let’s now take a look at the 16/9/’13 ‘witness statement’ by **Stephen Edward Wood**, a Private Investigator and Certificated Bailiff <http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/13%2009%2016%20GBH%20on%20Bailiff.pdf> It would appear that Stephen Wood is **in on the MK scam**. Here we have a statement, just like the Gaphael statement, which backs up Kirk’s version of events and which also supports Kirk’s stance that the police are corrupt and are out to ‘get’ him. All we have is this one statement from him. There is nothing to support anything he says. Incidentally I did check if he was indeed a certified bailiff and it appears that he is, confirmed here <http://uk.linkedin.com/pub/steve-wood/18/177/a49> and in an email reply from the County Court Business Centre.

I’ll pick out the salient points of Wood’s statement and again comment in red.

Wood states [3] that he makes this statement in relation to an incident that occurred on the 31/7/13 and on the 5/8/13. **Where is the documentation in relation to these two incidences?**

He says [4] he was “first instructed by the owner of 175 Cowbridge Road, in relation to non-payment of rent by the tenant. The owner being Belinda Kirk **Kirk’s daughter** on the 24<sup>th</sup> 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”. **Where is the documentation**



showing the rent arrears/non payment of service charges? Where is the documentation listing all these breaches of conditions of the lease? Where is the eviction notice?

In point 5 he says: “Having received the signed documentation from Miss Belinda Kirk **we attended the property on 31st July 2013**, taking peaceful possession, **changing the locks ..**” **Woah. How were they able to get into the property?** According to Kirk [and the script] the locks had been changed by Davenport sometime before 23/7/13. According to Wood [point 6], Davenport contacted the bailiff’s office **hours** later on 31/7/13 requesting that he be allowed to attend at the property to remove his goods. So did Wood and Belinda Kirk break a window or something to force entry? In any case, since when has a bailiff had the legal authority to change locks? Where is this ‘signed documentation’?

In number 7 Wood says: “We therefore sent a bailiff **who?** to meet with the ex-tenant at the property on the 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2013.” He said that a few hours later Davenport and three males man handled him out of the shop allowing Davenport to re-take possession of the property, “becoming a trespasser in the building where the leasing had been forfeited.”

In number 8 Wood says that he called South Wales police for assistance, but they refused to take action as Davenport was “making unfounded **allegations of assault against the bailiff**”. He says the police did not pursue this matter, deciding to “believe Davenport rather than a court appointed bailiff”. **Where is Davenport’s witness statement?**

In number 9 Wood says that on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2013 at **10pm** he and a team of three **unnamed** bailiffs “returned to the property to remove the trespassers from illegally being in the premises, as is the right under common law”. **Where is the signed paperwork detailing the events of 5/8/13 and 2/8/13?**

In number 10 Wood says that Davenport, who had moved his family in, was not leaving the property and was threatening to assault anyone who attempted to remove him.

In points 11 and 12 Wood says that Davenport’s son, who said he was a qualified solicitor [Wood says he later discovered that was not true], made threats of violence. Wood requested the attending police to arrest Davenport’s son [**name unknown**].

Wood states in his points 13 and 14 that the female Police Sgt questioned Wood's attendance and reasons for him attempting to evict the occupants, stating that she did not believe that he was a Certified Bailiff, saying that "you can get anything off the internet". **Where is the evidence that this unnamed police sergeant said this?**

In number 15 Wood states that, "two of the bailiffs **unnamed** entered the premises and tried to remove Davenport, however the scene soon became violent *on Mr Davenport's side* with his family assisting him, whilst the police stood by and watched." He says: "One of the Bailiffs was injured receiving *gouging* to his skin causing bleeding; he *still has the scars to this day.*" **So it must have been a particularly nasty cut. Where are the medical records/photos?**

Wood states in number 16 that Davenport and 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." **So, there is physical violence going on between 2 groups of people, such that at least one person was badly injured and the police just stood by and watched for 2 hours??? Where are the witness statements i.e. EVIDENCE? Where is the evidence that police even attended?**

In number 17 Wood states: "It was clear that the Female Police Sergeant in attendance had a personal grievance against Bailiffs or knew the illegal occupants of the property. It was clear that she was siding with the tenants and having accused me of being a liar, ignoring crimes." He adds in number 19: "I truly believe that South Wales Police have failed in their lawful duty in protecting not only a member of the 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."

In number 20 he says: "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 ... I was put in fear of my safety in clear sight and hearing **of at least twelve officers** and again no action was taken." **None of these police officers are named and no I.D numbers given. Why didn't Wood put in an official complaint against this sergeant?**

Continuing on with Kirk's idea of evidence. On the page referred to above <http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/archive/2013/07/19/maurice->

[jailed-yet-again-by-south-wales-police.aspx](#) Kirk publishes another **part** document 'Statement of Truth' re an *alleged* theft. It is written by someone called Michael Murphy to support Kirk's delusions that the police are targeting him. There is no documentation to support anything this Murphy says. Following on is another alleged 'Statement of Truth' which is *allegedly* written by Murphy. However this one isn't signed and has just been typed up onto Kirk's site. It too is not backed up by any evidence that anything stated is true. Further down is another **part** document, which has no name, signature or date! It does have the number 59 in the bottom right corner though! Further down are **more part documents**, one re the threats against Davenport and Kingsley and one showing snippets of info which reveals that he was arrested for threatening to shoot and kill the Mayor of Cardiff. Continuing down the page is **yet another part document** re the CPS barrister David Gareth Evans. If you continue reading that page you will see even more **part documents**. Why doesn't Kirk publish **full** documents? Because they reveal too much **truth**, which is **not** Kirk's intention.

Now onto **Kirk's wife Kirsty**. Dr Teg W wanted to speak to Kirsty to try and establish a thorough understanding of what makes Kirk tick, so he could make an informed assessment of Kirk's grey matter. Kirk the control freak of course didn't like that idea as some more truth might slip out; which of course wouldn't be part of the script. He said that she is suspicious and reluctant to get involved, but that he would encourage her. Yeah right, lying little sh\*t. Funny how she was happy to be involved bringing food in for Kirk when he was on his pretend hunger strike. It seems she does come to her senses though. He says here <http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/archive/2013/02/16/south-wales-police-caswell-clinic-psychiatrist-reported-for-alleged-fraud.aspx> "and attempt to snatch, using armed police, our then ten year old daughter, Genevieve, which instigated immediate divorce proceedings I have never wanted." He says the intended snatching of his daughter was an attempt to further undermine his already fragile state of mind. Course Kirk the jerk doesn't blame himself for his wife walking out with their child. Kirk, you clown, if you weren't so self-obsessed and you made some effort to become a half decent human being, you might have kept your wife. Kirsty had to peg-leg it with Genevieve for the sake of sanity and safety for the pair of them. If she hadn't done so, Social Services would have been duty bound to step in. It is in fact reported that the risk management plan of 17/12/09 entailed a referral to Social Services in the event of Kirk being released or bailed. How the hell did Kirsty manage to stay with that warped conceited pr\*\*k for at least 17 years [and married for at least 12 years]??? Apparently he had a long

marriage to his first wife, Janet, too – 23 years. They had 3 kids. At the time of their divorce a social worker advised Janet not to allow him back in the house and Kirk was **not allowed to see his kids**.

It amazes me that Kirk and his fellow State agent Smiths fail to see that by working for the dark side they will ALL end up in a very lonely, sad and sorry state. ALL of them will be despised and rejected by society and by their loved ones. There will be no-one to care for them when they're old or sick and they'll eventually die alone ... destitute and desolate.

Kirk repeatedly states that 'HM Partnership' and 'freemasons' are conspiring against him. Well he's spinning a line here too because a man of his stature will know that **freemasonry controls everything**, including 'HM Partnership'. Something I stumbled upon which amused me no end is Kirk's comment: "The judge knew 100 odd court files were no more 'lost' than either Maurice Kirk or Patrick Cullinane was a Freemason."

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/RCVS%20SWP%20Abuse%20of%20Process%20Application%20Sept%202007.pdf> That's a good one! I would be very surprised if both these men are **not** high level masons. Patrick Cullinane is Kirk's lay legal representative and hails from the 'VOMIT' era; he is a close friend and loyal supporter of Norman Scarth and is connected with Victims Unite. Kirk chose Cullinane and Dafydd Morgan of 'Stand Your Ground' to defend him on 23/7/09. Dafydd Morgan [friend of Yolande Lindridge] is also familiar from years ago when VOMIT was online. Anyone who defends Maurice Kirk is no different to him – a despicable lying lowlife NWO gatekeeper. Either that or s/he is incredibly naive and gullible. If it is the latter I would advise both these men to disassociate themselves from Kirk and Scarth immediately as they are now tainted by association. Patrick Cullinane gets publicity from Butlincat and here <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gv3PZpn-RIg#t=22> he is seemingly in cahoots with the seriously dodgy 'Seven', attacking the integrity and credibility of Mark Windows. Cullinane <http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/11/10-11-23-comments.pdf> is looking more suspect by the minute. If he is genuine he had better wake TFU quick smart and realise that his 'friends' [who include the fake Farrell] are duping him and using him. I also now have my reservations about Meirion Bowen. He is associated with Victims Unite and is a supporter of Kirk and other dodgy characters, such as Norman Scarth. Say no more!

[http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south\\_wales\\_police/entry1517.aspx](http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south_wales_police/entry1517.aspx)

[http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south\\_wales\\_police/entry1569.aspx](http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/files/folders/south_wales_police/entry1569.aspx)

One day I'll get round to **investigating all of these men!**

Kirk tells Dr Tegwyn W that he knew of a targeted police campaign against him as he received info from his clients [some of whom were police officers]. He says he was told that his vehicles were being watched and photographed by the police. He says he was driven from Guernsey following death threats from "several members of the local freemason society." Well you'd think someone who has been 'under surveillance' for as long as our gallant warrior Kirky would actually have some hard proof! Where is his secretly recorded/photographed evidence? What are the names of these freemasons? Why doesn't he name the lodge? He says he does have this evidence! During his rant here

[http://www.kirkflyingvet.com/PDFs/Interview%20Statements\\_Transcripts.pdf](http://www.kirkflyingvet.com/PDFs/Interview%20Statements_Transcripts.pdf) he says "I have chapter and verse, witnesses, tape recordings, film, I even had to make a hole in the roof of my house opposite to watch them filming and in, and, and investigating my, my cars outside my veterinary hospital in Barry in Tynewydd Road and I even got Policemen who were coming in to see me as clients tipping me off and I also had people in Barry who had radios telling me we listened to the Police again they are outside your surgery." **SO WHY ISN'T THIS VITAL PROOF PLASTERED ALL OVER HIS WEBSITE???**

In Kirk's 'Permission to Appeal the Judgement and draft order of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2010' silly Sabine says that, re the Newport Road incident, the Defendant [police] produced only custody video with the tape obliterated from above waist level, preventing the Claimant from obtaining collar numbers or face detection of those who 'severely manhandled' him in both Rumney and Roath police stations. Well there's no evidence that any police officer assaulted him and as for police numbers, why didn't Kirk observe and note them down himself? The video itself would not have been able to capture *everything* in the room. Sabine says that this incident is an essential link in the chain of **bullying incidents**, which collectively form a "claim for 'Organisational Harassment'." She also claims that "The **Non-Investigation of Crimes** is a Case of **Bullying Tactics**". That of course is just another ridiculous claim. It is plain to see who the criminal is and the police/CPS/justices have done their duty in that regard.

She goes on to say re this incident that "The Defendant never gave evidence due to the guilty plea, obtained under duress and at the RCVS, years later, lied as to the facts [see transcript]." Well she doesn't link to

this transcript and in all the transcripts that are published I have not seen any evidence of lying by any police officer or RCVS official.

She also claims that Kirk is subject to “**multi-agency harassment**”. In this regard she says, “There is a body of evidence relating to court proceedings and their interference by the Defendant or their “partners in collusion” that is waiting to be taken into account for the purpose of quantifying damages. This aspect, especially for ‘4<sup>th</sup> action’ requires particularly careful examination, by an *independent* body ...” Well there is no collusion as it is a matter of *fact* that Kirk had umpteen convictions; which is all public knowledge. As for ‘independent body’ Sabine knows very well that there is no such thing; there are only individuals i.e. ‘ordinary’ members of the public who are independent. As for facts, the evidence plainly shows that it is KIRK who is the bully and the one doing the harassing. It is also evident that Kirk is the one playing the **delaying** game.

Sabine speaks of **falsification** of original police documents and **falsified and altered court records**. As said there is no evidence of any false documentation on the part of anyone within ‘HM Partnership’ as regards Maurice Kirk. There is, on the other hand, an abundance of evidence that **she and Kirk and all their McKenzie Mates are the ones giving false testimony**.

As regards ‘MAPPA’ she says, “Arbitrary categorisation of the Claimant who *never was an Offender* in the first place.” Words fail me. Also she says the poor boy had to go through the process of **asylum** applications instead of being near his families in the month before Christmas. Well it looks like we Brits are going to have to suffer this fu\*ker for a little while longer as the French have no intention of tolerating the tw\*t. More on this below. Can’t we ship him and his team of McKenzie shills off to Siberia or something?

It is abundantly clear that everything the McKenzie monkeys accuse others of, **they are themselves guilty of**.

Sabine has the jaw-dropping audacity to state that “the 4<sup>th</sup> action highlights how failed disclosure is part of the malicious intent, resulting in severe **contraventions of the Claimant’s human rights**.” Kirk is the one being malicious and he doesn’t give a flying f\*\*k for anyone else’s human rights!

But she has the *ultimate* audacity to say, “According to the malicious intent of the Defendant, the actions should have ended with either a corpse or imprisonment for life.” Whose corpse? Hers or Kirk’s?

Talking of corpses, she says: “In the same pace as the types of harassment by the Defendant intensified, the civil action in Court by the Claimant had to cover more and more complex and unusual issues, over a time that seems to be indefinite, unless it is ended by the claimant’s death.” Well I would say there is another option. Kirky boy could start being honest and fess up to the massive bag of bullshit he’s been spewing over 20+ years. But he’ll have to grow some balls first. Alas I fear there’s more chance of him emigrating to the moon ... Now there’s a thought.

He told Tegwyn that he has contemplated suicide; he’ll probably seriously contemplate that option when it dawns on him that karma will one day come and kick his butt.

Kirk’s McKenzie team’s ‘Permission to Appeal the Judgement and Draft Order of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2010’ is full of the same old bollocks. It is claimed that the Claimant was “not well enough for the pace they choose and try to impose.” Well he was well enough to conduct continuous **nonsense** litigation, which he would **not have dared do** if he didn’t have his shill dream team encouraging and partaking in his dirty work.

Elsewhere in the ‘Permission to Appeal ...’ it is stated that Kirk had “become unwell and not able to adequately respond to the stages in the case, including to either know what to amend from advice, or to do research and decide”. Also “... will not be able to deal with new information such as how to bring a complex legal case, within the complexities of the UK legal system and when no reliable source of advice is available. When at the height of stress, the claimant seems not well enough to control and organise as is needed for a simple hearing and he will be too stressed to present himself well.” Well Kirk has driven himself insane cos he listened to a group of lying psychopaths and was encouraged to behave as abhorrently as them. The poor f\*cked up delusioned creature has been so brainwashed, he really believes he’s a hero, just like his good pal Norman Scarth does.

Further on under the title **Adversarial balance in power and fairness?** is more rambling bollox from the Masonic controlled depraved McKenzie puppets. Under their title **Principle in Equality Act 2010 that allows a**

**change to Preliminary Judgement** is more of the same **generalised rambling cr\*p**.

Kirk's lay legal lot state that he was subject to unfairness and disadvantage because he is not a lawyer and cannot get one; that he and his then secretary approached over 80, specialising in the field, who all refused. Kirk's sister Celia L Jeune says her brother chose to represent himself in court because he would not be able to afford legal representation and would not be able to find a reliable lawyer <http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/news/default.aspx> As said she and the McKenzie clan know perfectly well that Kirk was repeatedly offered FREE legal representation of his choosing. He chose not to accept the assistance of a solicitor because he had no intention of sticking to relevant matters in court, as a solicitor is paid to do, but rather his agenda was to use the courts as a stage to rant off about how important and 'dangerous' he is to 'the enemy' as he is exposing the 'corrupt South Wales police' which he says is protected by the 'corrupt Cardiff cabal'; even though he has not one iota of proof. See more on this below. In any case it would appear that he lies about lawyers too. See this post <http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/blogs/legal/default.aspx> 2/5 of the way down he says, "I dutifully arrived at number one court to have my lawyers from England apply for 'variation' to my draconian bail conditions so I go and sit in the public gallery." See also his use of a solicitor here [file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/11%2006%2016%20JR%20Judgment%20\(3\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/11%2006%2016%20JR%20Judgment%20(3).pdf) Kirk's sister just parrots the same old shill speak as the rest of the clan, without backing up anything she says. And this woman is a f ... ing magistrate for God's sake! Kirk's adult son, Alex Kirk, is no better. See here [http://www.kirkflyingvet.com/PDFs/Letter\\_BailApplication\\_100809.pdf](http://www.kirkflyingvet.com/PDFs/Letter_BailApplication_100809.pdf) for his shilly lies and insults.

Also in the link above is mention of Kirk's appeal against his conviction for assaulting a prison officer. Kirk claims he arrested the officer Rogan for committing a crime when he failed to return his passport which he says was held unlawfully after he had been released from prison. According to the shills the authorities had to cover this up and so initially charged him with unlawfully entering a prison which they changed to a charge of assault. They say that since the incident occurred in front of the main entrance to Cardiff prison which is monitored closely by a security camera, there should be video evidence to settle the matter as to what actually happened, but that the camera in question was either



**not working or was switched off**, much like the cameras in the Pont d'Alma tunnel on the day Diana was murdered. How convenient that there is no evidence! It is almost certainly the case that the camera was working and did film the evidence, but that Kirk won't show it because it reveals the truth; which is not his twisted version. Notice, yet again, there is no link to any official documentation/court judgement or transcript. Notice also how these gatekeepers love to compare with high profile cases!

Further on it is stated that Kirk was going without medical attention including pain killers for the whole week **despite an untreated prolapsed bowel** known to the medical staff..... Well I'd like to see the medical evidence. And if it is true, then why did he scare the living daylights out of the public in court by removing his trousers? **[See the 4/5/12 court transcript below.]** The dirty b\*stard didn't have to remove his trousers and expose himself to everyone; he could have excused himself and gone somewhere private to attend to himself.

Moving swiftly on through the same page to: **Day one, two, three and four of the trial for breaching the R.O and making threats to damage**. I comment in red. I quote: "... presentation was approaching the shambolic at one point with various barristers, solicitors and police officers bustling about the courtroom, struggling to play back a tape recording of one of the alleged offences. **Evidence?** A bad character application was brought forward against Maurice, which of course, as it turned out, had not even been served on him! **Evidence?**

It also seemed to come as a bit of a surprise to the prosecution that they would actually have to prove that a restraining order existed in the first place! The barrister had to improvise a bit when the judge asked him what evidence he actually had. **Where's your evidence for any of this? Why the vagueness? Where is the court transcript?**

At this point Maurice requested that he might be allowed the sight and use of some of the legal papers that he has been trying to obtain for so long. **Why the vagueness?. What 'legal papers' is he referring to?** Next up was the attesting [sic] and arresting, officer, who, under cross examination, did actually admit, at one point, That "your arrest was unlawful", this freudian slip was of course quickly corrected but nevertheless, it was said. It will be interesting to see if it is marked as "inaudible" when it comes out in the transcript! **Why don't you publish the transcript?**

No doubt they are expecting Maurice's enemies to burst in and start spraying gunfire at him in an attempt to save the taxpayer money!

**Grandiose delusions.**

There is a principle of EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW, or, as Maurice has made mention of on several occasions, EQUALITY OF ARMS on the battlefield that is the courtroom. **Now who else do I know regularly uses such terminology? Oh yes, my old friend, the toy soldier, Norman Scarth.**

The afternoon brought some developments with the prosecution witness, the supervising custody officer, giving evidence as to how the "restraining order" came to be served on Maurice.

It was largely a rerun of the original evidence that he gave last time they convicted him of breaching it. In other words it still contradicted the evidence given yesterday by the clerk of the court who said the "R.O" was served on him in the corridor, whilst the supervising custody officer again insisted it was served on Maurice whilst he was in the cell. **Please provide the evidence. Publish the court transcript.** PS. Please note that the video of the Police interview right after the arrest is on [this blog post](#). And here's [his sister's witness statement re bail and bail hostels](#). **That video is referred to above – it exposes more of the truth about Maurice Kirk. As said his sister is the same as Kirk and Sabine and all the rest of the shill dream team - just another Satan serving snake.**

The witness identified as the supervising custody officer was back on the stand to continue, not so much being grilled as roasted slowly over hot coals. Evidently his training kicked in and his answers consisted largely of "I can't remember". When pressed for a yes or no answer he repeatedly launched into a spiel worthy of the best politicians across the dispatch box. Maybe he should stand for prime minister? **Evidence please. Publish the transcript.**

What was produced by the prosecution, on the orders of the Judge, was a copy of the prisoner escort record. Unfortunately the first page was illegible, a fact noted by the Judge who asked for the original to be produced. When asked who had in fact made the entries in the record, the witness again launched into a monologue along the lines of "I do not remember". When asked who was in fact responsible for the keeping of the record he appeared to momentarily forget his job description as Supervising custody officer! **Again, prove your allegations.**

After he began to eat, he didn't pass anything for 4 days and was in pain, trying to survive with medicines and enemas. He also stopped eating again, for he now **wants a document that explains the corruption between Police, Prison, Courts and the Judiciary - preferably from a judge.**" FFS. **On and on and on it goes ... just a never ending steaming pile of make believe nonsense.**

Now let's take a swift nose at Kirk's utterly outrageous and totally unjustified **claim for damages**. The gall of this truly repulsive skunk knows no bounds. On his 'schedule of special damages' dated 20/12/1999 [scroll to the end of <http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/99-12-20-m-v-swp-1st-action.pdf> ] we see a list of claims. Let's just pick out the best ones:-  
Prepare for trial – 7 ½ hours at £60 per hour £450  
Prepare for trial and appeal at £60 per hour £800  
Prepare for trial including support staff for four hearings £800  
Unlawful detention on two days £800  
Publicity £3000  
My loss of work £2000

**Words fail me!**

Sickeningly there was initially a £50k award, ... which was overturned.  
[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/HM%20Conspiracy%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/HM%20Conspiracy%20(2).pdf)

As for Kirk's solicitors Bobbetts Mackan who represented him in the above action, they have their slurping straws in the same Masonic spittoon as all NWO gatekeepers. Maurice and Mackan are most accomplished piss-takers. Another seedy soulless solicitor slurping from the same straw is G Huw Lewis. He also refuses to deal in facts and instead rides the MK gravy train, listening to and regurgitating Kirk's bullcrap.  
<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/11%2011%2015%20Solicitor%20letter%20to%20Cardiff%20Magistrates.pdf>

Now let's look at the **charges against him re the machine gun**. The shill spin is of a "notorious and farcical "machine gun" case, following South Wales police, having failed to get me [Kirk] to Ashworth". The theme throughout Kirk's **fantasy** is that 'HM Partnership' is colluding to have him locked away for life in order to shut him up once and for all, to prevent him exposing the corruption within South Wales Police and the

cover up which followed within 'HM Partnership'. Well there is no evidence anyone is trying to lock him away indefinitely and there is an abundance of evidence that Kirk more than deserved the various periods he's spent doing bird i.e. in the Maurice Kirk story, there is no corruption, so nothing for him to expose. Well, I should say there is no evidence of any corruption within 'HM Partnership'; the corruption is coming from him and his McKenzie chimps.

In any case, even if he was locked up for longer periods, that would not stop him progressing his civil actions. As we can see in the court transcripts that are published, ALL justices have been very tolerant and more than fair, giving him all the help they can. Kirk is the one causing problems for himself. Also Kirk has his very capable McKenzie monkeys who can do a lot of his dirty work and especially his goforing. As for his 'legal papers' that he says he needs to access, it is extremely obvious that he uses that as an excuse to hinder or obstruct proceedings, which is all part of his sly game. All of us unfortunate to be caught up in the legal merry-go-round know that anything important can be stored on a tiny memory stick, with copies handed to trusted friends, for safekeeping.

Curiously, Kirk has not published the court transcript of the trial or the judgement and there is no other official documentation provided to show what actually happened and the verdict. He says he was found not guilty by a jury of any firearms offences

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/news/archive/2013/11/19/arrest-of-a-violent-offender.aspx>

See also on this page an excellent judgement from judge Bidder; which is of course followed by a list of Kirk's usual fanciful delusions. In the comments section is reference to Christopher Ebbs, by 'Guido'. More on this below. Elsewhere Kirk's spin is that he was, "jailed on a fabricated allegation that he was 'in possession and trading in machine guns with live ammunition'." On the same page the romancer says, "Instead the Welsh Authorities pursued all that was left, to stop the civil trial beginning, i.e. the registration of Maurice Kirk as a 'Vexatious Litigant'."

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/news/archive/2010/12/14/hm-privy-council-receives-reasons-for-french-asylum-incl-threat-to-kill-by-south-wales-police.aspx>

**There was more than enough evidence from as far back as the early 1990s to classify him as vexatious.**

For more of his nonsense about the machine gun trial and other MAPPA matters see <http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/10-12-07-mjk-mappa-executive-summary1.pdf> Incidentally he says he doesn't

know why he was removed from his MAPPA categorisation on 17/12/09.  
Why doesn't he publish the report of that meeting?

Here is the indictment:

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Indictment%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Indictment%20(1).pdf)

Count 1

#### STATEMENT OF OFFENCE

POSSESSING A PROHIBITED WEAPON, contrary to section 5(l)(a) of the

Firearms Act 1968.

#### PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE

MAURICE JOHN KIRK between the 1st day of January 2008 and the 23rd day of June 2009 without the authority of the Secretary of State, had in his possession a firearm namely a Lewis Machine Gun5 which was so designed or adapted that two or more missiles could be successively discharged without repeated pressure on the trigger.

Count 2

#### STATEMENT OF OFFENCE

SELLING OR TRANSFERRING A PROHIBITED WEAPON, contrary to section

5(l)(a) of the Firearms Act 1968.

#### PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE

MAURICE JOHN KIRK between the 1st day of January 2008 and the 23rd day of June 2009 without the authority of the Secretary of State, sold or transferred a firearm, namely a Lewis Machine Gun, which was so designed or adapted that two or more missiles could be successively discharged without repeated pressure on the trigger.

Count 3

## STATEMENT OF OFFENCE

POSSESSING CRIMINAL PROPERTY, contrary to section 329(1 )(c) of the

Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.

## PARTICULARS OF OFFENCE

MAURICE JOHN KIRK between the 1st day of January 2008 and the 23rd day of June 2009 possessed criminal property namely, £2000 (two thousand pounds) knowing or suspecting it to constitute a person's benefit from criminal conduct.

The following is the response on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2012 by R A HOLDER Detective Inspector, South Wales police headquarters.

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/12%2006%2001%20SWP%20MG%20IPCC%20Conclusion.pdf> My comments are in red.

Sir

Complaint against the Police by Maurice John KIRK

This report relates to a Proportionate Investigation carried out following a complaint against the Police by Mr KIRK.

He is a man with an extensive history of making complaints and pursuing Civil Claims against the Police and other organisations. In fact, in his witness statement he describes his occupation as a chronic litigant.

In June 2009, Mr KIRK was arrested for possession of a prohibited weapon and other offences. The weapon concerned is a World War Lewis machine gun and he ultimately appeared at Crown Court, charged with offences relating to that.

Mr KIRK complained via letter, dated 21st August 2011, concerning South Wales Police perverting the course of justice, concerning the investigation into him. He included a self-written witness statement, in which he details various allegations.

On 18th October 2011, a dispensation application was sent to the IPCC, on the grounds that the complaint was out of time.

On 6th December 2011, the IPCC wrote to South Wales Police and advised that the dispensation was granted, with the exception of two areas that should be investigated, namely

1. Officers tampered with the machine gun in order to make it capable of firing.
2. Discrepancies regarding an undercover operation and the subsequent evidence given.

The investigation has therefore concentrated on those two areas. In addition, when visited, Mr KIRK raised a further issue regarding his MAPPA status and I will comment about this further on.

#### Lewis Machine Gun

Mr Ronald COOPER is a collector of historic aircraft and in around April 2008, purchased a World War Aircraft from Mr KIRK, having seen it on Mr KIRK'S website.

Included in the purchase was a Lewis machine gun, which was a necessary part of the purchase in order to balance the aircraft properly.

Mr COOPER states that Mr KIRK told him that the gun had been deactivated, that is, the gun was not capable of firing as certain parts had been removed. Mr COOPER actually states that it was deactivated and describes missing parts. He states he does not know the serial number of the gun.

Mr COOPER states that he painted the gun black and the magazine silver, after cleaning the outside but not the inside of it.

After being contacted by the Civil Aviation Authority, Mr COOPER left the Lewis machine gun with Mike SCOTT, a registered firearms dealer, for the purpose of further deactivation, the reason being that the present deactivation did not meet the requirements of new legislation.

Mr SCOTT confirms that he received the Machine gun from Mr COOPER and describes how he felt that the gun had not been properly

deactivated. He states the serial number was 2221, possibly ending in 66.

Mr SCOTT explains how he handed the gun to the Police and there are statements attached showing continuity of possession of the gun until its arrival with Mr Andrew HUXTABLE, the National Ballistics Intelligence Service Armourer based at the Scientific Support Unit, Police Headquarters, Bridgend. Mr HUXTABLE formed the opinion that this was a Firearm that was capable of firing.

The gun was further examined by Mr Phillip RYDEARD, a Forensic Scientist, who provided expert evidence. He gives the serial number as 222166 and details why he feels the gun is not deactivated. He actually test fired it using ammunition and shotgun cartridges.

Mr Richard MABBIT is the Superintendent of London Proof House whose role mainly entails the Inspection of Military weapons. He also gives the serial number as 222166.

He field stripped the gun and concluded that it had not been deactivated.

Mr Samuel PERRY, the Superintendent of Birmingham Proof House, also conducted a field stripping of the gun and concluded that it had not been decommissioned. He also gives the serial number as 222166.

The gun was later shown again to Mr COOPER who stated that he could now push a wire rod down the barrel whereas previously he could not. This is quite likely to be as a result of the weapon being field stripped on a number of occasions.

Mr KIRK alleges that the Police deliberately unblocked the barrel of the gun so as to make it capable of firing.

There is clear continuity of the weapon from Mr COOPER through to the various experts, all of whom say it was capable of firing and in fact it did fire. There is no doubt it is one and the same gun and there is no evidence whatsoever to say the Police deliberately unblocked the barrel.

Mr COOPER makes reference to the unblocked barrel in a statement taken by the Police during the Criminal Investigation; the fact is not hidden as suggested by Mr KIRK who states that Mr COOPER raised it



under cross examination. In fact, if a Firearm is properly deactivated, the barrel can not be later unblocked.

Mr KIRK makes reference to the magazine of the gun being painted by the Police. This is his word only and frankly makes no difference to whether the weapon was capable of being fired. RC says he painted it silver. But the idiot Kirk can't keep up with his own lies and says <http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/11-10-20-defence-statement.pdf> "Mr Cooper, the main prosecution witness in the ridiculous trial who had bought my decommissioned machine gun, a year before my June 09 arrest and had painted major black coloured components on it to silver." Also, it is revealed in this 25/6/09 court transcript

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/1\\_B20090055%20-%20KIRK%20-%20EXTRACT%20-%2025.06.09.pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/1_B20090055%20-%20KIRK%20-%20EXTRACT%20-%2025.06.09.pdf) that Kirk testifies that it was "left with the RAF authorities for about two years and it was sold from there to this chap, Mr Cooper." See RC's statement here

[http://www.kirkflyingvet.com/PDFs/Interview%20Statements\\_Transcripts.pdf](http://www.kirkflyingvet.com/PDFs/Interview%20Statements_Transcripts.pdf) In conclusion, I find in relation to this issue that there is no evidence of Misconduct but this is simply one of a series of unfounded conspiracy theories currently being flaunted by Mr KIRK.

Of course, if the gun had been properly deactivated crowing Kirk would have been only too happy to publish his certificate of Proof on his website.

See here

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Tape%20record\(5\)%2023\\_06\\_09.pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Tape%20record(5)%2023_06_09.pdf) for what is meant by proper deactivation.

Sabine's skill speak is that this gun was exempt from new legislation. She states <http://mauricejohnkirk.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/11-01-03-machine-gun-case-summary.pdf> [point 3]: "The 1968 Fire Arms Act was amended meaning that if the 'gun' remained as it had first been decommissioned, it was exempt from the new regulations. This became the *critical argument* in the later trial." Well there is no evidence to support that statement. Why doesn't she publish the transcript of the trial? Other transcripts are published.

Sabine Spin also states [point 18]: Jury informed MJK their verdict was concluded after the first day of evidence and asked why was the purchaser of the 'gun' not also in the dock? *He and police had 'modified*

*it'* and the jury believed, correctly, that the police had made attempts to withhold that fact from them.” Clearly RC is not in cahoots with the police; if anything he seems to be *supporting* Kirk by saying that when later shown the gun he could [quoted from above] “now push a wire rod down the barrel whereas previously he could not.” Sabine of course does not provide evidence that the jury said anything of the sort. Sabine continues spinning her fanciful version, saying [point 19]: “Failed disclosure by the 25<sup>th</sup> Feb '09 *false affidavit* meant trouble; so police *concocted* this gun story and *falsified* the medical evidence to obtain an Imprisonment for Public Protection.” Well she and Kirk can scream ‘false’ and ‘concoction’ all they like but they’ve failed to prove any of their allegations.

As for the trial which took place on 25/1/'10 with the verdict delivered on the 9/2/'10, the shills gloat that Maurice was freed by a majority not guilty verdict. Well there is absolutely no official documentation to show what actually happened and no judgement even to confirm the verdict. I have searched high and low for any info and can only find the usual shill shite.

### Undercover Tactics

Mr KIRK makes reference to phone calls to his home, by a female officer, claiming to be interested in purchasing a gun. He states that a male Officer gave evidence at Court, concealed behind a screen, to the effect that he had made the phone calls. He states this person used the pseudonym of 'Foxy'.

I can confirm that an 'undercover' Officer from another Police force was actually utilised in attempts to purchase a gun from Mr KIRK. This is clearly sensitive and confidential so I will only mention it briefly. Needless to say, I have listened to audio recording of phone calls from the Officer who made the calls, he is clearly male and identifies himself as 'Foxy'.

My suggestion is that Mr KIRK has been sighted on the name Foxy during the disclosure and court processes and has assumed that Foxy is a female, dare I say as most people would. I can say categorically that the Officer is male and that Mr KIRK is mistaken in this respect.

It is reported here

<http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Flying+Vet+sold+First+World+War+machi+ne+gun+off+fighter+plane%3B...-a0217583321> that jurors were told an undercover policeman codenamed Foxy saw the advert and called Kirk

asking if the weapon was for sale. But Kirk replied: "She's no longer with me." Foxy asked if the gun had been deactivated, but Kirk allegedly said: "**No, this one works.**" This is also confirmed on this 25/6/09 court transcript

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/B20090055%20-%20KIRK%20-%20PROCEEDINGS%20-%2025%2006%2009.pdf> Also stated here is that Kirk had listed the machine-gun with '**ammo**' for sale on his website.

## MAPPA Status

Mr KIRK wishes to complain about lack of disclosure to him over his MAPPA status. A copy of the MAPPA meeting minutes executive summary is attached which shows a **summary of the meetings held in 2009** when Mr KIRK was categorised as Level 3 MAPPA. He has attempted to obtain further minutes from individual agencies. **He makes mention of minutes referring to him being shot if he approached the then Chief Constable. This is incorrect although it is clear that because of the threat posed at the time by Mr KIRK, the Chief Constable was subject of close protection.**

It can be clearly seen from an attached Court Order that on 14th July 2011, it was ordered by His Honour Seys LLEWELLYN, QC, at a County Court Hearing, that Mr KIRK'S application for disclosure of full minutes was dismissed. There is in fact **no obligation to provide minutes to a person subject of MAPPA** and this has been reinforced by the County Court judgement.

The partner agencies are therefore within their rights not to disclose individual minutes to Mr KIRK and he is fully aware of this. **To complain about this is in fact an abuse of the complaints procedures.**

## Observations

I should point out that Mr **KIRK has not been very cooperative** during this investigation.

On 7th February 2012, I visited him at HMP Cardiff in order to take a witness statement, which I duly did. **He refused to sign it until I gave him a photocopy which the prison staff obliged with and I provided him with a copy immediately.**

Mr KIRK signed the statement then **demanding a photocopy of the signed version**, which the prison staff did not do. Mr KIRK then stated

that I had taken the statement under duress and he wished to withdraw it. He has subsequently written to me requesting a copy of the statement and has been directed to submit a Subject Access application. In fact, on Monday 21st May 2012, I spoke over the phone to Mr KIRK and it was clear that he had forgotten that I had given him a copy of his unsigned statement. He has also criticised me on his website and provided my Office telephone number, encouraging people to ring me, although nobody has to date.

And now onto **Christopher Paul Alexander**, previously known as **Christopher Paul Ebbs**.

Kirks's response to Dr Tegwyn William's listing of past forensic history in his August Psychiatric Report is: "1997 Battery common assault conviction following evidence from Christopher Paul Ebbs psychiatric malingerer when convenient, congenital liar and a thief."

In the Privy Council Judgement – Kirk v the RCVS <file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/Privy%20Council%20Judgment%2019th%20Jan%2004.pdf> dated 19<sup>th</sup> January 2004, it is stated:

The next assault case was in 1997 when Mr Kirk was convicted by the Bristol Magistrates of common assault and threatening behaviour (under section 4 of the public order Act 1936) arising out of an incident at the plume and Feathers public House in Bristol. The complainant was Mr Christopher Ebbs, who had done some work on an aircraft belonging to Mr Kirk. It appears that Mr Ebbs was exercising a lien on the aircraft's logbooks and other documentation as security for a bill of about £22,000. They arranged to meet in the public house. Mr Ebbs said in evidence that this was with a view to exchanging the aircraft documentation for a cheque. He said that while they were having a drink, Mr Kirk swung a fist at him, knocked him to the ground, kicked him in the ribs and tried to extract the documents from his coat pocket. This was the basis of the charge of common assault. He was also alleged to have said "I've got "a shotgun and I know where your parents live". As a result of this threat, Mr Ebbs went to the police who moved his parents into a hotel and provided them with armed protection. This threat was the basis of the charge of threatening behaviour. Mr Kirk's evidence was that he asked for his papers and reached over expecting to receive them, but Mr Ebbs fell off his chair. As

Mr Kirk tried to help him up, a drunken customer grabbed him. He denied kicking or punching Ebbs or making threats against his parents.

The Bristol magistrates convicted on both charges and imposed fines of £600 for the assault and £500 for threatening behaviour, together with an order to pay Mr Ebbs £100 compensation. Mr Kirk appealed to the Bristol crown court but the appeal was dismissed. He also brought a number of applications for judicial review, alleging that the trial had been an abuse of process. One ground was that there had not been proper disclosure of relevant statements made to the police and another was that he had been unable to obtain the medical records of Mr Ebbs, which would show that he had psychiatric problems. A judge had made an order for disclosure of Mr Ebbs' medical records by the prosecution if he was willing to allow them to be produced. But he was not willing. None of the applications for judicial review was successful. Mr Ebbs made a statement to the Disciplinary committee and was cross-examined by Mr Kirk about his mental records and other collateral matters which the committee's legal assessor (Sir John wood) ruled to be irrelevant. Both the magistrates and the crown court accepted Mr Ebbs as a witness of truth. The judge in the Crown Court said. "We were satisfied that Mr Ebbs was an honest and truthful witness. He is a man of good character. He appeared to us to be mild-mannered and not aggressive. His account of the incident was supported by an independent witness, Mr Westlake. He said that he saw Mr Ebbs on the floor, with Mr Kirk bent over him holding his collar.

We rejected the account given by Mr Kirk. We agreed with the suggestion put to him by [counsel] that he was a bully and that he assaulted Mr Ebbs because he refused to return the documents.

Mr Ebbs again gave evidence before the Disciplinary committee and was cross examined by Mr Kirk in a manner which the committee called rigorous and some of its members would have described as bullying. But the committee also accepted Mr Ebbs as a truthful witness and rejected Mr Kirk's account of the meeting as false.

In the documents which Mr Kirk has produced to the Board, there are several about Mr Ebbs. A Mr Timothy Wiltshire of Lincolnshire, who was being sued by Mr Ebbs (who had obtained ex parte relief) describes him in uncomplimentary terms. A Mr Bennett of Cornwall says that he lied about his qualifications as an aircraft engineer and falsified the records of an aircraft. The South Wales Police, in a letter to Mr Kirk's constituency MP Mr John Smith in June 1998, say that Mr Ebbs was

being prosecuted by the CA A for various offences but that, according to the CAA, the prosecution is presently suspended as Mr Ebbs is in receipt of psychiatric treatment". Allegations and counter allegations by and against Mr Ebbs were also being investigated by other police forces. None of this information was tested either in the courts or before the Committee.

The acceptance of Mr Ebbs as a truthful witness is something which has probably riled Mr Kirk more than any other feature of this case. But the fairness of the court proceedings was not a matter for the committee to investigate. It was something which Mr Kirk was entitled to, and did, raise by way of appeal and judicial review.

Well, apart from the unproven allegations against Ebbs, there is nothing to suggest that events surrounding the assault by Kirk did not happen as Ebbs described and testified. However Ebbs' credibility later comes into question as he is convicted of sexual abuse, an offence which occurred in 2006 and 2007, for which he received a 7 month prison sentence. It is reported in The Gazette on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2008

[http://www.gazetteseries.co.uk/news/1942565.choirmaster\\_admits\\_sexually\\_assaulting\\_boy/](http://www.gazetteseries.co.uk/news/1942565.choirmaster_admits_sexually_assaulting_boy/) See also

<http://wallysplace.wordpress.com/2013/01/31/christopher-alexander-or-christopher-ebbs/comment-page-1/>

Kirk says in this post <http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/blogs/legal/default.aspx>

“ ... See, for example, the continuing nonsense metered out from South Wales Police HQ when Inspector Rice featured so much in the numerous malicious prosecutions. One being how South Wales Police crossed the River Severn back in the 90s and met up with Christopher Alexander (Ebbs) to try and persuade him to change his evidence in Bristol Crown court and RCVS London Court to get me struck off as a veterinary surgeon . Usual blackmail on his professional flying licences were muted as did the CAA with me in Taunton when negotiating a plea for an offence of low flying I had never committed.”

The statement in question which Ebbs apparently wrote, on 27/10/12, to support Kirk's assertion that the police have 'got it in for him' states:

1] I Christopher Paul Alexander [I was known as Christopher Paul Ebbs at the time period in question] was the principle prosecution witness in a case brought against Maurice Kirk.

2] The case relates to an offence of assault by MK.

3] I am led to believe that the outcome of the case was influential in the removal of MK's license to practice as a vet.

4] Prior to a hearing at Bristol Magistrates Court I received a request to meet with a police officer to discuss my statement and the case against MK.

5] The meeting was held at Aust motorway services.

6] In addition to the officer who requested the meeting five other people were present [plus myself].

7] From memory those present were [myself] PS Rice, DC Williams, DC Evans, Jim McKenna [CAA] Representative from Wales CPS, plus one other unidentified person.

8] During the meeting it was suggested that I should alter my statement to increase the impact my statement would have against MK in the proceedings.

9] During the meeting I was threatened with various sanctions if I failed to alter the statement, which included sanctions against both my pilots and aviation engineer's licenses.

I confirm that this is a statement of truth. Witnessed by Sarah Churchard.

This scenario does not ring true. There's no evidence that it happened apart from this statement. Perhaps Ebbs was persuaded to write it from the Masonic high ups, with the trade off being some sort of protection for Ebbs so that he could continue with his paedophile activities or from people who may want to 'get him' due to his paedophilic practices. Who knows, but there are certainly far too many unanswered questions for this statement to be accepted as legit. For example, why would it be written so late in the day? [Presumably the hearing at Bristol Magistrates Court would have been in 1997/98. If that's the case this statement would have been written around 14 years later!] Where is the statement that he used in court? Why doesn't he publish a copy of that? Why doesn't Ebbs give the date of the Bristol hearing? Why doesn't he give a date for the meeting that took place at 'Aust' motorway services? Where is 'Aust'? He doesn't know who the 5<sup>th</sup> person is. Why didn't he find out? Why are there no other statements to confirm this account from any of the other 5 witnesses? His allegation of being threatened – of sanctions, do not ring true; there has to be valid reason why someone would lose a license. Maybe this was thrown in because he had already lost his pilot's and aviation engineer's licenses due to his sexual abuse conviction! Who is Sarah Churchard?

Take a look at these links and especially the following comments  
<http://wallysplace.wordpress.com/2013/01/31/christopher-alexander-or-christopher-ebbs/comment-page-1/> and  
<http://pilotsfriend.wordpress.com/>

I quote: "So here we are in 2012, Maurice has come full circle and Ebbs (now known as Christopher Alexander) **becomes his best friend and**



signs a statement the day following Maurice getting arrested for breaking into Ebb's house ??? Initially Ebbs claimed he got home to find Maurice sitting there eating his food uninvited after Maurice had broken in and called the police. The following day he changed his story. Not before Maurice had to spend a night in the cells.

The day after Maurice's release Ebb's funded Maurice going for a fly in one of his aircraft. He also signed a statement for Maurice to use to try and get his registration as a vet reinstated, and allow Maurice to retire as a vet rather than a struck off vet.

The documents below [see the linked website] were originally provided by Maurice Kirk: "Madam [Barbara Wilding] is to sign a sworn affidavit that her police did not take a statement from Christopher Paul Ebbs who informed Special Branch I [Kirk] had been smuggling pigs into the Vale of Glamorgan from Eire in my 2 seat Piper aircraft leading to a memorable court case, nor was she aware of the incident." See more of this in Kirk's 'PSA' 6/9/10.

"February 2009

If anyone knows anything on Lyons Flying Club and Chaudet, France's 'Christopher Paul Ebbs',...where is his property, his aeroplanes, his business contacts, offspring, where are they and who else has been injured? I would be grateful to know. A reward is offered. ."

### **Fred Smith [permalink](#)**

**"It seems that Maurice plays games with everyone. Just noticed this post on his website, written in the "third person tense" yet seemingly posted by Maurice at 5.07pm.**

I guess its a bit like his claims on his website of the Police going to get him at his Wales address, when the reality was that they had arrived to check his car for forensic evidence after he had reported it being broken into and items being stolen. He was so frightened by this that he took photographs. Just as he claims that he took Photographs in France of them trying to "section him" This is in the realms of fantasy and manipulation by Maurice to paint the picture he wants people to believe." "SOUTH WALES POLICE HAVE MAURICE SECTIONED IN BRITTANY within 30 minutes of speaking with NHS (Wales) rogue lawyers while having lunch he is surrounded in his Merdrignac Breton main street and

*bungled into a 'pannier a salad' and driven to Pontivy Hospital for psycho analysis.*

*more and photos taken at abduction....later*

*coincides in just days of GMC conclusion on Caswell Clinic doctor, IPCC machine gun and South Wales Police and CPS re appeals in London, all effectively, arriving 'all together'.....to further substantiate a South Wales taffia conspiracy to pervert the course of justice  
Published Jan 26 2013, 05:07 PM by Maurice Kirk”*

**Only a short time ago Maurice was trying to use the French Authorities to protect him: (From Maurice's own Website)”**

Have a look at the comments section on this page

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/news/archive/2013/11/19/arrest-of-a-violent-offender.aspx> The only genuine commenter here I believe is Cat Lady/Suspended, who has been in touch with me and who remains anon for understandable reasons. The rest of the people commenting are Kirk's fellow spineless spin merchants. They could even be one 'sock puppet'. They are all scum agents of the State, all **pretending** to be brave 'truth soldiers', yet too scared and depraved to reveal their identity. Incidentally *everything* that Kirk has brought upon himself, which has led to a conviction, he pinpoints as being the excuse to deregister him as a vet.

See numerous examples of this in his 'Particulars of Claim' 24/10/07 whereby we see a long list of his usual falsifications but where a hint of the truth is revealed in his various convictions. For example, he says: "Further, the plaintiff was convicted for '**driving without due care and attention**' as he caused an **imaginary car** to 'stop'. The RCVS ruled the conviction of 'driving without due care and attention' rendered the claimant to be **unfit to practice veterinary surgery and was struck off for life.**" Also: "Between 1994 and 30<sup>th</sup> August 1995 the claimant's surgery in Llantwit Major was **burgled 3 times**, the crime reported to the Defendant [police]. In Crown court on the 22<sup>nd</sup> March 1996 the Defendant on oath denied the surgery had been burgled during the period quoted above. The plaintiff was convicted of 'allowing' clinical waste from the said premises to be found elsewhere with costs incurred to the claimant exceeding £8000. The Defendant was aware the RCVS and judge knew the fact that **the only other veterinary practice in the**

**town possibly liable had submitted a false veterinary certificate to the prosecution** and the principle had given appropriate evidence in order not to be subject to the same possible prosecution. A small black bag containing clinical waste had been found with some 50 others of unlawful household waste on the edge of the town car park. The RCVS ruled on the 29<sup>th</sup> May 2002 the conviction of **'failing to prevent the deposit of controlled waste'** rendered the claimant to be **'unfit to practice veterinary surgery' and was struck off for life**. The claimant suffered loss due to the conduct of the defendant." Another example: "In 1995 the Defendant received a complaint from the claimant of **criminal damage and theft of property** but instead he was fined £500 for 'common assault' the conviction only obtained by **perjury** committed by the Defendant. **Kirk, you haven't proved that anyone has perjured themselves**. The RCVS ruled on the 29<sup>th</sup> May 2002 the conviction of **'common assault'** rendered the claimant to be **'unfit to practice veterinary surgery' and was struck off for life**. The claimant suffered loss due to the Defendant's conduct." I'd say this monkey is **unfit to call himself a human being**, never mind unfit to be a vet.

There are countless more incidents in his 'POC', also reiterated here <http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/13%2007%2016%20Claimants%20Cosing%20Submissions%20KIRK%20v%20SOUTH%20WALES%20POLICE%20BS%20614159.pdf> [which includes more on Ebbs] whereby we have, as always, Kirk's perversion of the truth, but whereby a hint of the truth is disclosed in the conviction. For example he says, "In 1993 persons **unnamed** known to the Defendant [police] occupied part of the premises without permission. The garage contained a WW2 US Army aircraft, a Piper Cub and spares exceeding a value of £15,000. Also veterinary memorabilia ... value exceeding £11,000. The above property was **destroyed by fire** and the **squatters** boasted about it. **The claimant was accused of arson for financial gain**. The aircraft and main contents of the garage were uninsured. **Yeah right!** The claimant suffered loss due to Defendant conduct." He says, "On 30<sup>th</sup> June 1993 the Claimant's Barry property was **burgled** and suffered **criminal damage**. The claimant suffered loss due to the conduct of the Defendant." He continues, "On 10<sup>th</sup> Feb 1994 the Claimant's **motor vehicle suffered damage**, exceeding £700, **leaving the road to avoid an accident caused by the excessive speed of another vehicle**. **Fair dos Kirk gotta give you some credit for the stuff you dream up. Are you in the guinness book of records yet for the world's biggest bullshitter?** The Defendant refused to divulge particulars of any of the drivers of the cars that sustained substantial damage and serious injury. The Claimant suffered loss due to the conduct of the Defendant." He says,

“In 1995 the claimant’s motorcycle was **stolen** outside his surgery in Barry. Claimant suffered loss due the defendants’ conduct.” **Why wasn’t it locked?** Also: “On 8<sup>th</sup> June 1995 the claimant’s Cardiff surgery was **burgled with criminal damage**. Claimant suffered loss due to the Defendants’ conduct.” And: “On 14<sup>th</sup> September 1995 the claimant was **assaulted** and had his premises severely **damaged by fire** by persons **no names** known to the Defendants. The plaintiff entered the premises and fought the flames alone with 2 fire extinguishers **L.O.L**, neither of which appeared to function. Examination of the appliances later revealed they were both faulty. The Defendant refused to investigate a complaint on those who supplied the fire extinguishers. The claimant suffered loss due to the Defendant’s conduct.” Etc etc etc.

Here’s more: “On 3<sup>rd</sup> May 1996 the claimant’s **stolen** motor vehicle was found in a police car park. Defendant refused to reveal the circumstances.” And: “On 17/10/1997 the Defendants watched and did nothing as **drunken youths threatened assault and criminal damage** on the plaintiff and his property...” And: “In January 1998 the claimant caught a **burglar** in his Barry premises ...” And: “On 1<sup>st</sup> April 1998 the claimant’s Llantwit Major Surgery was **again burgled ...**” Also: “On 1<sup>st</sup> June 1999 during an Abuse of Process Application by the plaintiff, the **CPS lawyer Ms Jackie Seals, committed perjury** in that she deliberately lied on matters relating to a purported ‘Breach of the Peace’ allegation. **Prosecution documents were falsified and presented before the court and custody records shredded. The Defendants fabricated new charges** months later... the trial proceeded immediately with the Defendant being refused an adjournment as is the custom here.”

See the related court transcript here

<tfile:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%2010%201%20SWP%20Vale%20Show%20Doc.pdf> for the truth of that in relation to an incident on 19/8/98. Also in

the transcript is yet more proof that **no-one is withholding documentation except Kirk himself**. Judge Gaskill reminds Kirk that numerous documents have been copied out for his convenience. Also, see the witness statement of D Davies via this link. Reference is made to the fact that **Kirk has in his possession various witness statements from named people. But he doesn’t publish any of them. Wonder why! Why also doesn’t he publish the other court transcripts for the various related Magistrates and Crown court hearings?** If he did maybe **truth and not spin** might emerge. As it is,

all we have is a skewed account from the proven liar Kirk, which is backed up by a statement from his personal assistant Diana Graham. [Her statement is hearsay only and is written in very similar style to Kirk's. Further, it is evident that some of Kirk's employees will lie for him.] The statement from D Davies is supported by the facts outlined in the police skeleton argument [see page 20 of this pdf] and in the respondent's skeleton argument re 'abuse of process'. I won't bother commenting much cos I think you get the picture by now. I'll just mention that you have to laugh at the pathetic Kirk's scribble of "LIES – MY STATEMENT 11/1/99 TO POLICE" at point number 3 where it is stated "No documents have been disclosed in support of The Appellant's submission". **Is that what you call evidence Kirk? It turns out that even that wasn't disclosed!** Also, in c.1 "The Appellant contends that he received a letter from Bridgend Magistrates Court dated 2<sup>nd</sup> October 1998 [but not disclosed by the Appellant]." **And not disclosed on his site either.**

**Kirk angrily scrawls "LIAR" and "LIES" all over the Respondent's document. WELL KIRKY OLD BOY, WHY DON'T YOU DISCLOSE ALL THE COURT TRANSCRIPTS, SO THAT WE CAN ALL SEE WHO THE LIAR IS – YOU. Not that we need any more proof.**

Still referencing his 'particulars of claim' Kirk the clown continues: "On 7/8/'03 the claimant was made to stop and produce driving documents. The Defendant **sent particulars to John O Groats police station and they have never been seen since.**"

How many times have you heard a genuine establishment [Masonic] victim say "you couldn't make this stuff up"? I've said it myself, loads of times, because it's true, **genuine victims of the Masonic mafia** have to put up with the most unbelievable and intolerable shenanigans and mind 'games' from those in high places. So when fakes like Maurice Kirk come along, with their completely fabricated nonsense, it is all very believable. The difference is, Kirk and co do not have any evidence to back up anything they say. **They're just having a right laugh at our expense.**

Kirk's bulldust just goes on and on and on ... more thefts, more criminal damage, more arson, more squatters in his properties ... He goes on and on about the proof that he has [not got], such as in **transcripts not revealed, tape recordings not provided, photographs not presented** ... And he comes out with more and more completely unjustified accusations of **criminal conduct, perjury and perversion of justice by**

## **judges, CPS, police, RCVS ... more than 47 incidents of lawyers lying in court ...**

Here's a good one. He says: "On the 12/10'07 the Defendant refused to investigate the **destruction or deliberate loss of court files** lodged at the Cardiff Civil Justice Centre. The **court admitted** there had been 5 boxes but with the **Attorney General's intervention** years earlier and with the **Treasury Solicitor sending all these files for Actions** blah blah blah to 'interested parties' as the **internal memo** put it, the court were **down to one box**. This was confirmed by a **sequence of photographs** within the confines of the HM court building, taped personally by the claimant in open court and further **confirmed by court correspondence**. On 12/10'07 **fire broke out** in the Cardiff Civil justice centre **apparently** as the claimant was leaving and if it had not been for the quick arrival of a number of fire appliances the **last and lonely box** of the claimant may have also been destroyed." I'm lost for words! Seriously this guy would not pen such balderdash if he was not in cahoots with fellow 'controlled opposition' agents and getting protection and payment from up high. And remember all this unimaginable jiggery pokery in high society is being paid by OUR hard earned taxes. **People, please, open your eyes and see what is really going on; and then put your head in your hands and weep with despair.**

See

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/09%2006%2019%20SWP%20Witness%20Statement%20of%20Maurice%20John%20Kirk%20final%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/09%2006%2019%20SWP%20Witness%20Statement%20of%20Maurice%20John%20Kirk%20final%20(1).pdf)

if you can stomach any more.

Incidentally I noticed some of his 'claim numbers' starts BS, followed by a row of numbers. Could that BS stand for bullshit by any chance? I think we can safely take Kirk's account of everything that has happened and incidences that he alleges happened with a **massive dose of scepticism**. He is ALL spin and NO substance. The piss taker even tried to **petition** to HM to the court "as it outlined the proof of the conspiracy between the Defendants and the RCVS". Jesus wept. Folks, can you believe the level of deception and the lengths Kirk and his fellow fakes go to in order to please their NWO paymasters? It is truly mind blowing. What was it Goebbels said, the bigger the lie, the more people will believe it.

If you need more proof that 'HM Partnership' is the *victim of Kirk* and not the other way around, read on. There is an overwhelming amount of

evidence that he is being pig-headed, uncooperative and wasting everyone else's time and money and sending authority figures around in circles, including court officials. For example take a look at this 2/12/09 transcript of Judge Bidder who is, according to Kirk, "conspiring with Dr Tegwyn Williams and CPS, frantically falsifying medical records."

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/09%2012%2002%20Transcript%20Crn%20Cr%20REDACTED.pdf>

Amongst all the twaddle he comes out with, the big headed prat boasts he's been "classified as one of the top five percent of most dangerous people in the United Kingdom". Well perhaps he has, but not in the sense he thinks; as in dangerous to the PTB; he's a danger to himself and to anyone who speaks the truth about him. He says in his 'Permission to Appeal the Judgement and Draft Order of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2010 Additional Document from the McKenzie Team' that he's been categorised as VISOR [violent and sexual offender register]. He says that this "can mean in reality a message to agencies requesting they find excuses to lock up the Claimant for life". Well we know this evil b\*\*\*stard is a violent bully; but that he is also a 'sexual offender' is news to me. Not that it would surprise me. As for locking him up for good, that is highly unlikely, unfortunately. Even if he was, it wouldn't solve anything, unless they threw away the key; it'd just cost us serfs sh\*t loads more of our hard earned taxes. The solution would be to cut his lying tongue out and cut off his writing hand. That'd sort him out.

I comment in red.

CLERK: Are you Maurice Kirk?

JUDGE BIDDER: Mr Kirk, are you going to answer the court at all?

DEFENDANT: Sorry?

JUDGE BIDDER: Are you going to answer the court at all? Are you Mr Kirk: Because I haven't met you before. Could you please tell me whether you are Mr Kirk or not?

DEFENDANT: What is my obligation?

JUDGE BIDDER: Well, I just would like to know your name please.

DEFENDANT: Well, I have been having difficulties in prison being able to get clearance under the (inaudible) laundering of money laws in order to get to instruct a lawyer and to pass funds accordingly...

Further on:

JUDGE BIDDER: Well Mr Kirk, it is difficult for me to take this matter any further since you refuse to take a copy of the report. If you took a copy of the report and read it then you could tell me what it is ...

He makes rambling wild claims, which he can never back up with evidence.

DEFENDANT: They entered, 30 police officers entered my home with sniffer dogs and went away with documents relating to my civil action for damages. That is what this case is all about. You know that, we all know that, but no one in this room has the moral fibre to take the subject seriously and consider the final consequences of the conduct of a bunch of bent lawyers who started all of this, protected under the immunity of being part of HM conspiratorial (inaudible) Yes, we know of bent lawyers and police officers, but nothing Kirk says holds any weight because he fails to provide any proof. He comes across as a rambling buffoon; which is what he is. As for a gang of police officers running off with his vital evidence, that's just laughable. Any genuine whistleblower has copies of all vital documentation, stored elsewhere.

And:

DEFENDANT: ... and I gave them that report then on the website, but the prosecution on the 15th of June, a person called Richard Hayes, jumped in court when lying about my position when asking for bail, lied his head off on a number of points, I haven't bothered to read this statement. That is the level of information that has come to me showing that this has got nothing to do with the machine gun case, this has got to do with politics. The fact that once again if I get disclosure I win, if you lot succeed in withholding evidence, like you have done in the past, I will lose. I am going to fight you for disclosure all the way through the courts and I will win. More rambling nonsense. Kirk, like all shills, never deals in facts. And they never answer questions direct. They deal in fantasy.

The next bit is straight out of Fawty Towers:



JUDGE BIDDER: Right, Mr Kirk, I see the document you referred to, it is in fact headed, 'A witness statement' and it refers to a number of actions before Mr Justice Collins, before Judge Chambers QC, before Judge (inaudible) Llewellyn QC, and before Mr Justice Goudy QC, so is that the document you say is your defence case statement with regard to these two charges that you face in this court?

DEFENDANT: No.

JUDGE BIDDER: No. There is another document is there?

DEFENDANT: No.

JUDGE BIDDER: There isn't?

DEFENDANT: I have documents downstairs, I have five files in my, seven lever arch files in my cell in prison. I have got 142, I think it is, lever arch files spread around in Wales, England and Brittany, and of course I have my computers. Remember I asked to have access to my computers. Judges have already asked that I have access to my computers, so I want to hear a succinct (inaudible) ...

JUDGE BIDDER: Can I please ask you, Mr Kirk, is there a document where you set out your defence to these charges? Does such a document exist?

DEFENDANT: Yes.

JUDGE BIDDER: You have a copy of it?

DEFENDANT: Yes.

JUDGE BIDDER: Will you produce it to this court?

DEFENDANT: **It is out of my control.**

JUDGE BIDDER: Where is it at the moment then?

DEFENDANT: **I am not telling you because I am not daft. If I tell you they may get at it first.**

JUDGE BIDDER: Right. Can I return then, I am afraid, do you wish to have legal representation or not? Because you mention various firms of

lawyers who you have instructed, presumably you could contact one of those firms and ask them to represent you in these proceedings.

DEFENDANT: I have personally contacted about 20 plus lawyers.

JUDGE BIDDER: Yes

Like all shills Kirk talks a load of old codswallop, can't prove his claims and has the audacity to accuse others of lying and lacking evidence:

DEFENDANT: Yes, but you see, you judges aren't told in the first place. The lawyers for the prosecution on the 15th of June said I was unemployed, I have no fixed abode, interfere with witnesses, would abscond, all the list, there were 15 nonsense statements, not of it backed with evidence, none of it ... I wasn't allowed to bring any evidence in rebuttal ...

DEFENDANT: So you can't stand corn, can you?

JUDGE BIDDER: I can't stand what?

DEFENDANT: Stand corn. Yes.

JUDGE BIDDER: I'm sorry, I don't understand what you mean.

DEFENDANT: (inaudible) they have overturned bail was on a pack of lies and you are the seventh judge who hasn't the moral fibre, the moral fibre to hear a legal argument that (inaudible) what was his name? Ace, Richard Ace, on the 15th of June told Judge Hughes a pack of lies and caused the magistrates bail application which I was given bail unconditionally, you are yet another Welsh judge which is why I have been applying to be transferred to an English prison and to an English court. Insolent jumped-up little twirp.

And of course there is the usual unnecessary aggression from our **showman** Kirk:

DEFENDANT: I am more concerned about my imprisonment than this stupid machine gun case. Yes Kirky, you should be worried. But not for being imprisoned in a man-made prison or lunatic asylum; you should be seriously concerned about the fact that you have imprisoned yourself in the worst possible way; you gave your mind and soul to Satan. It is only this morning that you have decided, who are you to decide that I am fit to

defend myself in this case? I find it outrageous. They can lock me away and delay these proceedings for their own benefit only for five months and ... (inaudible) we have got a piece of paper here from some doctor who came to see me **apparently, I gave no permission for a doctor (inaudible) ...** Kirky lad, you asked for all this. Everyone knows you are not 'mental'; we all know you are a highly intelligent, clever b\*stard; but **you are weak**, you listened to the voices of evil, **sold your soul to Satan** and played a very sinister 'game'. Was it worth it? Right-minded folk can only feel sorry for you and your fellow McKenzie saddos. All of you have shackled yourselves to Satan's skirts **forever**. All of you skills, despite your intelligence, high levels of education and wealth are **more enslaved and poverty-stricken** than the beggar on the street. You wretched people have **nothing**. The sad fact is, none of you realise it. You really think your numerous fellow NWO gatekeepers and your high powered, wealthy high-ups in Freemasonry and other secret societies will protect you forever. Wrong. You are all weak and cowardly and you will desert each other. Only God can protect any of us. God who is in us is greater than those who are in the world.

JUDGE BIDDER: Mr Kirk, will you sit down for a moment? Will you sit down for a moment? And I can only make the decision if I have two medical opinions which confirm that, and I have explained to you on more than one occasion now that there are no reports of that kind and therefore you are competent to stand trial and you are competent to defend yourself. Now, you will understand that ...

DEFENDANT: It is outrageous the disgraceful way that this sort of thing goes on when they use the (inaudible) cover for somebody who just happens to be a bloodyminded, somebody with political views **Kirk, you don't have any views, you are totally controlled by the McKenzie Baboons** that you don't like. It is called **honesty** that's a good one; **Kirk you're so used to lying, you don't know what truth is any more** in a court room, you lot can't seem to stomach any more, you have to break every rule in the book. You allow these people, these lawyers, these barristers here to lie and cheat. They are answerable to no one but their maker. I find it outrageous. Sorry to go on so much ...

JUDGE BIDDER: Right, well, Mr Kirk, please be seated. That is the second time you have used bad language, if you use it for a third time I will not stay to hear you use language of that kind again or treat this court with disrespect.

It is evident in all the court transcripts that are published that all justices have patiently tolerated Kirk's shenanigans and have only been trying to help him. See the 1/10/'09 court transcript. It also shows more of Kirk's game-playing, bullshitting, spinning and manipulating ... and costing us lot colossal amounts in public funding. I comment in red.

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/T20097445%20KIRK%20PCMH%20%2526%20BAIL%20APP%20%2001.10.09.pdf>

RECORDER: I have indicated I am happy to grant a Representation Order in your favour, as I have indicated from day one, so that any solicitor of your choosing and counsel would be able to help you. Very much my opinion that that would be in your interests and I am worried that people do not seem to know that that has been indicated to you from the moment I first saw this case. Were you to go down that road then, of course, it would be possible for me, out of public funds, as I would inevitably do and as I have already indicated, order funds to be made available for a psychiatric report, from a psychiatrist of your own choosing, to be obtained. Likewise, a firearms expert of your own choosing, who might well be of assistance in this case. You have refused throughout to deal with solicitors and so on and so forth I could not tell you the date without looking it up but I have certainly been told two things which have caused me concern, because I cannot tell whether they are true or not. If you are not here I cannot ask you and if you do not have lawyers I cannot ask them. But certainly I have been told on one occasion, when I made arrangements for you to make a bail application, that you refused to go to the video room and, on another occasion, that you had refused to come to court. The position being advertised to me, Mr Kirk, being that you would not make a bail application over the video link and you would not make a bail application coming to court. I made arrangements for a lawyer

who was prepared to, to speak to you and, indeed, I also gave leave for your wife to speak to you, with a view to trying to secure you representation. When even, despite those efforts, you would not get representation, although charged with a serious offence, I formed the view that I had no alternative but to have your mental health investigated because you appeared to be behaving in an irrational fashion and that is, to some extent, how we end up here.

... although I repeatedly say "You need representation, it is available free, you need a solicitor, you can pick your own, then we can make some progress," he refuses to do so and seems only to wish to talk about a conspiracy in which I am a part and I cannot get anywhere with him and we are having problems because of that.

Psychiatrist, ballistics expert, firearms expert, all of these things are available to him at public expense if he just says the word but he refuses to do so. That is the position, whatever it says on the website.

RECORDER: But, if you face a sentence of five years' imprisonment and the prosecution is saying that there is no defence, as a matter of law, on the facts that they have, then, I have to tell you, I and you are likely to want representation and that begins to raise a problem if someone is refusing.

I cannot get him to serve a defence case statement, say what his defence is and so on. He wishes to talk about problems he has with Barbara Wilding and so on and so forth. I am only concerned with the legal facts and issues around this case and I have got to try to make progress. A matter which, again, I can talk to you about but he would not understand, backlog of 800 cases in this court. I do not have unlimited resources to simply deal with that all day, every day. I cannot. But he must have a fair trial about this matter and I am going

to do everything in my power to secure it. He would help me if he said, "I would like to be represented by such and such a firm" because I can extend a Representation Order. Of course, they will need to be skilful in order to explain things to him because he seems not to want to talk about what the case is actually alleged against him. All right?

I am here to try to ensure he has a fair trial. I have to be fair to the prosecution as well. As I say, he has insulted me in the past.

At the moment, if he refuses to have representation, I cannot do anything. Various people, at my request, have gone to see him but he has refused to be represented by them.

I want to ask you, before, as I need to, is there any change of your position in relation to seeking representation? I have indicated, and I will indicate on every occasion that you appear because I believe it very much in your interests, that a Representation Order is available. I have indicated one must be granted in this case because you are at risk of a lengthy prison sentence if convicted and I am worried you will not do yourself justice unless you have the help of a lawyer

[See p25 Kirk blabbing on... ]

Because what happened, from my end of things and I am happy to share it with you, is that I was told you were refusing to go to the video room. Of course, I am not actually in the prison, so I cannot check that. You only see the screen. That is what I was told. Of course, I did not rely on that in one sense, in that all I can then do is say, well, if that is right he is to be produced here.

THE ACCUSED: Right. Let us go back to the list which burns very much in my breast. It might cause the effect that I have caused on the medical team, to cause such a report to be written and it is called delusions, paranoia, evidence of possible brain damage.

RECORDER: Well, you and I are in the same boat, in that we have not seen the scans they refer to and I, therefore, cannot form a view about that. At some stage, before acting on such material, I would need somebody to express a second opinion about that, with the same level of qualifications, if it is disputed. One of the reasons why I would like you to get representation, because then solicitors would be able to make application to The Legal Services Commission for legal funding to try and check that sort of material but I cannot do it unless you seek representation. More expense for you and I the dutiful taxpayer! Folks, no wonder there's no legal aid for the people who are genuinely in need.

THE RECORDER: Am I a member of that?

THE ACCUSED: You are because you, well, we digress, you are because I have been before you before and those jury members complained and they sent you notes that the police officer had been sent there by the Chief of Barry police station to see what was going on and he was influencing each police officer as I cross-examined him.

THE RECORDER: I have, you must understand that I deal with many many cases. You, of course, know your own better than I would. I have some recollection about being unhappy about the way police officers behaved in that case but I cannot now remember the detail. I really cannot. It is a long long time ago, in terms of I would have done hundreds of cases since then. But what I am at the moment finding difficult to understand is why you regard me as one of "you lot" when I directed a not guilty verdict and I treated you as fairly as I think I did. That is what I do not understand.

THE ACCUSED: But you should have ordered the arrest of those police officers. They were caught red-handed by a jury, my Lord.

THE RECORDER: But I cannot do that. I cannot just order the arrest of people.

THE ACCUSED: You could have ordered someone to take proper legal action for the conspiracy that was blown by a trial by a jury.

THE RECORDER: It was not blown by a trial by jury. It was ended by me directing a not guilty verdict because you were not guilty of dangerous driving.

Mr Kirk, does it contradict our conversation a few minutes ago, that you regard a judge who directed that you be found not guilty as part of a conspiracy to persecute you? Excellent point from the judge

THE ACCUSED: I did ask that I could answer it once I had gone through the list, to show that serious changes in the prosecution's argument to detain me in custody are now flawed and no longer relevant.

THE RECORDER: But I do not accept that at the moment. At the moment, I am afraid, I think that you would not be able to be trusted to co-operate with the completion of an assessment as to your mental health if you were granted bail.

THE ACCUSED: Sorry, why?

THE RECORDER: Because you have refused to answer the question on a number of occasions. I think it is a reasonable question.

Well, I am not saying you can finish the list because I have a duty, having regards to public funds, to keep it within a reasonable compass and I am not sure it is helping me take my decision. I am trying to ensure that you feel you are being treated fairly, so please continue but it cannot just go on for ever when you are not talking about matters that are particularly relevant.

ACCUSED: Well, I have been told by the CAA that they have suspended all my licences.

Also in the same transcript reference is made to Kirk's McKenzie henchmen and women who are up in the public gallery. Mr Twomlow speaks for the prosecution.



MR TWOMLOW: Two court bailiffs attended a semi-detached house in Capel Allerton and police attended with an ambulance to prevent a breach of the peace. He [Norman Scarth] barricaded himself in. Bailiffs gained entry, went upstairs and, as a bailiff opened the door, the defendant had a chainsaw and caused injuries to the bailiff's hands and arms. The bailiff forced him to the floor.

THE RECORDER: So a bailiff, a court officer.

MR TWOMLOW: Further than that I have no information as to the degree of injury.

THE RECORDER: Well, if he is on licence...

MR TWOMLOW: It was wounding with intent to cause grievous bodily harm.

THE RECORDER: And the weapon was a chainsaw.

MR TWOMLOW: The weapon was a chainsaw. As I say, [from Scarth who was in the public gallery being loud and abusive] the fax is "Beware the fury of a patient nation" and referring to the execution of doctors. I have no idea what his licence conditions are and I have no desire for him to be persecuted but it does seem to me, and I direct you should have a copy of Dr Tegwyn Williams' report of the 30th September and the attachments. Incidentally, the fact that he wishes to associate himself with Mr Kirk's case does not mean that Mr Kirk wants to associate with him. So that is also of significance but shows the dangers of all of this.

THE RECORDER: If it is anything to do with me, as I have on earlier occasions, give leave for, subject to security and the arrangements for any member of his family to talk to him, that is fine. Is Mr Kirk's daughter here? Yes. I meant every word that I say. I would be terribly grateful if you can persuade him to get a solicitor to act for him. I can then start things moving in a very different way. I appreciate he hates me and there is very little I can do about that but I am, in fact, only trying to help him. That is why I am speaking to you in this way but, obviously, with some of the people who are beginning to be associated with this, it is very difficult because I have to consider safety issues, all sorts of things.

I am afraid, unless we can nominate a solicitor or he can choose a solicitor and I can grant a Representation Order, all hearings will be like this and I do not want them to be like this. I want someone to look after his interests.

Well, you can but it does not mean I can grant it because if he starts simply saying he wants witness summonses to have people here and so on, he does not understand but, as a matter of law, that is not what the bail application would be about.

THE RECORDER: Norman Scarth. And it talks of a word of warning, talks of bewareing the fury of a patient nation. Says, "If there is one among you, lawyer or psychiatrist, with conscience and courage enough to do what you ought, release Maurice Kirk and cease your criminal activities. If not, I fear for the future and you should too." It is becoming very clear to me that Norman is no different to Kirk, McNeill and all the rest of the **lying evil pretenders that are the NWO gatekeepers**. Now, Mr Scarth, I am informed, we have been informed earlier, has a conviction for a very serious offence, wounding with intent, in which he attacked bailiffs with a chainsaw. Now, can you explain to me what is your connection with Mr Scarth? ...saying that our nefarious activities are being recorded and will be remembered, referring or **making comparisons with doctors arraigned at Nuremberg**. What is your view about that? Is it a decent thing to do? Is it a sensible thing to do?

THE ACCUSED: It is a matter for him, my Lord, but this chap I have only met once in my life. **LIAR LIAR, PANTS ON FIRE**. Scarth is hardly an acquaintance. These two are bosom pals. See the numerous emails on this **Norman's correspondence for the period September 2009 July 2010 starting with his more recent postings pdf** document which reflect that. Also Scarth refers to Kirk as "My friend Maurice Kirk" <http://trallwmfarm.blogspot.co.uk/2009/08/my-friend-maurice-kirk-on-hunger-strike.html> And in Sabine's 'House of Lords' meeting on 3/3/'10 during his bullshit diatribe, Kirk cries, puts his hand on Scarth and says it is "**because of my friends**" that he is not incarcerated for life <http://edm1297.info/2010/03/11/tackling-the-serious-oppression-of-hm-subjects/> Another lie he comes out with during that meeting is when he says he wouldn't miss a court case for all the money in South Wales' police fund. The lying git wilfully misses court cases. Further on in that video he talks about the prosecutor telling the judge that the psychiatrist believed that he had a brain tumour! What a talented actor Kirk is.

Maybe that's why he was such good pals with fellow actor and drunkard Ollie Reed. He also makes a strange comment that 'they' had no intention of taking him to court re the machine gun case. The trial had taken place on 25/1/'10!

Towards the end of the transcript Kirk gives more BS. The judge goes on to talk about his fear of Kirk committing more crimes and of **relevance**.

THE ACCUSED: The court has told me that I cannot serve witness summonses for the 10<sup>th</sup> January for 200 police officers who have retired on the police station. **The police station at the moment are refusing to answer any of my letters** under disclosure under Section 31 CPR Civil Rules or under the criminal regulations which relate to this case. Do you understand?

THE RECORDER: I do. I have formed a view, I am afraid. I will give you five minutes to say anything else you want to but I have to case manage it in terms of the time and resources. People have waited a long time. At the moment, Mr Kirk, as a matter of fairness, I have to indicate that I am satisfied that I will have to keep you in custody at The Caswell Clinic, that **you will not co-operate with a continuing psychiatric assessment if I admit you to bail and that you represent a significant risk of further offending if I am to grant you your bail because you are obsessed with this litigation and you would do anything which you feel is justified, criminal or not, in order to further it.**

THE ACCUSED: I wish to know the suggestion that I will offend again but, before I do that, I wish to know what offence I have committed.

THE RECORDER: Well, at the moment you are charged and, under the bail provisions that I have to apply, I have to proceed on the basis that that allegation is provable and you have previous convictions. I appreciate you dispute some of them and I put the disputed ones out of my mind but you have previous convictions.

THE RECORDER: My major concern, though, is that you are obsessed with this matter, **you will not see reason and I cannot trust you not to commit further offences because of your obsession** which, amongst other things, is illustrated by your total refusal to accept offers of representation.

THE ACCUSED: But nothing that you have referred to suggests an offence could be occasioned. I was left holding, when the music stopped, apparently I was holding a gun that some people say was in breach of The Firearms Act. Except it is you, I remember, on the transcript, you ordered that I should be given a transcript. Nobody gave it to me. I had to buy it six weeks, I think it was, after this case took place in my absence because nobody told me it was going on and you said---

THE RECORDER: I thought it might help if you had a transcript because I thought you might appreciate that I was **trying to treat you fairly**.

THE ACCUSED: Yes.

THE RECORDER: But it has not worked.

THE ACCUSED: But nobody gave me the transcript.

THE RECORDER: Because your obsession is too powerful.

THE ACCUSED: But nobody gave me the transcript. I did not know what was going on and you said

THE RECORDER: But you have it now.

THE ACCUSED: But you said this has got nothing to do with Mr Kirk, it appears it is to do with the gun, and when the music stopped from 1985, when it was put on the aircraft, to the chap who has it or still has it in Lincolnshire or somewhere, I have parted with the alleged item over a year before and you said, yourself, that this is a matter of the legality of the weapon, not Mr Kirk. But now you are saying that I am likely to reoffend. Offend by way of firearms?

THE RECORDER: **I would not know. Any offending that you think would further your cause in relation to the litigation about which you are obsessed including, potentially, involving people like Mr Scarth and others who feel that they are persecuted by some sort of conspiracy.**

THE ACCUSED: **But I wish to serve witness summonses on police officers and court staff who have now retired and I, the most extreme---**

THE RECORDER: Mr Kirk, I am going to stop it now for this reason. What you are giving, and I do not think it is fair in some ways, is a

demonstration of the extent to which you are obsessed about these matters. I have read Dr Tegwyn Williams' report. You appear to me to be demonstrating the paranoid tendencies which he describes.

THE ACCUSED: But I---

THE RECORDER: Thank you very much. I need not trouble you, Mr Twomlow.

THE ACCUSED: I---

THE RECORDER: I have listened---

THE ACCUSED: The difference between paranoia, it is the belief that you are in a persecution and cannot back it with evidence. I have the evidence here. I have independent witness statements. ???

THE RECORDER: Mr Kirk, it is the end of the hearing but I will ask you once again. Are you interested in taking advantage of a Representation Order so that a solicitor can look after your interests?

WOMAN IN GALLERY: Forgive me, your Honour, I have evidence.

THE RECORDER: Are you interested in a Representation Order?

THE ACCUSED: I have already indicated, my Lord, that 20 law firms, even during the short time of two months, three months, four months in prison, I have, once I ask them to investigate who instigated me being locked up---

THE RECORDER: Well, they are probably going to say – I will try to explain it to you, Mr Kirk, because it is my duty to do so, to try to help you as much as I can. They would be paid for doing work which is relevant to the prosecution against you. That is how the funding works. That would involve them in a consideration of whether the gun is a firearm within the meaning of the Act, whether you were in possession of it, whether you sold it and so on. It would not extend to them being paid for the sort of things you are asking about. So, they are probably only trying to do their duty by the public funds that pay for them and ensuring they only did work which was reasonable. So you are likely to run into that. That is true. They will refuse to undertake work which they feel they would not be paid for because it is **not relevant**. I understand it is difficult for you to understand that. If you had lawyers

whom you trusted and if you concentrated on the idea that it is not a good idea to be convicted of this offence which carries five years' imprisonment, you might want them to do that work. The problem I have trying to get through to you is you are so obsessed about these other matters that you do not really want to talk about that. You want to talk about the other matters. But, the offer is still there but they will tell you they will only do work that is relevant to the prosecution.

You misunderstand the law in relation to the statute and that is a good illustration of why you need representation but I cannot force it. You think you know things when often you do not.

Finally, in this court transcript we see more of Kirk lying through his teeth, insisting he has the evidence, but unable to produce it!

THE ACCUSED: The jury handed you a note complaining about high ranking police officer in the well of the court signalling to each police officer that I cross-examined---

THE RECORDER: No, they did not. But, be that as it may---

THE ACCUSED: I have those notes.

HE RECORDER: Be that as it may.

THE ACCUSED: I have those notes.

THE RECORDER: I am not discussing it with you.

THE ACCUSED: I took them from the well of this building.

Kirky plays with everyone, no matter what their profession within 'HM Partnership'. He just loves to give everyone the run-around and wind people up. When he's not doing that he's being downright evil – making nasty threats or being aggressive towards totally law abiding innocent people. He's an evil obnoxious narcissistic little creep who is doing a great deal of damage to the serious activist and freedom fighter. Satan must be singing for joy that he has the likes of Sabine and Kirky in his pocket. Well you shills, enjoy it while it lasts cos you haven't got much

time left; you will all soon have the smug smiles wiped clean off your sorry faces when the full truth finally dawns on the awakening populace.

Have a look at this court transcript [30/7/09] where we see the judge doing all he can to help but Kirk is being his usual self - awkward, attention seeking and a massive drain on the public purse. I comment in red.

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/5\\_T20097445%20-%20KIRK%20-%20REMARKS%20-%2030.07.09.pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/5_T20097445%20-%20KIRK%20-%20REMARKS%20-%2030.07.09.pdf)

.... Well we have made contact I should say with the prison, confirming that he is not willing to attend. On an earlier occasion in line with the normal modern practice it was arranged to be dealt with over the video link, so that we can save money, and he refused to go to the video link room. It is reported by Dr Teg Williams that he barricaded himself in his cell and refused to leave. W\*\*nker. No wonder he got sectioned. I have done everything I can to give him an opportunity to make a bail application and he refuses to make one. In relation to representation, I have indicated on previous occasions, and indicate again, that I would grant a Representation Order to any firm of solicitors who is prepared to act for him. But he has identified no firm of solicitors who he will have acting for him, so I cannot accommodate in those circumstances. Solicitors have tried to assist, and I have been grateful. They have had meetings with him. But they tell me they cannot act for him, he does not want them. I have indicated it is not a question of an individual firm, he can have whatever firm he likes, and he will not have one. So there is an impasse entirely of his own making. And if he is not mentally ill it is difficult to understand what he is trying to achieve. Today's hearing leads to nothing and wastes further public time and money. It is

apparent that he has no conception that he causes difficulty to other people, other litigants, defendants, witnesses and so

on by behaving in this fashion. He is entirely on the face of it concerned with himself and nothing else. In such circumstances considerable public money is being wasted by what he is doing and we are at the moment getting nowhere. And if he continues to

refuse to come to court until I have a psychiatric report I am in some difficulty I think appointing someone to act on his behalf.

In the following court proceedings [16/7/09] we see more evidence of the judge doing everything possible to accommodate him [despite being subject to uncalled for abuse] and more evidence that Kirk's wife is NOT 'suspicious' or 'reluctant to get involved' as her lying husband claims. The evidence is that Kirsty has been very supportive of him; that he takes advantage of her good nature when it suits him and keeps her at arm's length from 'nuisance' folk whose job it is to dig into Kirk's affairs, such as the psychiatrist, because he feared she might reveal too much inconvenient truth. It is clear he messes everyone around, including Kirsty. Best thing she ever did was leave the self-centred pig. I comment in red.

[file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/4\\_T20097445%20-%20Kirk%20-%20all%20proceedings%20-%202016.07.09.pdf](file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/4_T20097445%20-%20Kirk%20-%20all%20proceedings%20-%202016.07.09.pdf)

THE CLERK: Case listed for application for bail, Maurice Kirk.

THE RECORDER: Yes. Mr Leathley, I am told – I mean technically we are on the video link – he is refusing to come to the videolink.

THE RECORDER: Have you been able to get instructions to act for him?

MR LEATHLEY: My Lord, I am instructed by Mrs Kirsty Kirk.

THE RECORDER: But, as you know, although I have got every sympathy with Mrs Kirsty Kirk, she is not able to give you instructions.



MR LEATHLEY: I can tell you that his loving wife is genuinely concerned, if not about the state of his mind but the state of his health.... I think Mrs Kirsty Kirk is going to see her husband for a family domestic visit this Saturday. I think that would be the opportunity that she either will or will not succeed in persuading him that his best interests lie in legal representation ... He has no source of income he has his properties and his 'shilling' and he has thousands that he can afford to throw away on his non-existent witnesses, so he is an unemployed gentleman facing five years' imprisonment in theory, who has now, in your Lordship's eyes if nobody else's eyes, raised considerable concerns about his either medical or psychiatric condition and, in fact, if for no other reason he may not be in a position to pay for a report commissioned or might be commissioned. So I invite your Lordship to make an indication that this honourable court would look in favour upon his being granted legal assistance by The Legal Services Commission makes you wanna vomit, doesn't it in the preparation of this case which involves very intricate points of law at first blush, my Lord.

MR LEATHLEY: Yes. On the basis that Mrs Kirsty Kirk is successful at a domestic visit this Saturday, in perhaps advising her beloved husband of what may or may not be in his best interests, can I be impertinent enough to suggest that this matter today, which was listed as an application for bail but cannot, because of lack of instruction, be an application for bail, that this matter is adjourned to either Monday or Tuesday of next week on the same basis, on the proviso that Mrs Kirsty Kirk is successful in persuading her husband where his interests lie and so to an application with his assent could take place upon proper legal instruction on either Monday or ...

THE RECORDER: That is almost as far as I can take things today but I have to deal with one other matter and then I will order a transcript of what has transpired for today.

MR LEATHLEY: Thank you.

THE RECORDER: Although I am conscious that would cost public money but I know the consequences, from Mr Kirk's perspective, if I do not. What was Kirky saying about being denied transcripts? Lying sleazebag. Here we have a judge ordering one at public expense, without even being asked to! Have you ever had such pampering from a judge?

MR LEATHLEY: I would have requested the same, so Mr Kirk can be aware of what has been said.

THE RECORDER: I am afraid that, for my pains, I received abuse from Mr Kirk at the material time, on the basis that I was only doing this as part of a conspiracy in order to cover up the wrongdoings of the police and, in fact, I have a pretty clear recollection that some of that abuse took the form of foul language directed at me, which I did hear, but when I asked him if he would like to repeat what he had just said he did not say what he had said the first time. I ignored that but I am afraid his behaviour before the jury, to some extent, was such that I could not overlook it altogether. I, therefore, committed him for contempt. He claimed to have had a heart attack, I believe, as a result of that and that, I think, was not proved on any medical intervention. My recollection is, in the end, because of the trouble he was causing to the prison authorities, I substituted a fine for any sentence of imprisonment. Again, for my pains, I was, therefore, excoriated on his website. In fact, I had sought to do nothing other than treat him with courtesy and fairness but that is how he had behaved.

I order a transcript of this hearing so that he is not disadvantaged and, of course, the prosecution can help me as to whether or not I should recuse myself or not. There are considerable difficulties, given Mr Kirk's website, in my identifying judges who have not been attacked thereon. Most of them, I should think, like me, treat Mr Kirk as an attention-seeker who is his own worst enemy and are not biased against him because of what he says about us. That is my view and I do not feel that a concerned bystander would feel he would not get a fair hearing from me. But, at the end of the day, it is what Mr Kirk thinks that we would have to listen to. I think that sums up my position.

For more evidence of Kirk being awkward and obstructive and revealing more of his disgusting behaviour, despite being given more than enough fair play, see the 4/5/12 court transcript re the breach of restraining order concerning the harassment of Dr Tegwyn Williams.

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/maur%208feb%2012%2005%2004%20RO%20Tri>

[al%20T20120090%20-%20kirk%20-%20All%20proceedings%20-%202004.05.12.pdf](#)

During these proceedings one of Kirk's McKenzie friends - God bless him or her - sees this despicable creature for what he is and abandons him.

JUDGE CURRAN: The uproar that would be apparent on the transcript began when Mr Kirk **started to remove his trousers** and was reaching behind him for something. I am now informed, after he had been restrained by the dock officers and taken down to the cells; that he is **bleeding from the rectum, having removed something or excreted something from a place of concealment inside him**, as I understand it. Is that right? The dock officer is nodding.

MCKENZIE FRIEND: **I would like to withdraw as Mr Kirk's McKenzie friend** (inaudible).

JUDGE CURRAN: That is a perfectly understandable reaction, thank you.

DOCK OFFICER: I understand he is refusing to come up from the cells until he has legal visit from his McKenzie friend.

JUDGE CURRAN: The McKenzie friend has withdrawn. Would you inform Mr Kirk that his McKenzie friend has withdrawn and in the circumstances he must come back up into court please? (Pause)

DOCK OFFICER: Your Honour, he says he is **not coming to court until he speaks to his witnesses, not the McKenzie ... witnesses in the case.**

JUDGE CURRAN: He is to be told to come into court. He will be able to call witnesses if he wants to, **but he is not going to be speaking to anybody now; he has got to come into court**

DOCK OFFICER: He needs to speak to his brief, he needs to see a doctor. If the brief tells him to come to court, he will come to court.

JUDGE CURRAN: He needs what?

DOCK OFFICER: He said he needs to see a doctor and then he said he needs to see his brief, I don't know which one is his brief, and if the brief

tells him to come to court, he will come to court, but he wants to see his brief first.

JUDGE CURRAN: He has not got a brief.

JUDGE CURRAN: Yes. Is he coming back into court?

A: Well, he just wants that and then related back to him, so he didn't give me an answer. He was actually on the toilet, but he wanted it read on the toilet.

CELL MANAGER: Your Honour, this is from Mr Kirk. "I am not in a position to give evidence. I wish my witness to give evidence so need, so no need for me to attend. The witness is Dr Tegwen Mal Williams.

JUDGE CURRAN: Can I see that? (handed) The request for the attendance of Dr Williams is something that has been repeated throughout by the Defendant. Dr Williams is the subject of the restraining order. It was because of the Defendant's harassment of Dr Williams that he was convicted of the offence under Section 2 from the Protection from Harassment Act in the Cardiff Magistrates' Court. Dr Tegwen Williams is not the Defendant's witness. He was a witness who was correctly abandoned by the Crown. As putting him in the witness box when he had no evidence to give directly concerning the breach of the restraining order would simply have afforded the Defendant the opportunity of continuing the campaign of harassment against the doctor by having him cross-examined in a public court, when he is not in a position to give any relevant evidence in the case. I have already refused an application by Mr Kirk to have a witness summons served on Dr Tegwen Williams compelling his attendance at this court and I will not grant such a witness summons. In the circumstances, Mr Kirk is to be informed again that Dr Tegwen Williams is not a witness in this case; he is not going to be called and unless he comes back into court immediately the trial is going to proceed without him.

He then sent a note saying, "I need to see a doctor. I need to be taken back to prison but would like Mr Ivan Edwards, North Road, to give evidence and there will be no need for me to be present because the court has his statement". Mr Ivan Edwards is not here; is not known to

the court; and the court does not have his evidence or any statement from him.

JUDGE CURRAN: Thank you for your note, ladies and gentlemen. The first question is, you asked was this, "Is there CCTV footage of the restraining order being handed over? Cell three. If not, why?" You decide the case on the evidence and there is no evidence of CCTV footage in this case. Your second question is, "Could we see Michael Williams' record of the presentation of the restraining order as referred to by Lee Barker?" Again, Mr Williams gave evidence before you but with, any record of the presentation of the restraining order is not in evidence and is not part of the evidence. You have to decide the case on the evidence that you heard and nothing else. I deal now with the absence of Mr Kirk from the dock. After the outburst in the course of which I think you saw him begin to remove his trousers and reach towards his rear, he was taken down to the cells. After a delay to allow him to calm down, I ultimately got the, he was declining to come back into court so I got the dock officer to read this document out to him, which I signed. "The prosecution have concluded their case and you have heard the evidence against you. Now is the time for you to make your defence.

JUDGE CURRAN: During the course of this case, you have heard how on 1st December of last year, which was the third day of a contested trial in the magistrates' court, in the absence of Mr Kirk who declined to come into court, the district judge found him guilty of the offence under Section 2 of the Protection from Harassment Act of harassing Dr Tegwen Williams, a consultant psychiatrist. After that, the Defendant was given an opportunity of coming up into court according to the prosecution's case, to hear sentence passed but declined to do so.

Apart from a sentence of imprisonment, the prosecution's case is that the district judge made a restraining order, a copy of which you have got. It is Exhibit 1 in this case and that some days later, Mr Kirk broke the terms of the order by publishing the exhibit which you have got before you on his website. The Crown's case is that although he was not physically in court when the restraint order was made, Mr Williams the court clerk went down to the cells and saw Mr Barker, the supervising custody officer, hand him a copy of the order. It appears to be the Defendant's case that he disputes firstly that a restraint order was made; and secondly that he was given a copy of it and he told the police when

he was interviewed that the first he knew about the restraining order was sometime considerably later and that he had not seen it before being shown a copy of it when he was being interviewed.

If you look at the indictment you will see that he is charged with the single offence of acting in breach of a restraining order contrary to the provisions of Section 5 of the Protection from Harassment Act. In particular, what he is alleged to have done is to be a party to material being placed on the internet relating to Dr Williams which he was prohibited from doing by restraining order made by the Cardiff Magistrates' Court on 1st December. You have got a copy of the order. It prohibits him, the Crown say, from contacting, approaching or communicating with Dr Williams directly or indirectly by any means; from displaying or disseminating any material, photographic or otherwise, relating to him; becoming a party to the display or dissemination of any material, photographic or otherwise, in relation to him; becoming a party, or placing any information on the internet concerning him; or becoming a party to any material being placed on the internet concerning him. So what the prosecution have to prove, to prove this charge is this: firstly that a restraining order was made at the Cardiff Magistrates' Court on 1st December 2011; secondly that the order prohibited the Defendant from being a party to placing any information concerning Dr Williams on the internet; that a copy of the order was served upon the Defendant; and that the Defendant either placed the information about the doctor on the net himself or was a party to somebody else doing it and that he had no reasonable excuse for doing so.

CLERK: Would the foreperson please stand? Have the jury reached a verdict upon which at least ten of you are agreed?

FOREMAN: Yes.

CLERK: Do you find the Defendant Maurice John Kirk guilty or not guilty of acting in breach of a restraining order?

FOREMAN: Guilty.

JUDGE CURRAN: Maurice John Kirk born 12th March 1945 in Taunton; 67 years of age; and he has 15 convictions for some 25 offences. They are spanning from 1978 until December of last year. There are offences of violence and assault occasioning actual bodily harm in 1978, moving through a number of public order offences, driving offences. The item at item 12 is an offence of contempt of court in June 2010 from this Crown Court and had a sentence of 28 days' imprisonment imposed. There was further public order offences in August 2011 and there is of course the harassment conviction from 1st December 2011 for which as the jury have probably heard an imprisonment term of 18 weeks was imposed, together with the restraining order. There was on the same day, a conviction for common assault and a failure to surrender to custody and on 2nd December at the Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court, there was a conviction for racially aggravated harassment, a public order offence with a racial aggravation, as well as another failing to surrender to custody at the appointed time.

JUDGE CURRAN: Would you inform Mr Kirk please or can somebody inform Mr Kirk that I intend to sentence him, that he has been convicted and that I intend to sentence him now. So if he wants to come into court to make any representation to me, this is his opportunity of doing so.

MR EVANS: Your Honour, there is the Crown's application for costs as well although I should probably wait until Mr Kirk comes into court if he does so. He may wish to have something to say about that.

JUDGE CURRAN: What is the figure?

MR EVANS: The average figure from the schedule provided to prosecutors is £3,500. (16.13pm) (PAUSE) (16.14pm)

JUDGE CURRAN: Am I right in saying that there was subsequently an appeal by Mr Kirk against the conviction for the offence under Section 2 of the Protection from Harassment Act. The appeal was dismissed; the conviction upheld; and the order remains in force.

... and there is no doubt at all that Mr Kirk, as the behaviour during the course of this trial has demonstrated, is capable of acting in a highly intimidating and threatening and abusive manner. For that reason his conduct was obviously a source of great concern to the doctor. For that

reason, the offence involving a bare faced breach of the order very shortly after it had been made requires nothing short of immediate custody. Having said that, I also bear in mind that this offence does not involve an actual attempt to confront the doctor or go to his place of work but the mere publishing of offensive material on the net, on the Defendant's own website.

I sentence the Defendant in his absence because he has declined to come back into court and since there may well be as there very often is by Mr Kirk an application for leave to appeal against this conviction to the Criminal Division of the Court of Appeal, I would make it clear in my sentencing remarks which may be drawn to the attention of the judge receiving the application for leave, that consideration needs to be given perhaps to the way in which the Defendant behaved throughout the trial, which the transcript would reveal and indeed the repeated offers which were given him this morning to come back into court and to give evidence and to call witnesses if he wanted to. All of which he declined.

See <https://www.sendspace.com/pro/dl/s2vh75> for the prat's response.

Here is the restraining order

<http://kirkflyingvet.com/blogs/legal/11%2012%2001%20Restraining%20Order.pdf>

In the 24/6/2010 transcript

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/10%206%2024%20SWP%20Cooke%20transcript.pdf> the insolent sleazebag says: I am serving it on this court.

Judge Cooke responds: Well, you are not, Mr Kirk. You do not serve things on the court in that way ...

Followed by:

MR KIRK: Right, I throw it at you.



THE RECORDER OF CARDIFF: ... if you speak to me politely and you want me to look at it, I will look at it.

MR KIRK: I have a file to lodge with this court.

THE RECORDER OF CARDIFF: You cannot lodge files, there are no proceedings in being.

MR KIRK: I wish you to see the contents of this report and adjourn and come back after you have studied this document.

THE RECORDER OF CARDIFF: These proceedings are concluded, thank you very much. I have ordered the disclosure of the documents to assist the anaesthetist. The rest of this ...

MR KIRK: I have done it under Data Protection Act, I have done it under Freedom of Information Act, I have done it three times now.

THE RECORDER OF CARDIFF: The rest of this is an abuse, Mr Kirk.

MR KIRK: It is an abuse application that I am making today.

THE RECORDER OF CARDIFF: Mr Kirk, there is no abuse application, there are no proceedings against you.

MR KIRK: It is right here.

**The brass of this barsteward** knows know bounds. He pens a letter to Dolmans [solicitors for the police] on 14/2/2011, saying: "The team that surrounds Mr Kirk includes people not wanting to take action against police but rather to find solution to an unusual, if not bizarre case."

Jesus wept! First of all, someone should tell this joker that he *might* come across as more **credible** if he spoke in the first term, rather than the third. Clown Kirk has absolutely NO grounds to take action against anyone. The **solution** is to expose the Masonic controlled 'lay legal' monkeys who surround him. Without his dirty dealing disciples propping him up and protecting him, Kirk is dead in the water.

He continues: "We imagine consolidation should occur, as helpful to all ... There is the potential issue of whether there has been bad faith and abuse of subjective decision making in the multi agency MAPPA."

Big head Kirk thinks he's so important; he imagines he's on the same level as the police and other government agencies. He isn't. And there

is no place for 'consolidation'. He's a **serial offender** and the police/other establishment agencies have done their job as best they could. Actually, when the full truth emerges about Kirk and his McKenzie circus, we will find that he is almost certainly a high up mason moving amongst high up Masonic co-conspirators within his 'lay legal' set up, the police and all of 'HM conspirators'.

Also: "We imagine most people would see it as wise for us to try to bring an end the need for Mr Kirk being involved in any court cases at all." The unimaginable impudence of this guy! He is the one involving himself in a ridiculous amount of **groundless** court actions. If he did not have his shilly McKenzie clique on board, he'd disappear, with his head down and his tail between his legs.

His final paragraph reads: "Regardless of the European Directive, we feel it is correct to ask what would the Defendant's position be regards the team's willingness to attempt to steer and persuade Mr Kirk to enter into mediation on a consolidation of all cases, aiming to end the tone of disputes, and need for court cases?" Cheeky clown. Mediation indeed! All Kirk needs to do is develop a backbone so that he can start being honest and listen to his conscience. Then he needs to start adhering to the law. If he really wants to throw off his shackles to Satan he needs to develop some faith in God, speak FULL truth and blow open the whole Masonic evil that is behind the 'controlled opposition'.

Maurice Kirk reminds me of my evil ex GW. GW also had 'high up' friends and so, not surprisingly, it went to his head and he too thought he was someone special. Also, just like Kirk, he presented a picture of himself as being a nice decent harmless honest bloke ... a great father and loving partner. **In front of others**, this was the side people saw. In fact the nauseating pretender continued the act when we used to meet in court. He and his equally odious solicitor/barrister gave the impression they were such nice kindly gentlemen. They'd all offer me coffee; in fact they'd fall over themselves trying to reach the drinks machine first with their pound coins, so that I didn't have to get my purse out. They'd hold the door open ... and my ex would even offer me a lift home. Meanwhile they were all plotting to destroy me and my kids. F... ing fakes; all of them.

Another sign that someone is a fake is that they ALWAYS drift off their own 'cases' and compare themselves or their situation to high profile cases that are currently being aired in the MSM or they find similarities between their own 'case' and that of cases which have set precedents in

law. For example Kirk refers to the “case law of Waters” and the “Hunter principle”. Norman Scarth used this tactic in all of his writing; in fact pretty much half of everything he said on all of his documents would reference some historic figure or important case law or something in the MSN. He regularly compared himself to some famous heroic freedom fighter.

The puffed-up prick MK causes trouble and wastes public monies wherever and whenever he possibly can. Another example of this is getting himself detained in a secure psychiatric unit after landing his aircraft near President Bush’s Texas residence. This was after being rescued from the Caribbean by the US Coastguard after a forced landing at sea. He claims his intent was to hand a letter of thanks to their commander in chief. He then gets himself referred to psychiatric services at Coity Clinic after coming under investigation by the FTAC [fixated threat assessment centre] for attempting to contact Prince Charles, allegedly to hand a letter detailing his grievances against the SW police. He even went to the local tourist info centre and asked if there was a back door to Prince Charles’ residence! Imagine if we all behaved like this wa\*ker.

Unfortunately for we Brits, the French have no intention of tolerating the time-wasting, trouble-making parasitical dirtbag Maurice Kirk. In his claim for asylum, their reason for rejection is summarised thus:  
“However, the applicant has provided no element, in his detailed but, nonetheless confused, declarations that could seriously establish that he be the object of persecution or threats.”

<file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Administrator/My%20Documents/Downloads/11%2005%2019%20Asile%20Appeal%20docs.pdf>

And now a swift mention on who might be ‘in’ on the Maurice Kirk scam. Obviously I don’t know the answer to that, but I can tell you that there will be a hell of a lot more ‘in’ on the charade than just Kirk’s McKenzie baboons. I would hazard a guess that the vast majority of judges and magistrates are **in the know**; so too will a high percentage of all the senior officials of all the MAPPA agencies and all the lawyers be playing along. Put simply a lot of them will be high level masons, **playing the game**. The lower grade employees of all the agencies and within the judicial system will be, in the main, honest and genuine, doing their job and oblivious to what is really going on within the higher stratosphere of

society. Now if some of these 'high ups' could develop a conscience and grow a backbone it'd make my job a lot easier. They don't need to be *that* bold, they would be helping enormously if they could *anonymously* publish some official documentation, e.g the court transcripts that Kirk doesn't want us to see or the official videos or police interviews ...

I believe all the MPs are in on it. Alun Cairns MP writes to David Sissling, Chief Executive of Abertawe Bro Morgannwg University Local Health Board asking him to assist Kirk re his 'withheld medical records'. <http://kirkflyingvet.co.uk/blogs/legal/archive/2010/10/23/vip-support-for-access-to-medical-records-required-for-hip-replacement.aspx> Well it's no surprise to see a shameless MP earning his crust from the Maurice Kirk sham; just like the skunk MPs who support the Hollie Greig farce. Here's another with his snout in the trough - Walter Sweeny; well he used to be one, he's now a solicitor [just as bad]; Sweeny has been trying to obtain Kirk's medical records to establish authenticity and what immediate intervention is required ... AMs are no different. Jane Hutt AM contacts Edwina Hart AM on Kirk's behalf. Hart also writes to Sissling ... and he, being the chief exec, is almost certainly in on the act too.

Kirk's MP John Smith apparently supported him. According to Kirk he followed Kirk's crusade with diligence, but was 'nobbled', so as "not to pursue demands to know why the South Wales Police have spent a king's ransom to try and get me prosecuted". [http://www.kirkflyingvet.com/PDFs/Interview%20Statements Transcripts.pdf](http://www.kirkflyingvet.com/PDFs/Interview%20Statements%20Transcripts.pdf) In other words John Smith developed a bit of a conscience when he realised what a thoroughly unpleasant lying slimeball Kirk is. He should've gone one further and exposed the fact that Kirk is a high calibre dis-info agent, bought and paid for by the Masonic hierarchy. When is any MP, AM, MEP ... or anyone at the 'top', such as Sisslingling, going to reprimand the likes of Kirk and demand to know what the Feck is going on??? This lot happily and unblushingly collect their fat pay cheques, courtesy of you and me the dutiful taxpayers, to go along with this disgusting charade. **When is ANYONE who in a position to do so going to develop a conscience and a backbone and rock the bloody boat???**

As an aside Kirk the cheeky blighter believes for one's MP not to intervene when given the proof is tantamount to an Abuse of Process and should be immediately investigated by an appropriate authority. The keyword there is 'proof'. In any case Kirk knows there's no such thing as an 'appropriate authority' and that there never will be until freemasonry and all the other dirty secret societies are outlawed. Until that happens he knows he's safe to continue with his filthy little 'game'.

And what of the big hitting heavy weights of the 'alternative media'; the likes of Chris Spivey, David Icke ... Are they exposing the fraudster Maurice Kirk? Course not; you don't grass up your mates.

As for the cost of all this, Sabine estimates that £800,000 has been paid to the people who masquerade as lawyers for the South Wales police. Nearly a million squid, for the price of police lawyers alone. F\*\*cking disgusting. Can you imagine what the real cost must be for letting Kirk use the police service and courts for over 2 decades as a playground. These prostitutes in suits [solicitors and their ilk] should be languishing in prison themselves for their **play acting part**. Of infinitely more importance though is the price of our **freedom**; don't any of them realise that **their silence furthers everyone's enslavement, including their own and that of their loved ones**.

**Here are the typical character and common traits of fake 'victims':-**

These people are a highly intelligent, articulate, arrogant, egotistical, abrasive, insolent, self-obsessed, self-satisfied lot. Lying is their livelihood. They are compulsive bare-faced liars and will believe their own lies. They are brilliant actors, great entertainers [many are great comedians] and all are most accomplished word-twisters – they regularly and effortlessly spin the truth with their manipulations and exaggerations.

Many compare themselves with historical heroes.

They have all the time in the world to antagonise and harass officialdom with their never ending stream of insulting but humorous letters/emails/videos or by direct confrontation. They are frequently abusive and aggressive and regularly go off topic re their own 'case' and resort to ranting, repeating and generalizing.

**Everything** that these fakes accuse others of, **they are themselves guilty of.**

They never deal in facts. Bullshitification and obfuscation is their **game**. They produce very little, if anything, in the way of official documentation/recordings to back up their story. They repeatedly state that they have the proof – transcripts, tape recordings etc but we **never** see any of it! Their ‘evidence’ is mainly hearsay or part or blurred official documentation/photos/videos. Any full clear documents or recordings that they do publish do not substantiate their story, but rather reveal more of the truth. These people use out-of-context quotes/images and talk about unnamed ‘witnesses’.

Fake ‘victims’ love the limelight; they get a buzz off litigation and courtroom drama which they instigate and which is totally without merit and they thrive on the adulation incarceration brings. Many earn the ‘chronic litigant’ or ‘vexatious litigant’ title – and boy do they wear those badges with pride!

They don’t suffer any hardship. Instead they inflict it on others. Many of them are violent. All of them are dangerous. Collectively these despicable creatures cost the unsuspecting decent law-abiding dutiful taxpayer an untold unimaginable obscene amount of money.

Behind the facade we see a line of cowardly utterly loathsome abusive individuals who bully and threaten anyone who dares to speak full truth. Our two geriatric eccentrics Maurice Kirk and Norman Scarth perfectly fit the above description. Two peas in a pod: each the other’s alter ego.

Finally the likes of Maurice Kirk, Norman Scarth, Robert Green and all the other wannabe heroes might just regret getting themselves imprisoned when the truth about them dawns on their fellow inmates. Wouldn’t want to be in their shilly shoes when the prison population realise what thoroughly wicked lying dangerous depraved criminals these actors are.