

Hoist by their Own Petard?

Only a cynic, perhaps, would ever suggest the Defendant's solicitors deliberately withheld page 47 from their Defendant's Skeleton Argument, last August, when attempting to 'strike out' nineteen years of litigation on the excuse there was no evidence of 'malice' aforethought in the local police force.

It is the Defendant's 'account' of **Action2, Para 9**, one of the Claimant's many arrests whilst on duty and only received by him on the 1st March, long after the November judgement, striking out incidents on their argument that one cannot sue the police, if they obtain any conviction, however trivial it may be.

Para 152: states the Claimant was 'seen' driving along Port Road, Barry, 'erratically', at around midnight, but stopped by other police officers, nowhere near the scene of the alleged offence.

Para 153: 1st police officer stated the Claimant gave a negative breath test and not arrested.

Para 154: 2nd police officer stated the Claimant refused to give a breath test and was arrested.

The Claimant was arrested alright but allowed to enter his client's house, adjacent to his parked vehicle, there having been no such 'car chase', to attend to a dying dog that was then quietly put to sleep. Covert police surveillance knew full well the Claimant had been called out to that emergency.

It was only then the Claimant was put in handcuffs and taken to the police station where the duty officer, following a negative breath test, yet another zero, zero reading, released the prisoner without charge. The Claimant has been refused the custody records, videos and incident number ever since.

The critical page was left out, unfortunately, as two other recently identical incidents, of police, again, falsifying a 'refused breath test at the road side' only to be followed, shortly after, by a zero reading on the definitive test at each police station, was in the very same document for 'strike out'.

The Claimant was maliciously charged, a rare decision following a zero reading, and convicted on both.

With no page 47 for the trial judge raises the question, when weighing up whether there was a sinister pattern arising, in one or more of forty similar incidents, especially after so many custody records were destroyed immediately after the Claimant's requests to retain. Was 'malice' likely now, contrary to the judgment decision to 'strike out' the two incidents below, carrying such similar circumstances?

Actions 2 Para 11 (Newport Rd, police caught on camera beating up Claimant) and **Action 2 Para 6** (Llantwit Major, midnight, Claimant on an emergency) both carried convictions for failure of breath test.

The very same trial judge had refused the Crown Court Appeal, in the latter incident, heard in the Claimant's absence, not accepting his medical report when recovering from an operation, while the former incident, even more violent, the Claimant had pleaded 'guilty' for fear of his life, in the hope that the harassment and increasing acts of violence upon him, by the South Wales Police, would finally stop.

The convictions had the Claimant struck off as a veterinary surgeon on the whim of two duty officers.