NO POLICE PSYCHATRIST COVED BE FOUND IN SOUTH WALES TO POLLOW MY 28 DAY PAROLE REVIEW

No. A7306AT HMP Parc Heol Hopcyn John Coity Bridgend CF35 6AP

MEQUEST FOR ECHR RECEIVED MY 25 PM BY 2018 MOPLICATION

25th May 2018

The Registrar
European Court of Human Rights
Council of Europe
67075 STRASBOURG Cedex
France

BEFORE,

Dear Sir/Madam

MAURICE KIRK V UNITED KINGDOM – CLAIM FOR FAILURE TO ARRANGE PAROLE HEARING AND SUBSEQUENT STRIKE OUT OF CLAIM IN CARDIFF DISTRICT REGISTRY AND REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO APPEAL ON THE PAPERS IN THE COURT OF APPEAL

I enclose an application to the court regarding the above matter ON 25 MAY 2018

The final Order of the Court of Appeal, Item no. 177, p. 913-915, copy enclosed, was made on 20th March 2018 in the Court of Appeal, and sealed on 22nd March 2018, and was received by me on 26th March 2018. This was therefore, the final exhaustion of domestic remedies in this case.

I have included the bundles that were before the Court of Appeal and were the basis of the refusal of permission to appeal by Lord Justice Simon.

I have included the most important documents in the initial release on licence and subsequent recall, and the claim in the Cardiff District Registry to give a chronological introduction.

The Claim was framed and brought in accordance with the case of R. (Kaiyam & ors. v. Secretary of State for Justice [2015] A.C. 1344, Item no. 168, p. 798-822, which held in the Supreme Court that a failure to arrange a Parole hearing engages article 5 ECHR and may be in breach of article 5, depending on the individual circumstances. It was claimed that article 5 was breached regarding this particular case.

The remaining papers are all contained in the two Court of Appeal Bundles, the Core Bundle and the Supplementary Bundle, including the Defendant's evidence, which were compiled in accordance with the Practice Directions of the court for the filing of bundles in the Court of Appeal.

MILLOSS TROUTS

WELLOW

THELLOW

MEDDIZE ZITZ

In so far as a challenge was made to the determination of permission to appeal on the papers, I filed a Skeleton Argument dealing with that aspect of the case, and the Lord Justice could therefore have directed an oral hearing to determine that issue as a preliminary issue regarding the lawfulness of CPR 52.5(1). However, as can be seen, his Lordship declined to do so.

I also seek an interim measure for a stay on enforcement proceedings regarding the three orders for costs made against me in favour of the 1st Defendant for £4,999, the 2nd Defendant for £11,000 and the 3rd Defendant for £20,010 by His Honour Judge Keyser QC in the Cardiff District Registry in his subsequent Order dated on 16th October 2018, under rule 39.1 of the Rules of Court.

Yours faithfully

Maurice John Kirk

Encs

MYRARI PROOF OF PRAVI BY SOUTH WALES POLICE

ANN FET