

IN THE PRIVY COUNCIL  
DR AYLMER JAMES CROMPTON  
v  
HEALTH COMMITTEE OF  
GENERAL MEDICAL COUNCIL

91856

No 45 of 1984

THIS CASE ASSERTETH :

- (1) The Commencement of the proceedings is to be found on folio 92 of the second volume of the Transcript. I shall refer to the first volume as pages and to the second volume by folio numbers in the bottom right hand corner. The short hand writer has not produced an accurate transcript of my words during the proceedings. Vital words have been omitted or transposed or mis-spelt producing incomplete, ungrammatical, sentences. There are so many instances that I shall need to correct the record in a separate addendum to the case. I have written a letter to the Registrar of the Privy Council concerning omissions: (16/10/84)
- (2) The names of the Health Committee are not given in the Transcript or published elsewhere so the Committee appears to exist as a secret society contrary to the Unlawful Societies Act of 1799. For such a society to be allowed to exercise judicial functions would appear to put Lord Hailsham in breach of his Oath of office as Lord Chancellor.
- (3) The directions of the Committee are only given in hypothetical terms: (pages 86-88). The real meaning has to be deduced from the subsequent and contradictory letters of Mr Gray and Mrs Loggan. The appeal is imperative as those directions are impossible to comply with as I shall explain below.
- (4) There is a sinister official called the Preliminary Health Screener who appears to be exercising by himself the judicial powers of both the Preliminary Proceedings Committee and the Health Committee and of the officer appointed under paragraph 9 of Schedule 4 to the 1978 Medical Act. Mrs Loggan refuses to give his name. The annual general report of the G.M.C. for 1981 reveals his name as Sir Denis Hill. On page 17 that report reads :-

(4) "In one case a direction for erasure was reversed on appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. One case was referred to the Health Committee for determination of the question whether the doctor's fitness to practice was seriously impaired." I am the subject of both those sentences and Sir Denis Hill is in contempt of the Sovereign by denying me employment in this way in contempt of Her law. Vide folio 87. The disciplinary committee did not refer me to the Health Committee. Lord Diplock stipulated that any Health Committee proceedings must be de novo. Vide folio 15. This is precisely what the G.M.C. has not done. Sir Denis Hill did not make a lawful referral to the health committee, vide infra, but has used it as a device to cloak vexatious continuance of punitive proceedings.

(5) On the fifth page of my petition I ask for a Declaration that the proceedings before the Health Committee have been initiated contrary to Paragraph 6(2) of the S.I 859 of 1980 and are therefore void for absence of jurisdiction. The Transcript shows no information from a "person acting in a public capacity" nor does it show any statutory declaration in support of information from any other source. The duty of Sir Denis Hill under rule 6(2) was to stop the matter proceeding further and this duty he failed to perform. The legal assessor has also failed in his duty to reprimand Sir Denis Hill for this breach of the rules. Vide S.I 1980/941.

It appears that while the last President was dying, Sir Denis Hill, used Rule 5(2) to appoint himself under Rule 5(1)(c) and then abused his authority contrary to Rule 6(2) in contempt of the Privy Council. It was therefore bad for Mr Draper to try and cover up this transgression of the rules retrospectively by writing to me in the terms of Rule 6(3)(b). Vide folio 19. The letter did not correspond or comply with Rule 11(1)(e) by stating the clinical condition referred to. The letter lied as to the nature of information received and in referring to the Chairman of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee: Vide folio 2. In any event I did not receive the letter and I have not condoned the breaches of the rules by agreeing to see another psychiatrist.

(5) It is oppressive conduct by Mr Venables, the Official Solicitor to criticise me in this situation for not seeing another psychiatrist: Vide folio 61. This letter is proof of conspiracy between himself and Alms and Young to pervert justice not only in the G.M.C. but also in Chancery. His letter was filed in Chancery in a perjured Affidavit by Mr Francis Michael Pubermacher that was not served until Chief Master Howard (in the total absence of pleadings by Alms and Young) unlawfully awarded £ 6,519-51 to Alms and Young (folios 62-63). Master Howard was deliberately using his judicial office to assist the crime of false accounting contrary to Section 17 of the Theft Act 1968. It is disloyal to the Sovereign for a Crown Officer, Mr Venables, to assist crime in this way. (Vide folios 89, 90, 91.) (N.B. £910 + £1,933 + £1,023 (folio 90) = £2,500 (folio 89) but the dates are different. The money was first taken illegally from the sale of a house in March 1978 and then again from my bank account in May as soon as I was in custody. Mr Hornigman is aiding this crime by concealing prosecution by Sergeant Beardon on charges contrary to Statute (vide folio 8). Judge Vieloth is also aiding crime by failing to grant a stay of execution. Mr Butterton is a legal executive who is in contempt Bristol Bankruptcy Court by issuing a Bankruptcy notice (Vide folios 62-63) contrary to Section 20 of The Solicitors Act 1974. The <sup>LAW</sup> Society is aiding crime by delay in the prosecution of Mr Butterton under Section 20 (2) (c) of the Solicitors Act 1974. The officials of the Attorney-Generals office are aiding crime by delay in directing the Law Society to prosecute Mr Butterton. Registrar Frankel is aiding crime by failure to take cash accounts before making a Receiving Order. Mr Parker and Mr Jones are aiding crime by delay in listing my appeal in the Chancery Bankruptcy Court. Mr Hornigman is in conspiracy with Mr Butterton because he arranged the commencement of the Health Committee <sup>proceeding</sup> on the 27th day after Mr Butterton obtained a receiving order thereby forcing me to draft my appeal in Bankruptcy at the same time as I was trying to prepare to cross-examine Dr Fleming and Dr Herridge. The letter I wrote at the same time to Mr Gray has been omitted from the Transcript. The Chief Constable of

(5) of Avon is assisting crime by delay in the prosecution of Mr Pulvermacher, Mr Butterton, Registrar Frankel and Mr Higgins of the Official Receiver's office. There is a genuine dispute with the South Western Electricity Board arising from criminal interference with my correspondence by Mr Pulvermacher in 1978: therefore it is illegal for my electricity to have been switched off by the South Western Electricity Board but Mr Higgins has criminally allowed this and it may be for this reason that God delivered the President of the Board of Trade into the hands of the I.R.A. In any event I am being criminally harassed in the preparation of this case by being forced to live away from home where there is no electricity, no telephone and no dog. The Privy Council has a duty to direct the prosecution of everyone named in this paragraph because the crimes are a direct result of my prosecution in Taunton Crown Court contrary to Statute. Vide folios 78-81 and especially 79 first three paragraphs.

In addition to the conspiracies between Mr Hornigsmann and Alons and Young there is a further connecting link:- Hampsons are the solicitors not only for the Medical Defence Union but also for the Law Society. This means that if any doctor has cause to criticise the Law Society they can arrange a Masonic conspiracy to ~~have~~ <sup>have</sup> that Doctor framed as mentally disordered in order to prevent his employment. The involvement of Dr Wall of the Medical Defence Union is clearly shown by the fact that at no time has he attended a meeting of the Health Committee or written to inform me that it was taking place. Dr Fleminger admitted to being a member of the Medical Defence Union (vide folio 3) and so did Dr Herridge (folio 49). I therefore suggest that it is conspiracy by those mentioned to prevent justice that prevented the reports of Dr Fleminger and Dr Herridge being made available to the Privy Council in 1981. vide folio 18.

(b) The information given by the G.M.C. in the Transcript as to the inception of the Health Committee proceedings is contradictory (compare folio 19 (1st line) with folio 2) and I must therefore consider the possibility that Mr Honnigmann is lying and Mr Drofer telling the truth. This possibility is supported by the seditious libel of Chris Hewitt (Folio 45 and read also folio 44). The Evening Post refers to a Preliminary proceedings committee and then goes on to make it look as if the ~~two~~ "Law Lords" advised the Queen to return a criminal psychiatrist to the Medical Register. (The Press appears to confuse me with a Consultant Psychiatrist of the West London Hospital who was also put off the Register and is a rear neighbour of Sir Dennis Hill). My photograph was taken inside the G.M.C. building and I was not jailed for two years as stated but released by the ~~Great~~ Court of Appeal after serving a six ~~month~~ months sentence and six weeks false custody on charges found by Lord Justice Lane to be contrary to Statute. Mr Honnigmann has practiced deceit on the G.M.C. for eight years by concealing the existence of charges contrary to Statute in Taunton Crown Court. These charges were used to pervert justice by Sergeant Beardson because he was unable to identify me as the culprit of the other offence and he was deliberately prejudicing Judge Russell to make him lie to the jury that I had been identified. The deceit was passed on to Dr Herridge by Mrs Coggan to misrepresent me as having "thought disorder" as he had no first hand knowledge of the nature of the Taunton Crown Court proceedings. The article in the Evening Post (Folio 45) appears to be the source of the information referred to in Mr Drofers letter (Folio 19) and the order of the Sovereign is set aside in ~~defiance~~ <sup>defiance</sup> to the sedition of the gutter press of anti-royalists. If the Privy Council cannot effectively rebuke this conduct of the G.M.C. they might as well ask the Queen to abdicate and I trust She would refuse in order to uphold Her law (Folio 87). The G.M.C. have ~~had~~ <sup>had</sup> no time suggested that the Press article is not an accurate record of their proceedings. It appears

λ deference

λ at

(6) therefore, that Mr Straker rather ~~than~~ than report back to the G.M.C. in the manner that Lord Diplock instructed him to do; instead, arranged a secret meeting of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee which then divulged psychiatric reports to Chris Hewitt that had been refused to the Privy Council upon grounds of confidentiality. There is no evidence in the Transcript that the legal assessor attended the meeting of that Committee although it was his duty to do so. Vide S.I. 1980/941. ~~If he did attend without advising them to comply with Her Majesty's order he should be prosecuted for sedition or treasonous violation of his Oath of office.~~

(7) The confabulations of the G.M.C that I have exposed in the last four paragraphs prove that the Health Committee proceedings were started illegally contrary to Rule 6(2) and should be declared void without further delay.

The same paragraphs also provide evidence in support of my application for a Declaration that Messrs Waterhouse and Co have conducted a malicious prosecution by exposing some of their collateral motives

(8) Section 40 of the Medical Act 1983 gives power to refer back to the Health Committee for amendment of conditions imposed and this is item (7) on page 5 of my petition. Although the Health Committee have found in my favour they are making my victory nugatory by imposing conditions with which it is impossible to comply. Direction (a) Page 86 is impossible to comply with.

There are no pre-registration laboratory posts in the N.H.S. Only in a pre-registration post can work be supervised in the sense that the G.M.C. uses the word. No Consultant clinical pathologist would be prepared to report on a doctor's mental condition as in paragraph 4 of page 87. Vide Mr Gray's letter not in Transcript. No psychiatrist could employ me as a clinical pathologist. Vide Mrs Loggans letter (not in Transcript).

(8) Misdirection (a) of the Health Committee (continued) As no post exists in the N.H.S. that corresponds to the stipulations of this directions it follows (*vide supra*) that it is impossible to comply with. The direction is therefore unlawful in common law and the remedy should be to quash it (*vide infra*). As to the duty of common law to quash acts impossible to perform, I cite *Dr Bonham v Board of Physicians* (1610) 86 Rf 107 in which the directions of the Board of Physicians to re-imprison poor Dr Bonham after he had been released on a previous successful appeal were described in the words: "~~against~~ against common right and reason, repugnant and impossible to be performed and common law will control it and cause such act to be void". I can hardly improve on these words myself. The latin words are equally good and I wish I could have a Writ with the wording given to Dr Bonham!

As to Statute Law, the placing of a medical practitioner under the supervision of another is a power not of the Health Committee but the Disciplinary Committee and that was terminated in my case by the Queens Statute of the 31st July 1981: *vide folio 87 and folio 93 (first three lines)*. There is a thundering and culpable silence by the legal assessor at this point in the transcript. Is he so ignorant or wicked that he cannot inform the Committee that an "official document" signed by the Sovereign has the imperative of Statute law? The G.M.C. has never complied with that order in any way whatever. They have both failed to return me to the Register, notwithstanding the collection of an annual retention fee in 1982, and to accept liability for my bill of costs or even to receive the bill. The G.M.C. must not be allowed to turn my victory on appeal into a thumbs-up sign at the Sovereign.

Compare folio 9 with folio 45 (and 44) and 64 ~~to~~ <sup>compare</sup> page 18.

(8) It would appear on page 18 that the Chairman did not consider the legal assessor and that I can well understand, however, I do not see this as any good reason why a man of the ilk of Mr Honnigmann should be invited to do the legal assessor's job. To the best of my knowledge, Mr Honnigmann has no experience as a barrister whatever. In any case he misled the Committee by suggesting that its procedures were properly instituted when he knew full well they were not in compliance with Rule 6 (2) or Rule 11 (1)(a). He also misled the Committee upon the directions of the judicial committee which had stipulated that Health Committee proceedings must be started "de novo". This has not happened. It was also pointed out by the Privy Council that the Disciplinary Committee had power to make a reference to the Health Committee. It is noteworthy that they did not do so.

Mr Honnigmann does not mention or explain this. vide page 71:

On this page I refer to a Preliminary Proceedings Committee which was very sensible of me (vide folio 19 line 1) and so did Dr Delvin but Mr Honnigmann denies the use of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee and refers to "the alternative path". What left hand path was this? There is not one word in the Transcript that purports to come from the President or an official source. Is it possible that Mr Honnigman and Sir Denis Hill did (contrary to Rule 6 (2)) as part of an inner secret society?

Vide Christopher  
in "The  
Brotherhood"

"There is no defence against an evil which only the victims and the perpetrators know exist" to quote "Christopher" the pseudonym of a secret very senior civil servant. There is, of course, always the all seeing eye of the G. A. O. T. U. spoken of ~~me~~ by ~~Reverend~~ Zechariah the prophet. Does Mr Honnigmann, I wonder, know His Omnipic<sup>name</sup>, or is he below the Royal Arch? Will he be found bent beside the plumb-line of Zerubabel? Let him beware the Lewis of a grand-master of high degree. Let him that readeth understand."

(9) Misdirections of the Health Committee (continued)

(b) The Committee drew up its direction in hypothetical and dangerous terms. The direction that I should accept unspecified treatment for an undiagnosed and unclassified mental disorder is a potential danger to my body and soul and the manner in which Mrs Coggan is using this direction is interfering with primary health care by Dr Edwards and should be regarded as attempted murder for which she should be prosecuted. Sir Alan Parkes died in 1981 so I cannot see him for gastrointestinal symptoms (vide folio 66) which could be due to carcinoid Tumour and could be lethal if I were given tranquillisers of the monoamine oxidase inhibitor group. Neither Dr Hemidge nor Dr Fleminger took any precaution to exclude this by laboratory investigation (vide folio 8). When I was a Registrar in Chemical Pathology at the Mental Hospitals Group laboratory I was called in to correct the treatment of many patients mismanaged and damaged by Psychiatrists. Often I found the mental illness to be due to medical or surgical conditions which the Psychiatrists had completely overlooked with unscientific thinking. No Psychiatrist, thank God, can change a personality but this does not stop them doing damage to personalities to satisfy the lowest vindictive attitudes of society. A direction for a pre-frontal leucotomy or chemical castration would be a diabolical attack on my soul vide P.C. 8 of 1980 and 24 of 1981 vide folio 85 paragraph 2. In that paragraph I refer to the teaching of Christ that a man's soul is worth more than the whole world and of the Coronation Oath of the Queen to respect this. The Queen made a law that I should be returned to the Register unconditionally and Mr Gray and Mrs Coggan appear to be conspiring with psychiatrists to ruin my career, and damage my mental health by unemployment and damage my soul by secret treatments all in treasonous contempt of Her Majesty and verging upon blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

(9) Misdirections of the Health Committee (continued)

Direction (b) This direction is an abuse of power to refer me to a psychiatrist for no clinical reason given but for the wrong motive of changing and damaging my personality by possible methods that could endanger my health, life and soul. If it is argued that Section 40 of the Medical Act 1983 prevents question of the ineffable clinical wisdom of the G.M.C., however inapparent, then a new Health Committee must be directed to reconsider the direction without delay. As to abuse of power by a judicial tribunal I cite Lord Gannor in "Administrative Law" page 157.

(10) Direction (c) The wording of this direction is an abuse of power and fails to preserve my rights as a potential patient to refuse investigations that are in the nature of an assault or even to change my neurologist. It should be borne in mind that some neurological tests have over a 50% mortality and the motivation of the health committee appears to be malicious and potentially murderous. Perhaps this is why they are so secretive as to who drafts their orders? There is no provision made for a letter from Dr Edwards to the neurologist (or the psychiatrist for that matter) and there should be. The omission of this provision is a serious and dangerous interference with primary health care. If as a result of this interference, Dr Edwards should fail to diagnose a gastric carcinoma or even a benign gastric ulcer and I die of an internal haemorrhage at any date, I pray that the Privy Council will give evidence to the Coroner or the D.P.P. of the culpability of Mrs Cogger and/or Mr Gray and/or Sir Denis Hill and/or Dr Wall.

The usurpation of a clinical role by Mrs Cogger and the manner in which she ~~ask~~ instructs clinicians is objectionable and, I believe, also illegal. I tried to contact the ~~neurologist~~ neurologist when I was told by Mrs Cogger that an appointment had been made. He refused to see me because he had no letter from Dr Edwards or Professor Shaw.

- (10) It is clear from the above that the directions of the health committee are drawn up with an ambiguity that would be a credit to a Pissar secret Freemason. The meanings given to the term "medical supervisor" by different officials of the G.M.C. are contradictory. The term "fitness to practise" is used in a way that interchanges the Health and Disciplinary committee at the whim of an official or witness. Vide paragraph 2 of folio 38 in which a member of the committee (not named) was allowed to put a quite improper leading question to Dr Herridge in the absence of any representative of myself. The answer given without cross-question must bias the clinical assessors until such time as it is removed from the record.
- (11) A Tribunal has a duty to draw up its directions and findings in precise and unambiguous terms. Vide Halsbury's Laws of England 4th Ed Vol 1 para 16. Failure to do this by the Chairman is a breach of Natural Justice that should void the whole proceedings.
- (12) Further errors in the conduct of the Committee The Registrar did not comply with rule 11 (1) (a) in his notice of referral and the legal assessor has failed to advise the Committee of this error. vide folios 19, 24, 40, 95, 96. On no occasion has the Registrar indicated the "mental condition" that he refers to as "mental disorder". The G.M.C. does not have legislative powers in relation to mental disorder. They have therefore no right to create a new definition of psychopathic personality which cannot be classified by any ~~paid~~ psychiatrist under the Mental Health Acts. It was stated by Dr Fleminger to be not capable of classification under the Mental Health Act: vide page 19 line 32. The Mental Health Acts explicitly state that a personality disorder must be capable of treatment: vide page 14 lines 2-3. and then goes on to say that he cannot make a clinical diagnosis: page 14 line 22. It is very curious that this alleged disorder should only have become apparent after the Sovereign ordered my return to the Medical Register.

Further errors in the Conduct of the Committee

- (13) The Constitution of the Committee did not comply with rule ~~4(b)~~ 4 (b) of the second schedule. Compare folio 129 para 6 with folio 2. My main career has been as a hospital clinical pathologist. I have never been a partner in general practice and so Dr Meyrick should not have been a medical assessor. The Registrar neglected to correct the composition of the medical assessors in the light of the Chairman's direction: folio 129.
- (14) Documentary evidence should not have been accepted from Dr Sternberg and Dr Page without opportunity to cross-question them. Dr Sternberg appears to have been in conspiracy with Dr Edwards to obstruct justice in the G.M.C (vide folio 140 para 2). The conspiracy appears to have been aided and abetted by Dr Page at the same address (vide folio 138). Neither Mr Roger Feneley nor Mr Slade (or Mr Espinner) were called to give evidence (vide folio 72-73 and 65). Dr Barker gave evidence to Bristol Crown Court that I was free of mental disorder ~~Dr Barker~~ but he was not called. Dr Gage gave evidence to Bristol High Court that I was free of mental disorder but he was not called. Dr Sternberg gave evidence to Taunton Crown Court that I was free of mental disorder. Dr Scott-White prepared a report in 1983 for the Chief Constable of Avon that I was free of mental disorder but neither he nor the Chief Constable were called: vide folios 18, 25, 64, 67 and 58. The G.M.C conceals evidence and witnesses that disagree with their pre-conceived prejudice. As a receiving order was obtained by a legal executive against me during the adjournment of the inquiry, I could not possibly offer conduct money to any of the witnesses to attend by sub-poenas. The responsibility to issue sub-poenas was entirely upon Waterhouse and Co and they misled me during the inquiry into believing that Dr Edwards would not attend

so I was taken by surprise which was contrary to the rules.

(15) Misconduct by deceit Certain letters of mine were written in the context of the disciplinary committee in 1979 and 1980 but were not answered by their recipients. They appear to have been intercepted by Waterhouse and Co and concealed for over a year until after the Privy Council hearing in 1981. Then in September 1981 they were produced to the President as evidence of alleged mental disorder. Neither Dr Fleminger or Dr Herridge were allowed to see those letters by Mr Honnigmann so they should not have been used by him in evidence. He refused even to cross-question me before the Committee upon my own letters and this is a further reason why he should not have been allowed to use my letters in evidence. Vide folio 19 at the 4th Paragraph and note how Mr Honnigmann projects all his acts calculated to pervert the course of justice upon a fictional Preliminary Proceedings Committee.

(16) Absence of Mr Patrick Flynn at hearing. The Committee were biased by evidence of a hearsay nature in letters of Mr Patrick Flynn (folios 20-23) and it was not sufficient for the Chairman to tell the Committee to disregard his evidence (pages 47-48). The legal assessor should have ordered a new hearing with a new Committee just as a Judge in a Crown Court would order a new jury when prosecution evidence was proven unsworn.

(17) Actions of Mr Patrick Flynn There is a calligraphic error in sub-petition (5) on page 5 of the petition and the name should be P.J. Flynn not J.M. Flynn vide folios 20-23 and 68 and 71. Mr Patrick Flynn never served me a letter as instructed (vide folio 20 para 1). It is possible that it was he who once brought me an envelope containing a piece of blank paper (folio 20 para 1)

(18) Violation of Human Rights by Mr Flynn Mr Flynn has pried into the privacy of my home (~~folios 20~~) (Folio 70). I deny that either myself or my dog howled in the manner his letter described (folio 70 para 5 at top of page). He touted for hearsay and spread slander among my neighbours (folio 20 et seq). He made no inquiry of Professor Darling as to dental pain (folio 65). I deny living in a bungalow (folio 22). I ask the Privy Council for a Declaration (sub-petition 5) that the conduct of Mr Flynn in relation to my home and correspondence was a violation of my Human Rights as given by Article 8 of the Human Rights Convention of the Treaty of Rome: (vide folios 75, 76 and 77 and compare folio 25). The GMC is a public authority within the meaning of Article 8 and the Treaty of Rome. Vide folio 80.

Mr Patrick Flynn failed to attend the Committee in spite of a sub-poena issued by Waterhouse and Co: Vide (folios 64, 121 and Page 47). He is therefore in contempt of a judicial tribunal and it is the duty of Mr Honigsmann to prosecute him. Mr Honigsmann reported that his agents in Bristol could not even find "Nationwide Investigations" (~~folios~~) (Page 47). I further note that their head office was at Brighton and that he was speaking about six weeks before a bomb exploded at the Grand Hotel, Brighton. Mr James Prior suggested that was the work of an IRA organisation that had been active for three years and then gone underground. (He was speaking on the BBC and there was confirmation from a Belfast source). Waterhouse and Co appear to have been employing an I.R.A. shell organisation: a "Nationwide" private detective agency employed for the "security" of a political conference would be a perfect cover to prevent the detection of a bomb of illegal purpose.

(19) Chris Hewitt appears to have exploited anti-royalist sentiment (perhaps from Patrick Flynn) by his article in the Chew Valley edition of the Evening Post of ~~24th~~ 24th August 1981 which I indicate was seditious against the Sovereign (Folios 44, 45). He was not called as a witness by the G.M.C. It was therefore wrong for Mr Honigsmann to prejudice the Committee against me by including his false reporting in the papers (Folio 45). The legal assessor was at fault in failing to correct this. He appears to have no objection to the publication of libel against the Sovereign or myself provided it helps to white-wash the public image of the G.M.C.

(20) Bias by legal assessor The legal assessor interfered with clinical matters that he did not understand by preventing proper cross-questioning of Dr Herridge on alleged thought disorder. of Page 57 with folio 31 (2nd paragraph) in which Dr Herridge maliciously caricatures my pending application to the European Court (vide folios 78-81). The legal assessor appears to be of the same sadistic ilk as Dr Herridge: perhaps he is his catamite. The attitude of both is a contempt of the European Court and a disgrace to European civilisation. He did not allow me to test the memory of Dr Herridge adequately (pages 50-54) although he was lying about the date when he saw me. The proceedings of 1st December 1980 are not in the Transcript nor is the guidance sheet given by the GMC to its witnesses.

The legal assessor never asked Dr Herridge to show his report to the Privy Council in 1981 (folio 59) in spite of the repeated requests of Lord Devlin (folio 15). The legal assessor has therefore deliberately obstructed the course of justice in the Privy Council.

(21) Malice of Dr Herridge For a two year period from 1943 to 1945 Dr Herridge carried out violent and vicious sexual assaults upon me before I reached the age of puberty. Only by kicking Colin Francis Herridge and running away could I escape. As he had no conscious memory of these events (vide folio 31 paragraph 1) I conclude that he was <sup>motivated</sup> subconsciously and projected his guilt upon me with confabulation. As he was also suffering from memory loss and disorientation in time (folios 49 and 50) he would appear to have the salient features of Korsakow's psychosis and be unfit to practice. His amnesia could be a serious danger to patients at the West Middlesex Hospital or Harley Street.

(22) Misconduct of Chairman The Chairman interrupted my cross-examination of Dr Herridge on the question of thought disorder by the use of legal libraries (cf Folio 67 with Folio 31 paragraph 2). If the use of a legal library is submitted as evidence of thought disorder then Dr Herridge would appear to be willing to certify the whole judiciary as mentally disordered. Compare Page 57 with folio 31 (2nd paragraph) in which Dr Herridge maliciously caricatured my application to the European Court (vide folios 78-81).

The Chairman and the legal assessor showed bias by allowing witnesses to be evasive to crucial questions concerning alleged personality disorder: vide pages 12-15, 18, 20, 21, 54 of Folio 31, 3rd paragraph as to need to ask <sup>the</sup> question. I had a right to repeat an unanswered question.

The Chairman showed bias by allowing Mr Honnigman to give evidence without opportunity to cross-question him: folios 107-116, pages 12, 18, 23, 56. The rules allow the solicitor to cross-question other witnesses but not to give evidence himself or to advise on law instead of the legal assessor.

(23) Misconduct of Registrar There was misconduct by the Registrar in the manner in which he obtained psychiatric reports for the Council. He sent ~~to~~ no clinical history to the doctors but instead a libelous and misleading account of Crown proceedings. He sent the psychiatrists no letter from Dr Edwards. He refused to send Dr Edwards any reason why I should consult a psychiatrist or any particulars of the reports obtained. He was written to by the President of the Royal College of Psychiatrists, Professor Pond, to the effect that he was making improper use of Psychiatrists. The Registrar has criminally perverted the course of justice by removing that letter from the Transcript. The Queen endows Royal Colleges to elevate the standards of medical ethics and the G.M.C. does everything to frustrate this and debase ethics to a lowest common denominator.

In October 1983 the Soviet Union was hypocritically excluded from the International Congress of Psychiatrists. In November 1983 the Soviet Union walked out of the Geneva Peace talks. The Queen was attending the Commonwealth conference and could not have ~~attended~~ a Privy Council Order at that date.

x  
signed

(24) Conspiracy to prevent hearing of case In ~~the~~ 1982 I was informed that I had been returned to the Register and my annual retention fee collected. In 1983 the hearing was arranged at a date that clashed with a direction by the Official Receiver to attend Bristol Bankruptcy Court. I could have been assisted for ~~me~~ non-compliance with this direction, vide folio 88.

This was a conspiracy between Waterhouse and Co and Alvis and Young to cause my financial destitution. When I lodged an appeal I was immediately attached for bankruptcy costs

(24) by Alms and Young including a fraudulent claim by a solicitor Mr. George Bates who at the time was in prison for fraud. Waterhouse and Co have therefore aided and abetted a criminal offence contrary to Section 39 (1)(a) of the Solicitors Act 1974. It has been proved in the Chancery Bankruptcy Court that the papers of George Bates were photostated four times to increase Bankruptcy costs by unlawful means and the case has been published in the Times Law Reports. The Transcript was not prepared in time but sent three weeks late and it did not reach me until January 1984 because it came open in the post. I did not receive any case (30 of 1983) either then or since and the G.M.C. therefore had no right to issue a petition for non-prosecution before I had either their case (if any) and the Transcript. The petition was incompetent because it contained a contentious rehearsal of my petition. My petition did not ask for the G.M.C. order to be varied as stated but for a judicial review and the Committal to prison of Mr. Honnigman <sup>FOLIOS 68-71</sup>. It was a contempt of the Privy Council to misinterpret my petition in order to prevent a hearing. I did not receive any summons to answer either a case (if any) or a cross-petition. At precisely the same time Parliament was passing the Medical Act 1983 which had a direct bearing on the subject matter of the case by amending the legal criteria for the definition of a psychopathic personality. I therefore wish for leave to amend that petition in the light of the new Medical Act 1983 and to file a case under the amended petition. If equitable justice is to be done it is essential that every interference by the G.M.C. in my life and affairs since 31/7/81 be reversed.

(25) Hearsay accounts were given by Dr Edwards of Dr Gay and the opinion of Dr Sternberg vide folio 44 without either myself having any opportunity to examine Dr Gay. I had no advanced sight of the letters of Dr Sternberg (that differ from his evidence to Taunton Crown Court) Folios 135, 138 and it was breach of Natural Justice to take me by surprise with the hearsay speculations of Dr Gavin Shaw page 44. When there is a rehearing there should be directions for subpoena. It is very convenient for Dr Edwards to have me off the Register as this makes him the only doctor in the village. This means that he has a vested financial interest in ~~us~~ giving unsatisfactory reports to the Council and that he ought not to be appointed as a supervisor vide page 87: this duty must conflict with a duty to give primary medical care and treatment for organic disease. The Committee ought to realise this especially when I live in the country and not in town with an alternative choice of general practitioners. I am sure that they are deliberately interfering with primary medical care in this way as a conspiracy of deliberate murder and that the Pring Council has a duty to ensure that every member of the Council is ~~prosecuted~~. The motive is clearly malicious revenge for successful appeal in 1981 and to ensure that I am dead before I am able to enforce the order for costs in my favour made at that time. It appears from a letter sent by Lord Hailsham to Mr Paul Dean M.P. that he does not admit the jurisdiction of the Sovereign and that he is aiding and abetting the removal illegally of funds from Taunton County Court by the Official Receiver to the Bank of England and that in this way he also is aiding and abetting my murder through destitution to conceal his contempt of the Sovereign by failing to implement the Ligitants in Person Act to the Pring Council.

x prosecuted

(26) Hemphsons conspired with Alms and Young to put third party proceedings in Taunton County Court at the same time as the Privy Council Hearing in 1981. Waterhouse and Co then refused to accept my bill of costs and conspired with Alms and Young for interlocutory proceedings to be in Taunton County Court in October 1981 and then with Mrs Danton to retrospectively falsify the records to suggest that there had been taxation proceedings at this time. I had received no summons for taxation at all and Mrs Danton had, in fact, refused to allow me to lodge my bill in August. As a result of lack of money I had to walk long journeys through the snow that winter when temperatures fell to  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$ . I lost all the skin on my feet and Dr Edwards was still treating me with cortisone ~~on~~ on the 18th March 1982. He told me it would be lethal to attend Taunton County Court but gave me an inadequate letter for the Court and as a result the Judge gave a Judgement in my absence. In this way Alms and Young made money out of letters stolen from my house while I was in custody in ~~1978~~ 1978 and which Mr Pulvermacher procured by telling me to plead guilty to charges that he knew were contrary to Statute. I knew nothing whatever of Health Committee proceedings on the 18th March 1982 and Dr Edwards told me nothing about them although he ought surely to have been informed if they were bona fide? That Taunton judgement is the basis of every bankruptcy proceeding both in 1983 and

(26) 1984 and the continuing coincidence of hearing dates for three years running must be the result of a deliberate conspiracy to defraud between Waterhouse and Co and Alms and Young. The coincidence extended to the James Crompton Investment Co Ltd of which I am the only living member.

The official receiver appears to be deliberately aiding and abetting the criminal embezzlement of fifty to a hundred thousand pounds by failure to produce accounts of the liquidation. It is disgraceful that the U. K. should be allowed a cash rebate from the Common Market while Crown Officers and the Board of Trade are covering up the thefts by the Official Receiver. Unless the Privy Council are able to give me a financial remedy against the General Medical Council, I must look to Waterhouse and Co for damages in tort. It is for this reason that I ask for costs against them if this appeal fails. It is outrageous that they should ~~not~~ profit from vexatious G. M. C. proceedings created by their own conspiracies to deceive and pervert justice.

(27) ~~Not~~ Notwithstanding the occasional force of my literary idiosyncrasies I know that I have some of the meekness of a Christian and if a camel is an animal designed by a Committee I reckon that if the health committee are on the job it will be a lame chimera. I have faced the technicalities of diagnosis, full square with reason and insight and I do not think that any fair minded person with some common sense can reasonably believe me to be mentally disordered on the basis of the Transcript or the opinions examined thereon. However, it may be argued that as a matter of law

(27) that the Privy Council must not use their common sense.

I would oppose this. However, to illustrate the absurdity and bad faith of the claims of mental disorder, I include in my petition the alternative remedy of sending the psychiatric reports to the Master of the Court of Protection. I have myself lodged a Caveat against Mr Higgins as liquidator in that Court but the Chief Clerk there is aiding and abetting criminal conspiracy and false accounting but refusing to show either it or the reports to the Master of the Court of Protection. There will therefore be a necessity for some Writs of Mandamus. Presumably the Chief Clerk could be held accountable for anything that happened to the employees of Mr Higgins through a fatal mistake such as paying a single penny to Alms and Young through Mr Butterton or the Bankruptcy Court & in the meantime I am forced to live away from home (and so is my dog) through the illegal cutting off of my electricity and telephone. The conduct of the G.M.C. is therefore murderous, treasonous and a total disgrace to British civilisation. The Treasury Solicitor is not complying with the Crown Proceedings Act 1947 by failing to allow Crown Proceedings.

(28) With this case I am filing a supplemental petition. It is possible that the Registrar will include a copy of the original petition with the case papers. The Appellant respectfully submits that the conditions and findings of the Health Committee of the General Medical Council dated the 25<sup>th</sup> July 1984 were wrong and ought and ought to be dealt with according to the Supplementary Petition with further remedy according to the original petition and the Appeal be allowed with costs for the following reasons:-

- (a) My costs awarded in 1981 have not yet been paid;
- (b) The Sovereign's Directions have not been complied with;
- (c) There has been four years' malicious prosecution by Waterhouse and Co;
- (d) There have been collateral purposes and deceit in collection of <sup>my</sup> annual retentive fee; in 1982
- (e) My cheques are being stopped upon the grounds of an alleged Receiving Order (L) Donegal at 2 weeks in production of Transcript

X psychiatric

X vide Section 20 of the Solicitors Act 1974

(g) Concealment of documents from Transcript to obstruct the course of justice.

References: Medical Registers 1978 - 1984.

- Annual General Report of G.M.C. for 1981
- The Brotherhood by Stephen Knight publisher Grenada
- The Evening Post (Chew Valley two star and three star editions) - 24th August 1981
- Statutory Instrument 1980/941
- Dr Bonham v Board of Physicians (1610) 86 Rf 107
- The Holy Bible
- Privy Council 24 of 1981
- Administrative Law - Lord Garner
- Halsbury's Laws of England 4th Ed Vol 1 paragraph 16
- Times Law Reports in Bankruptcy: Alms and Young v A.J. Crompton.
- Companies Court 00919 of 81
- Queens Bench Matters 903A 1979, 2195A 1980, 2193A 1980
- " " Actions 414A of 1980 415A of 1980
- Taunton County Court 8001953
- Bristol Bankruptcy Court 164, 192 of 1982, 60 of 1982
- " " " 66 and 72 of 1983
- " " " 148, 149, 87 of 1984.
- Chancery 1983 C 304
- House of Lords 29 of 1983
- Court of Appeal 50 of 1984
- Court of Protection Caveat.
- The Crown Office
- Mrs Coggan's letter of 13th June 1984 and 20th June 1984 County Court.
- Lord Hailsham in Libermann v G.M.C. 1972 1 All E.R. 798.
- Letter of Dr Edwards to Bristol County Court of 4th June 1979
- My letters to Mr Gray of 24th July '84 and 2nd August '84
- Mr Gray's letter to me of 28th July.
- My letter to Mrs Coggan of 14th June 84
- All letters of Mrs Coggan and Mr Gray since 25th July 84.
- My letters to Mr Owen of 23rd September and 20th October 1984
- 20th September 84 and 18th October 84.
- My letter to GMC of 19th July 1984.

Only in the Chancery' action for cash accounts was I the Plaintiff. In the other actions

(except 192 of 82 and 149 of 82)

Alms and Young are the Plaintiffs.

Hempsons were third parties in Taunton

A. J. Crompton  
22nd October 84.