

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE**  
**KING'S BENCH DIVISION**

**Claim No:** KB-2023-001785


**Between**

**MICHELLE DAVIES**

**And**

**THE GENERAL OSTEOPATHIC COUNCIL (1)**  
**THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE (2)**

**Defendants**



KB-2023-001785

---

**ORDER**

---

**BEFORE** Mr. Justice Ritchie, sitting at the Royal Courts of Justice, the Strand, London.  
as the urgent applications Judge on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2023.

**UPON READING:** the Claimant's application dated 14.4.2023 and the bundle filed in support  
which consists of an unissued claim form and a draft order.

**NOW IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. The application is dismissed and certified to be totally without merit.
2. No costs order is made.
3. Because this order has been made on the papers and without hearing the Claimant (or the Defendants) the Claimant may apply to vary or set it aside by notice in writing to the Court to be filed and served by 4pm on 22 April 2023.

**Reasons**

1. I take into account that fact that the Claimant is a litigant in person (CPR 3.1A).



2. By the notice of application the Claimant seeks an immediate mandatory order by way of urgent interim injunction against the Ministry of Justice and some form of stay against both Defendants.
3. There is no evidence provided in support.
4. There is no evidence that the notice of application has been served on the two Defendants. There is no evidence provided of why the application is made ex-parte (without notice) or of any good reasons for failing to give notice.
5. There is no evidence provided of urgency.
6. Box 10 of the notice of application, which is designed to provide a summary of the information relied upon for the application is unintelligible. There is reference to a case stated appeal in or from the Worcester Magistrates Court dated variously 22.9.2022; 16 January 2023 and 24<sup>th</sup> March 2023 but no explanation of the facts is provided and no copies of any Court documents are provided.
7. There is also reference to what is described as “contempt claim directions” but no order is provided and no breach of any order is set out.
8. The involvement of the GOC is not explained.
9. The Claim Form alleges bias, unfairness and torture against both Defendants but does not provide any facts so the foundation of the allegations is unpleaded save for a reference to an event in the year 2000 when what is described as a “corruption debate” occurred against “the cabinet” and it is asserted all successive cabinets.
10. This application appears to be an abuse of Court process and Court time and has no merit because it is unintelligible, discloses no reasonable cause of action and is unsupported by evidence. I also consider the application to be vexatious.
11. The procedure for an interim order application is set out in CPR r.25.3. The Claimant has breached the required procedure.

Date this order is made 14 April 2023