

**ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS**

**DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

**INQUIRY RE:**

**WARWICK SEYMOUR HAMILTON**

---

**DECISION ON APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION**

---

1. The Disciplinary Committee ("the Committee") of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons ("the College"), convened to consider an application for restoration to the Register by the Applicant, Mr Warwick Seymour-Hamilton. Ms Curtis appeared on behalf of the College. Mr Seymour-Hamilton appeared and represented himself. This is the Applicant's twelfth such application, his eleven previous applications (in 1995, 2010, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023) having been refused.
2. The College opposed the application, on the basis that the Applicant is not fit to be restored to the Register, and would pose a risk to animal welfare were his name to be restored to the Register.

**The Legislative Framework and Guidance Documents**

3. Section 18(1) of the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 provides:

*"where a person's name has been removed from the Register of Veterinary Surgeons or the Supplementary Veterinary Register in pursuance of a direction under section 16 of this Act, the name of that person shall not again be entered in the Register from which it was removed unless the Disciplinary Committee on application made to them in that behalf otherwise direct."*

4. The Act provides that no application for restoration shall be made within ten months of the date of removal, or the date of a previous application for restoration (s18 (3)). The Applicant has satisfied this requirement.
5. Part V of the Veterinary Surgeons and Veterinary Practitioners (Disciplinary Committee) (Procedure and Evidence) Rules Order of Council 2004 provides for the procedure at a hearing for restoration. This includes provision for the Chairman and the College's Solicitor to invite the Applicant to provide evidence concerning the Applicant's character and conduct since his name was removed.
6. The Disciplinary Committee Manual (September 2013) provides:

*"181. Upon an application for restoration, the burden of proof is on the Applicant to satisfy the Committee that he or she is fit to be restored to the Register. Factual assertions by the Applicant (who was the Respondent at the initial hearing) may be proved on the balance of probabilities.*

*182. At an application for restoration hearing the Committee will be concerned to learn of the character and conduct of the Applicant since his name was removed from the Register. Every case is different and no list can be exhaustive, but reference should be made to the list of relevant factors in the Disciplinary Committee Procedure Guidance. Common matters include the following, in no particular order; the Applicant's remorse; whether on the known facts there is a likelihood of repetition and if so, what steps have been taken to guard against that; whether the Applicant has kept himself sufficiently up to date with techniques of practice since his removal from the Register, and the repercussions of the disciplinary offence that led to his removal.*

*184. The Committee will be concerned to judge the weight of the case which led to the decision in the first place. In opening the case the RCVS barrister will provide the Committee with details of the case that led to the removal. The Applicant or his solicitor or barrister shall be entitled to address the Committee and adduce evidence and make such submissions on the question as he wishes. Likewise the RCVS barrister shall be entitled to address the Committee, adduce evidence and make submissions."*

7. The Disciplinary Committee Procedure Guidance (August 2020) confirms that the obligation is on the Applicant veterinary surgeon to satisfy the Committee that they are fit to be restored to the Register. It also provides that the Committee will consider a number of factors when exercising its judgement as to whether to restore a veterinary surgeon (para 85) to the Register, such as:

- (a) Whether the applicant veterinary surgeon has accepted the findings of the Committee at the original inquiry hearing;*
- (b) The seriousness of those findings;*
- (c) Whether the applicant veterinary surgeon has demonstrated insight into his or her past conduct;*
- (d) The protection of the public and the public interest;*
- (e) The future of the welfare of animals in the event of the applicant veterinary surgeon being permitted to have his or her name restored to the register;*
- (f) The length of time off the register;*
- (g) The applicant veterinary surgeon's conduct since removal from the register;*
- (h) Evidence demonstrating the efforts by the applicant veterinary surgeon to keep up to date in terms of knowledge, skills and developments in practice, since removal from the register (accepting that he or she must not practise as a veterinary surgeon).*

### **The original hearing**

8. The original charges were heard before the Disciplinary Committee on 13 June 1994. The Applicant did not attend the hearing and the Committee decided to proceed in his absence. The charge was:

*“At the time of an inspection by appointment of his professional premises at 9 Orchard Road [sic], Orpington, Kent on 6 August 1993, the said premises were not in a proper condition for the exercise of his profession and equipment and facilities were not maintained in working order, so that risks to the health or welfare of animals brought or to be brought to the said professional premises existed and the state and condition of the said inspected premises was such as to bring the profession into disrepute.*

*In particular, in the said inspected premises:-*

- (a) *there was no efficient system for documenting and filing records of case histories of all patients;*
- (b) *the Controlled Drugs Register was not properly maintained;*
- (c) *there were no adequate facilities for the sterilisation of instruments;*
- (d) *the operating theatre showed evidence of quite inadequate attention to hygiene presenting a constant risk of infection<sup>1</sup> to animals undergoing surgical procedures."*

9. The College, in support of its case, called Mr Jack Walsby MRCVS, who had visited the premises on 6 August 1993. He referred to a report that he had prepared in relation to the visit, indicating that, in response to a request for clinical records, the Applicant had produced three samples, all of which Mr Walsby described as *"totally inadequate"*. Mr Walsby stated that there had been no Controlled Drugs Register at the premises. He further said that he had been *"appalled by the unhygienic conditions in the operating theatre, the prevailing smell and slime under the mat."* He stated that there had been nowhere to wash; the wood in the operating theatre had been chewed and was impossible to clean; and that, on the floor of two of the cages, there had been urine-stained newspaper which appeared to have been there for some time. Mr Walsby described a pile of about 100 syringes on a dresser, many with needles; and indicated that there had been no sharps box and no facility for sterilising instruments. When asked questions by the Committee, Mr Walsby replied that *"to the best of his knowledge at the time of the visit the Respondent was treating animals on a regular basis."* Mr Walsby also stated that *"the Respondent had said that he was operating on a regular basis."*
10. The College also called Mr Neal King MRCVS to give evidence. In response to questions from the Committee, Mr King replied that, *"the Respondent had given every impression of being actively engaged in practice at the time of their visit."*
11. The Committee found the facts in the charge proved and further found that those facts constituted disgraceful conduct in a professional respect. The Committee commented that the *"evidence presented relating to the operating theatre showed a total disregard of basic hygiene and care for animals and was such as to bring the profession into disrepute"*. The Committee directed that the Registrar remove the Respondent's name from the Register.

12. There was no appeal against that decision.

### **Previous Applications for Restoration**

13. Since his removal from the Register, the Applicant has made a number of applications for restoration. The Committee was not bound by the decisions made in relation to those applications, but considers that they are of relevance for the following reasons:

- i. They set the context of the current application;
- ii. They provide some detail of the Applicant's conduct since removal from the Register, as he has given evidence on a number of occasions about that conduct;
- iii. They demonstrate that the Applicant has been made aware, on a number of previous occasions, of the type of concerns that would need to be addressed when making any future application for restoration. The Disciplinary Committee has expressed those concerns directly to the Applicant at previous restoration hearings.

### **First application for restoration**

14. On 24 July 1995, the Applicant made an application for restoration to the Register. He informed the Committee that since 1990, the combined effects of the recession and the strain of looking after his elderly mother had led to the situation in which his premises had been in the state described at the original hearing. Although he has done so subsequently, at this first restoration hearing he did not raise any suggestion that his practice was not open for business at the time of the visit.

15. The Applicant gave evidence that his main concern was to return to work with animals, but that he had made no preparations for doing so. He stated that he had not taken any steps during his period off the Register to update his knowledge, but would be prepared to undertake a course after restoration. He had not visited other practices within the previous year. He indicated that his former surgery premises were now closed: he was using them to keep rabbits and as kennels for his dogs. He stated that he had not undertaken any refurbishment of the premises as yet.

16. The Committee refused the application for restoration.

### **Second Application for Restoration**

17. On 18 June 2010, the Applicant made a second application for restoration. He gave evidence to the Committee that he had no intention of returning to clinical practice, but believed that restoration would improve his professional status by giving him more credibility, particularly in terms of recognition by the medical and veterinary professions, and that this would assist him with his plans to further his research work into plants with potential medicinal properties.

18. The Applicant accepted that in the previous fifteen years he had not undertaken any relevant Continuing Professional Development (CPD), had not visited any veterinary practices or read the RCVS Guide to Professional Conduct. He indicated that although it was not his intention to return to practice, if he did so, he would have to do some *“rapid revision of the areas where I was going to work.”*

19. The Committee refused the application, stating:

*“Although the Applicant said he had no intention at the present time of going into general practice... the Committee is mindful of the fact that it would have no power to prevent him from doing so. The Committee has an obligation to protect the public and animal welfare. If the Committee were to reinstate the Applicant to the Register, it would have to be satisfied that he is competent and safe to practise immediately and cannot simply accept his assurance that he would take steps to rectify his self-confessed shortcomings at some point in the future.”*

### **Third Application for Restoration**

20. On 11 February 2015, the Applicant made a third application for restoration. He told the Committee that he wished to be restored to the Register in order to widen his work and research, to include animals as well as humans.

21. The Committee refused the application, finding:

*“The Applicant’s answers to a number of questions from both Counsel for the College and the Committee raised a number of concerns. He described the hearing as an ‘exploratory meeting’ and indicated that his lack of knowledge in respect of a number of areas to do with veterinary practice and its regulation was because they are not relevant to his current work as a herbalist and naturopath. The Committee notes that this demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding as to the Committee’s function and its terms of reference.”*

#### **Fourth Application for Restoration**

22. On 18 March 2016, the Applicant made a fourth application for restoration. He referred to various research and studies he had undertaken.

23. The Committee again refused his application, stating:

*“The Committee has concluded that the Applicant has not satisfied it that he is fit to be restored to the Register. The Committee is concerned about the length of time that has passed since he last practised and the paucity of evidence he has provided to establish that, if permitted to return to practice, he would be able to attain the professional standards required of a modern veterinary practitioner, either as regards surgical capabilities/competencies or as regards his knowledge of currently available veterinary medicines. These factors lead into a conclusion that this Committee is not satisfied that the welfare of animals which the Applicant would be called upon to treat would be sufficiently protected were he to be allowed to return to practice, especially bearing in mind that any restoration to the Register would entitle the Applicant to practise without any limitations or restrictions on the type of work that he could undertake. The Committee entirely understands the Applicant’s desire to advance his prospects of achieving acceptance amongst academics and practitioners of his research work and that those prospects might be enhanced by a restoration of his name to the Register but that is not a factor which is relevant to his Application for Restoration. The Committee’s obligations and duties are to see that the interests of animal welfare are properly protected by ensuring that only those who are properly trained, knowledgeable and experienced are permitted to treat animals and that public confidence in the standards of the profession are maintained. The risks attendant on a restoration of this Applicant to the Register are, in the judgment of the Committee, plain and obvious.”*

### **Fifth Application for Restoration**

24. On 15 May 2017, the Applicant made a fifth application for restoration. The Committee again refused his application, stating:

*“The Committee has very great concerns about the future of the welfare of animals in the event of the applicant being permitted to have his name restored to the Register. He has made it clear that whilst he has no intention to return to routine veterinary general practice, he would intend to treat animals and to continue his research using animals. The Committee observes that, were he to be restored to the Register, there would be no power to prevent the applicant practising as a veterinary surgeon in any way he may choose...”*

*The Committee is far from persuaded that the passage of 23 years has not had a negative impact on the applicant’s ability to practise safely and competently as a veterinary surgeon at this present time.”*

### **Sixth Application for Restoration**

25. On 23 April 2018, the Applicant made a sixth application for restoration. The Committee once again refused his application, stating:

*“The Committee noted that the Applicant had been off the Register for 24 years. Until relatively recently he had not been undertaking CPD. His CPD now has a bias for herbal medicine, as does his extensive reading. The Committee was not satisfied that his skills are up to date and that he can practise veterinary medicine safely. The Committee was not satisfied that he would approach a sick animal with the full and rounded approach required of a veterinary surgeon. Nor did his confidence in this regard allay the concerns of the Committee. He expressed belief in himself on the basis of his practice which came to an end some 24 years ago. Veterinary medicine has developed profoundly during this period. The purpose of being on the register is to treat animals holistically using a veterinary surgeon’s skills and knowledge...”*



*The Committee was concerned that the Applicant has not undertaken a prolonged and intense period of retraining by way of relevant study to ensure a sufficient level of competence on return to practise.”*

### **Seventh Application for Restoration**

26. In May 2019, the Applicant made another application to be restored to the Register. On 30 May 2019, the Committee refused the application, stating:

*“This Committee had significant concerns regarding the Applicant’s ability to practise safely because nearly twenty-five years have passed since he has been in practice and there is little, if any, evidence of keeping up to date with the knowledge and skills required to practise as a veterinary surgeon. The Applicant, worryingly in the Committee’s view, did not accept that he was in any way deskilled by the passage of time. The evidence that the Applicant has provided showed limited interaction with other veterinary surgeons and there is no documented evidence of the discussions or structure of the meetings he had with veterinary surgeons in Europe. He described the meetings as “having a chat”. There is no evidence of a prolonged and intense period of re-training by way of relevant study to demonstrate that a sufficient level of competence to return to practise has been achieved. In the absence of such evidence the Committee was of the view that there would be a serious risk to the welfare of animals if the Applicant was restored to the Register. Further it was a grave concern to this Committee that the Applicant demonstrated worrying attitudinal issues towards individuals of a different religion and his attitude to employing a minor when he knew it to be against the law. Such attitudes in the Committees view are incompatible with professional standards the public would expect of a veterinary surgeon. Finally, there is no evidence of public support for the applicant veterinary surgeon.”*

### **Eighth Application for Restoration**

27. In June 2020, the Applicant made another application to be restored to the Register. On 1 July 2020, the Committee refused the application, stating:

*“He has exhibited a disregard for regulation and compliance with the law. He lacks an understanding as to why he has not been restored in the past. He has not set about addressing any of his shortcomings. He relies wholeheartedly on his research, yet he does not support that research with any real peer reviewed publications and he fails to acknowledge the consequences of being out of practice for so long. He has misplaced confidence in his own abilities and does not recognise that his approach and / or actions can represent a danger to animals and to the public.”*

### **Ninth Application for Restoration**

28. In June 2021, the Applicant made another application to be restored to the Register. On 25 June 2021, the Committee refused the application, stating:

*“The Committee considers that where some 27 years have passed since the Applicant has practised, there will inevitably be a serious risk to the welfare of animals if he is restored to the Register. In addition, the Committee is firmly of the opinion that it would not be in the public interest for the application for restoration to the RCVS Register to be granted in this case”*

### **Tenth Application for Restoration**

29. On 4 May 2022, the Applicant notified the College that he wished to make a further application for restoration. The Committee heard the Application remotely on 8 June 2022. The Applicant attended the hearing, having submitted a bundle of documents, which included a witness statement setting out all the matters that the Applicant wished the Committee to consider in support of his application, including some certificates of CPD webinars that he had attended in the past year.
30. On 10 June 2022, the Committee refused the application, stating:

*“...the Committee has concluded that the Applicant has not satisfied it that he is fit to be restored to the Register. The Committee is concerned about the length of time that has passed since he last practised and the paucity of the evidence he has provided to establish that, if permitted to return to practice today, he would be able to attain the professional standards required of a modern veterinary practitioner, both as regards surgical capabilities and*

*competence as regards knowledge of currently available veterinary medicines. These factors led to a conclusion that this Committee is not satisfied that the welfare of animals which the Applicant would be called upon to treat would be sufficiently protected were he to be allowed to return to practise, especially bearing in mind that any restoration to the Register would entitle the Applicant to practise without any limitations or restrictions on the type of work that he could undertake.*

*Whilst the Committee is cognisant of the Applicant's desire to advance his prospects of achieving acceptance amongst academics and drug companies of his research work and that those prospects might be enhanced by restoration of his name to the Register, that is not a factor which is relevant to his Application for Registration. This Committee's obligations and duties are to see that the interests of animal welfare are properly protected by ensuring that those whose names are on the Register are properly trained, knowledgeable and experienced in the treatment of animals and that public confidence in the standards of the profession is maintained.*

*For the reasons set out above, the Committee considers that where some 28 years have passed since the Applicant has practised, there will inevitably be a serious risk to the welfare of animals if he is restored to the Register without the factors identified in paragraph 85 of the Guidance being satisfactorily addressed. The risks attendant on a restoration of this Applicant to the Register are, in the judgement of this Committee, plain and obvious. In addition, the Committee is firmly of the opinion that it would not be in the public interest for the Application for Restoration to the RCVS Register to be granted in this case."*

## **Eleventh Application for Restoration**

31. On 9 May 2023, the Applicant notified the College that he wished to make a further application for restoration. That application was heard on 30 June 2023 and refused. In refusing the application, the Committee said:

*"The College invited the Committee to consider that where, as here, some 29 years have passed since this veterinary surgeon has practised, there has been no intensive, and prolonged re-training, no acceptance of the original findings and no insight into concerns about his fitness to practise, there will inevitably be*

*a serious risk to the welfare of animals and the wider public interest if the Applicant is restored to the register. The Committee agrees, and considers that the Applicant has not shown the required insight as to the steps he needs to take to return to safe veterinary practice.”*

*“... the Committee is firmly of the opinion that it would not be in the public interest for this application for restoration to the RCVS Register to be granted in this case.”*

### **The twelfth, and current, Application for Restoration**

32. On 12 April 2025, the Applicant notified the College that he wished to make a further application for restoration. In his email sent to the College he said:

*“I would like to appeal my deregistration again, "The Practice was Closed", during the next 3 months but if possible during early May.*

*I have, despite great difficulty in my TSRV, prepared a manuscript showing culture experiments which confirm in vitro my often repeated claim that the potentiated herbal antibiotics have harmlessly slaughtered all bacterial infections, often lethal, I have met in the past 25 years. These results are being reviewed for publication. Also I would like to represent 2 witnesses and previous reasons for appealing again.*

*These appeals are necessary of course so that progress can be made to the hapless patients facing death from modern often totally resistant bacteria, viruses and malignancies.” [sic]*

33. He was reminded, by letter from the College’s solicitors dated 11 June 2025, of the factors listed at paragraph 85 of the Disciplinary Committee Guidance.

34. It was a matter for the Committee’s judgment as to whether the Applicant had satisfied the Committee that he was fit to be restored to the Register, taking into account the factors set out at paragraph 85 of the Guidance. As noted above, the College opposed the application, on the basis that the Applicant is not fit to be restored to the Register, and would pose a risk to animal welfare if restored.

35. The Applicant indicated that he does not accept the basis of the original findings against him in 1994, stating that his practice premises were closed at the relevant time. The College reminded the Committee that this matter cannot be re-heard; the findings have been made, the Applicant had a right to appeal against those findings but did not exercise that right. Accordingly, any statements or letters purporting to go behind the original Committee findings were irrelevant and therefore inadmissible. Despite Mr Seymour-Hamilton stating he wished to “*appeal his deregistration*”, this was not an appeal. There is no such right of appeal to the Disciplinary Committee. This was an application to be restored to the Register.
36. The Applicant indicated (as he has in the past) that the purpose of his application was to assist him to achieve recognition for his herbal and natural remedy discoveries. In the past he has indicated that he has no intention of going back into general practice. As noted in previous decisions refusing the application, the Committee has no power to attach conditions to registration. Regardless of the Applicant’s current intentions, if restored to the Register he would be free to practise as a veterinary surgeon without restriction.

### **Summary of the submissions of the Applicant**

37. The Applicant provided a bundle of 139 pages, consisting of (taken from the Applicant’s index):
- Reasons for re-applying to the college
  - History
  - Disciplinary Answers
  - Criticism of College decisions
  - RCVI 2025 12th appeal
  - Evidence supplied by Mr Walsby and King
  - People have died recently in large numbers because of the following
  - Transcript breakdown
  - Photographs of pages of the transcript from the 1994 hearing
  - April 2024-August 2024 Concentrated learning
  - Concentrated revision September 2024-April 2025
  - Antiviral studies
  - Antibacterial research

- Potentiating Herbal Antibiotics by Treating with Antibiotic Metals by Warwick Seymour-Hamilton
- The CNM Antimutagenic Protocol
- Email from Mr Seymour-Hamilton to RCVS
- CPD certificate: Adsorbents and toxins in veterinary medicine
- CPD certificate: Advovet: Support for Animal Welfare Charities
- CPD certificate: Animal Welfare and Zoos with Born Free Foundation
- CPD Certificate: Are new pet owners struggling to finance pet health care?
- CPD certificate: Assisting families in the workforce: the impact of mentor mums
- CPD certificate: Building a tech-savvy veterinary workforce
- CPD certificate: career transitions and the path to sustainability
- CPD certificate: climate change and its possible effects on European parasites and their vectors certificate
- CPD certificate: contextualised care in the veterinary profession
- CPD certificate: CoVet: automating your admin work in practice
- CPD certificate: empowering women in veterinary philanthropy
- CPD certificate: factors driving dog relocation and the parasites they may bring
- CPD certificate: FLUTD – the role of urinalysis
- CPD certificate: improving controlled drug processes
- CPD certificate: nursing the urinary patient
- CPD certificate: perfect your practice AHC process
- CPD certificate: redefining dysplasia management across ages in dogs (Italian speaking)
- CPD certificate: surgical extraction of the fractured upper carnassial (108/208) in dogs
- CPD certificate: the future of environment discussions in the veterinary field
- CPD certificate: the hidden costs of ignoring menopause in veterinary practice
- CPD certificate: the wait is over introducing Tessie and Bonqat
- CPD certificate: Vetlife: providing confidential support to those in need
- Letter from Murat Akbas
- Letter from Pricilla Peter Tepeoglu
- Letter from Sevim Cankaya
- Letter from Trevor Farrow 12.06.2023

38. In his *“reasons for re-applying to the college”* document, the Applicant, despite being repeatedly advised over the last 30 years that a Committee considering his restoration

application cannot go behind the findings of the original Committee that led to his removal from the Register in 1994, continued to challenge those findings and to produce letters in support of his restoration from people who also seek to challenge the original findings, as well as providing character testimonials.

39. The Applicant also, as before, provided detailed accounts of his extensive work *“to destroy lethal bacterial infections in man and animals.”* He went on to say that *“Since deregistration I also have been working hard to successfully, as above chelate herbal antiviral plants which increases their antiviral effects by 500%. They have harmlessly killed all viruses I have encountered in the mediterranean area in myself and the dogs. This includes covid.”* [sic] The Applicant said that he had *“emailed 3221 authorities of this work including the prime minister 13 times and 220 NHS trusts. There has been no result or recognition of how important it is and in the end 16 million people died the number crippled is unknown.”*
40. In his document entitled *“Disciplinary Answers”*, the Applicant said that he accepted the findings of the original Committee, *“but their conclusions are totally wrong.”* He added, *“The seriousness of the findings and the result of the appeals has in our view prematurely ended the life of about 800 000 000 million people, the animal losses are unknown.”* [sic]
41. The Applicant also said that he studied veterinary medicine for at least two hours daily and that he is *“very capable of practice”*. However, his case remains unchanged from previous applications, in that he does not want to be restored to the Register in order to practise veterinary surgery, but so that he can more easily achieve recognition from academics and pharmaceutical companies for his work, which he believes merits widespread attention.
42. The Applicant provided oral submissions to the Committee and expanded on the various matters to which his documentation referred. As with previous applications for restoration, during the course of the hearing the Applicant continued to raise matters in relation to the original hearing in 1994, despite the Chair’s repeated indication that this was not permissible. He insisted his practice was closed at the time of the inspection as he had retired on health grounds from working as a veterinary surgeon three weeks before the visit to his surgery in 1994. Thus, whilst he said he accepted the original Committee’s findings, he added *“they were wrong.”*

43. The Applicant said that being struck off the Register had ruined his reputation. For the last two decades he had been travelling carrying out cutting-edge research in a 'Totally Secure Research Vehicle' ("TSRV") vehicle with his dogs. He said he had been able to infect himself with all the diseases he wanted to and the herbal remedies he had devised had been fully effective with curing him and his dogs. He had now finished travelling and wanted recognition for his work. The Applicant spoke at length about the various corona and other viruses prevalent in the world today and the ability of his herbal remedies to cure people. He also, he said, successfully treated his dogs' cancers with his herbal remedies.
44. The Applicant said he needed the permission of this Committee to reregister, but only in the sense that people will not work with him (on his herbal studies). He said it was a legal problem that has *"destroyed 800 million people who have died."* He said he could not move forward because no one would consider looking at something from someone who has been struck off. He added that he spent two hours a day studying herbal medicine, which was relevant to veterinary surgeons as well as the public. He also said he had been reading veterinary medicine *"solidly"* and doing webinars. He provided a complete list of all his studies. He reiterated that he does not want to practise but said he has *"never given up veterinary medicine"* and that was why he kept coming back to this Committee.
45. The Committee heard from Mr Trevor Farrow on oath. He provided a letter to the College dated 12 June 2023 from the previous restoration application. In that letter Mr Farrow commented in detail about his opinion of what happened at the practice in 1994. The Applicant sought to ask Mr Farrow questions about the inspection and had to be reminded that this was not permissible.
46. As to his character, Mr Farrow said he had known the Applicant for over 30 years and he was a family friend. He described him as extremely passionate, knowledgeable and intelligent. He added that the Applicant was dedicated and driven and although slightly eccentric, cares deeply about the future wellbeing of animals and humans. Mr Farrow said that the Applicant is a genuine person who is frustrated that he cannot *"fulfil what he has discovered."* He also said that when he had been in practice the Applicant had been highly regarded locally as a veterinary surgeon. In his view he considered the Applicant should be restored to the Register. However, he accepted that as a lay person he could not comment on the Applicant's ability to be a competent veterinary surgeon as of tomorrow.



47. The Committee also heard on affirmation from Ms Pricilla Tepeoglu. She too provided a letter for the 2023 restoration application, which went into detail about why she thought the original Committee's decision was wrong. Although the Applicant sought to ask her questions about what he perceived to be the unfairness of the original decision, he was again reminded that this was impermissible. With regards to his character, Ms Tepeoglu said the Applicant was someone she had known for four years and he was a good person. She said he had been working very hard on experiments that he wanted to do and she confirmed he went to the library every day.

### **Summary of the College's submissions**

48. These are set out fully in the written submissions for the College in respect of this application. The Committee took into account the oral and written submissions and all the information within the College's bundle.

49. Ms Curtis on behalf of the College, drew the Committee's attention to the underlying facts relating to the case and the previous unsuccessful applications made by Mr Seymour-Hamilton.

50. Ms Curtis indicated that the College opposed the current application on the basis that Mr Seymour-Hamilton is not fit to be restored to the Register. She said the College relies on factors (a), (c), (d) (e), (f), (g) and (h) within paragraph 85, namely:

(a) Whether the applicant veterinary surgeon has accepted the findings of the Committee at the original inquiry hearing;

(c) Whether the applicant veterinary surgeon has demonstrated insight into his or her past conduct;

(d) The protection of the public and the public interest;

(e) The future of the welfare of animals in the event of the applicant veterinary surgeon being permitted to have his or her name restored to the register;

(f) The length of time off the register;

(g) The applicant veterinary surgeon's conduct since removal from the register;

(h) Evidence demonstrating the efforts by the applicant veterinary surgeon to keep up to date in terms of knowledge, skills and developments in practice, since removal from the register (accepting that he or she must not practise as a veterinary surgeon).

51. With regards to these factors, Ms Curtis invited the Committee to consider the following:

*"The Applicant still does not accept the original findings which led to his removal from the register and, over the course of his previous applications he has shown no insight into the conduct underlying those original findings, nor has he shown insight into the matters identified by previous Committees as raising serious concerns (factors (a) and (c)).*

*The Applicant has now been off the register for some 31 years. The College submits that he would need to undertake prolonged, intensive, formal re-training to ensure that he was now fit to practise and meet the "day one" competencies of a veterinary surgeon. He has not done so. Restoration in such circumstances would pose a significant risk to animal welfare (factors (e), (f), (g) and (h)).*

*The Applicant has on previous occasions indicated that he has practised veterinary surgery – including two spey procedures in Calais – whilst off the register. He has also admitted using his own animals in order to try out new, untested remedies. The College submits that this conduct is indicative of someone without due regard to the importance of the relevant level of skills, experience and qualifications in order to undertake veterinary surgery. Again, the College submits that this present a real and significant risk to animal welfare (factors (e) and (g)).*

*The College also submits that the reputation of the profession, and public confidence in the profession, would be significantly undermined if the Applicant were to be restored without the necessary prolonged and intensive training required for him to be a safe practitioner (factor (d)).*

*The College invites the Committee to consider that where, as here, some thirty-one years have passed since a veterinary surgeon has practised, in the absence of any intensive and prolonged re-training, with no acceptance of the original findings and no insight into concerns about fitness to practise, there will inevitably be a serious risk to the welfare of animals and the wider public interest if that veterinary surgeon is restored.”*

### **The Committee’s decision**

52. The Committee noted that the burden of proof is on the Applicant to satisfy the Committee, on the balance of probabilities, that he is fit to be restored to the Register. The Committee noted and took into account the stance taken by the College in opposing the application. It also took into account all the material provided. However, the Committee considered that a significant number of the documents produced by the Applicant in support of his restoration application were not applicable to the factors that the Committee is obliged to consider, as set out in paragraph 50 above. The Committee also took into account the oral submissions provided by the Applicant and the evidence of his two witnesses.
53. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor who referred to the legislative framework and guidance documents that had been correctly set out by Counsel for the College. The Committee also accepted the submissions of the College and the Legal Assessor that this Committee has no power to re-open consideration of the original findings against the Applicant in 1994. Therefore, any evidence given by the Applicant and his supporting witnesses in relation to the original findings was inadmissible and to be ignored. The Legal Assessor advised the Committee that, to the extent that any evidence given by the witnesses amounted to simply testimonial evidence, the Committee could consider it. The Committee accepted this advice.
54. The Applicant said he accepted the original findings which led to his removal from the Register, but not the underlying facts or the Committee’s conclusion. As with his previous applications, the Applicant has shown no real insight into the conduct underlying the original findings, nor has he shown insight into the matters identified by previous Committees as raising serious concerns (factors (a) and (c)).

55. Whilst there could be a clear public interest in restoring an otherwise competent veterinary surgeon to the Register, there was also a public interest in not doing so when the individual concerned is not fit to be on the Register. Just because the applicant is passionate and well-meaning is not reason enough to return them to the Register. The reputation of the profession is more important than the fortunes of any individual applicant (factor (d)).
56. The Applicant has now been off the Register for some 31 years. The Committee was of the view that he would need to undertake prolonged, intensive, formal re-training, including self-reflection and assessment, to ensure that he was now fit to practise and meet the competencies of a veterinary surgeon. He has not done so, and were he to be restored, the Committee considered he would pose a significant risk to animal welfare (factors (e), (f) and (h)).
57. When considering the Applicant's conduct since removal from the Register, the Committee was concerned about his own reference to having spayed cats in Calais and the treating of his own dogs for cancer. It was also concerned by his reference to having cultured faecal bacteria in Mrs Tepeoglu's kitchen, which sounds far from hygienic and a potential risk to her family. The fact that the Applicant maintains there is no reason for him not to have done any of these things and that they would not have been incompatible with his being on the Register and therefore upholding the professional standards expected of a veterinary surgeon, was concerning in and of itself (factor (g)).
58. The Committee took into account and acknowledged the information provided by the Applicant about the Continuing Professional Development ("CPD") he had completed in order to maintain his knowledge, skills and developments in practice, since removal from the Register. However, the Committee did not consider that the steps taken were sufficiently structured or assessed to demonstrate that the Applicant had the necessary knowledge and skills required to be considered clinically competent as of tomorrow - which is the standard that must be met by any applicant applying for restoration (factor (h)).
59. Mr Seymour-Hamilton still lacks an understanding as to why he has not been restored in the past. Apart from additional CPD, he has not set about effectively addressing any of his shortcomings. He relies passionately on his research, yet he does not support that research with any peer-reviewed publications, indeed all his attempts to gain

recognition have been rebuffed. The Committee does not accept that it is necessary to have the words MRCVS after one's name in order to obtain peer-reviews or publication of a scientific paper. Furthermore, Mr Seymour-Hamilton fails to acknowledge the consequences of being out of practice for so long; indeed he seems to believe that his veterinary skills have not really deteriorated, describing them as *"something you do not forget, like learning to ride a bike"*. In the Committee's view he has misplaced confidence in his own abilities and does not recognise that his approach and/or actions can represent a danger to animals and to the public. In this regard the Committee finds the Applicant does not appear to understand the purpose of regulation: protecting the public interest, upholding professional standards and maintaining public confidence in the profession.

60. Whilst the Committee recognises the Applicant's desire to advance his prospects of achieving acceptance amongst academics and pharmaceutical companies of his research work and that those prospects might be enhanced by restoration of his name to the Register, that is not a factor which is relevant to his Application for Registration. He appears to believe that the fact that he does not wish to actually practise as a veterinary surgeon, (something he repeated several times during his submissions to the Committee), is an important factor to take into account. In doing so, he pays no heed to the functions and purpose of this Committee, as also reflected in his application where he referred to wanting to *"appeal my deregistration"*. This Committee's obligations and duties are to ensure that the interests of animal welfare are properly protected by ensuring that those whose names are on the Register are properly trained, knowledgeable and experienced in the treatment of animals and that public confidence in the standards of the profession is maintained. This Committee cannot restore someone to the Register who is otherwise not fit simply because they want to be able to use the title MRCVS in order to lend credibility to their work.

61. For all these reasons, the Committee is not persuaded that Mr Seymour-Hamilton is fit to be restored to the Register and this application is refused.

62. The Committee is firmly of the view that after such a prolonged period of failing to be reinstated as a Veterinary Surgeon, Mr Seymour-Hamilton has to face the reality that his continued applications, taking up time, resources and expense (which is ultimately borne by all those Veterinary Surgeons who are on the Register), are vexatious and ultimately unlikely to succeed. Whilst the College cannot prevent him from continuing to apply to be restored to the Register, Mr Seymour-Hamilton should by now realise

that this is not a good use of the College's finite resources. He is now 86 years old and has not practised for over thirty years and in fact has now been off the Register for longer than he was on it. This is now the twelfth time he has been found to be not fit to be restored to the Register. The Committee hopes Mr Seymour-Hamilton will now take time seriously to reflect and take into account the impact to all concerned of his continued applications, before deciding to submit any more.

## **DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

**8 July 2025**