



ROYAL COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SURGEONS
DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

INQUIRY RE:

MR WARWICK JOHN 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 thirteenth such application, his twelve previous applications in 1995, 2010, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2025 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.
3. In particular, the College invited the Committee to note the Applicant's conduct following his original removal from the RCVS Register in relation to poor animal care and unhygienic conditions.

The Legislative Framework and Guidance Documents

4. 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."

5. 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.
6. 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 Chair and the College's Solicitor to invite the Applicant to provide evidence concerning the Applicant's character and conduct since his name was removed.
7. The Disciplinary Committee Guidance (August 2020) ("the Guidance") 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).*
8. The Disciplinary Committee will only restore the name of an applicant Veterinary Surgeon to the Register where the applicant has satisfied it that he or she is fit to return to unrestricted practice as a Veterinary Surgeon and that restoration is in the public interest.

The Original Hearing

9. 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 to animals undergoing surgical procedures.”*

10. 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.”*
11. 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.”*

12. 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”*.
13. The Committee directed that the Registrar remove the Respondent's name from the Register.

Previous Applications for Restoration

14. Since his removal from the Register, the Applicant has made 12 previous 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

15. 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.
16. 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.
17. The Committee refused the application for restoration.

Second Application for Restoration

18. 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.
19. 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.”
20. 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

21. 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.
22. 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

23. On 18 March 2016, the Applicant made a fourth application for restoration. He referred to various research and studies he had undertaken.
24. 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

25. 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

26. 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

27. 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

28. 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

29. 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

30. 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.

31. 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

32. 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, that 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."

Twelfth Application for Restoration

33. On 12 April 2025, the Applicant notified the College that he wished to make a further application for restoration. That application was heard on 8 July 2025 and refused. In refusing the application, that Committee said:

"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)).

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)).

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)).

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)).

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)).

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.

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.”

The Current Application for Restoration

The Applicant’s submissions

34. On 20 May 2026, the Applicant notified the College that he wished to make a further application for restoration. In his email sent to the College he said:

“Reasons for reapplying.

a). Whether the applicant has accepted the findings of the committee. I accept the findings of the two veterinary surgeons who visited the practice; however, the practice had been closed 3 weeks before the visit and was being cleared out for sale. I telephoned the college before the visit and assumed that this was understood. I was too ill and distressed to attend the first trial and they went without me and de-Registered. The first trial transcript proves that this visit was not an inspection where I would have been fully aware. Also the state they described proves this was not an up and running practice. Also the comments of the two vets to the committee when put in the correct context and syntax prove that this was not an up and running practice. Also Mr Walsby commented to committee that he had been invited to visit

the surgery. Later he admitted that they just wanted to look at the records. You cannot invite an official inspection they tell you when, or just appear.

Of the 12 appeals the college has refused to look at the first trial transcript which shows that I am innocent of the charges.

b). The seriousness of those findings.

The findings by the two vets are very serious if I was practicing at the time, I was 3 weeks earlier but this is proved by the 1st trial transcript. The two vets found no evidence of staff, animals in cages, people waiting to be seen, phone ringing ect. The college commented to committee that they had tried to ring the practice with no result - of course not, the practice was closed.

c). Whether the applicant has demonstrated insight into his past conduct.

The practice was not functioning at the time, Mr King one of the veterinary surgeons informed the committee that I gave every impression of practising. That is all. He did not say that I WAS practising. There was nothing in there at the time to practice with. I was quite ill at the time with a completely drug resistant E. coli infection of the prostate which killed all the cows in question. I had been informed by Bromley Hospital at the time that I would never get rid of it. I would perhaps live 18 months - 2 years at the most. Constant pain forced me to retire and I had to find a completely new antibiotic series where I was very successful. I have included photo's [sic] of their in vitro effects which support the in vivo results to committee. This dead weight on insight would affect my behaviour for a long time. Although no one commented on it at the time.

d). Protection of the Public.

Since the practice was closed there was no danger to the public. My discoveries since de-registration will I believe be of incredible benefit world wide to medicine. A whole new series of potentiated herbal antibiotics which pathogenic bacteria have not met before. Also to date I have found no resistance building up to any of them where this is a failure of fungal antibiotics. The CNM antiviral protocol has harmlessly killed all virus infections I have encountered including COVID. The antimutagenic protocol destroyed my 3 stage clear cell carcinoma of the kidney. This was the rage at the time at Guys and St Thomas but stopped by the authorities bound by regulation. Due to age I do not have to die from any of the common cold viruses or flue variants, or various cancers and awful drug resistant bacterial infections.

e). Future of welfare of animals if permitted to be restored.

Without antibiotic cover the future of animals undergoing surgery is quite grim this applies also to human cases. The college has to my knowledge never received a welfare complaint on or off the Register. De-Registered, one is completely rejected and not allowed to compete in any

medicinal field. Should there be a deemed but not actual incompetence case in any event, if re-Registered the college evidence, would be devastating to all parties.

f). Length of time off the Register.

Being off the Register does not mean you cannot keep up, do very important research as I have done. I gained a degree in herbal medicine from Dublin when 74 to see if any herbal authority new of these discoveries, they did not neither does AI. In my case the college would not consider the first trial transcript the most important evidence and as you can see I have made 12 attempts. And the college adamantly will not go behind the first decision.

g). The applicants conduct whilst off the Register.

Previous committees have found no evidence of misconduct.

h). Evidence to keep up, with the knowledge and skills and developments in practice. Every year i have given each committee lists of studies of research claimed by the internet and AI which is exceedingly efficient. This year I have studied Parasitology in depth. Huge areas of Australia South Africa, and New Zealand now cannot support sheep due to completely drug resistant nematode worm infestation. This is my next and likely last important research - to kill that parasite with potentiated herbal parasitics. I am moving to Plymouth where there are a few sheep farms in Devon and Cornwall still functioning.,

The appeal to the college is not as has been frequently stated " we cannot stop him from practising if re-Registered", I have every time included that I do not want to practise. I retired 3 weeks before the visit by Mr King and Walsby and certainly in my case retired means retired.

The whole purpose of the appeals is to advance these discoveries to general medicine where they are desperately needed. Due to the college decisions this has been denied by every quarter.

So its not for me but them, I will be in a different dimension shortly.."

35. The Applicant provided a bundle of 148 pages, which included, but was not limited to:

- Reasons for re-applying to the college;
- History;
- Concentrated learning;
- Parasitology revision;
- Anti-mutagenic protocol;
- Anti-viral studies;

- Antibacterial research;
- College criticism;
- Disciplinary answers;
- Evidence supplied by Mr Walsby and Mr King;
- Submissions on behalf of the College;
- Letter from Mr Warwick Seymour Hamilton to Lovesthepet;
- Email from Murat Akbas;
- Neil Hopper Article;
- New broad spectrum anti-biotic that bacteria cannot get used to and reasons I keep applying;
- Document headed: "People have died recently in large numbers because of the following";
- Potentiation of herbal antibiotics;
- Email from Pricilla Peter aka PricillaTepioglu;
- Letter from Sevim Cankaya;
- The Potentiation of essential oils and their antibacterial enhancement;
- Document entitled "The Practice was closed"; and
- RCVS press release 17 July 2023.

36. The Applicant did not give live evidence but made lengthy oral submissions to the Committee which reflected the contents of his email of 20 May 2026.

37. In summary, he continued to vehemently deny any wrongdoing on his part and was forceful in asserting that the decision of the original Disciplinary Panel in 1994 to remove his name from the Register was wrong, stating "*I am completely innocent of the whole thing*". He confirmed that he had retired from veterinary practice, and that he no longer wished to practise as a Veterinary Surgeon. His position was that he had undertaken significant research in herbal antibiotics and the use of herbal essential oils which could have significant health benefits for animals. By way of example, he stated that his health remedies could cure tuberculosis. However, the fact that he was deRegistered had prevented him from gaining the recognition for his work that he felt he deserved. He emphasised his confidence that his research had the potential to save lives but that he would not be able to do so while he remained deRegistered.

38. In response to questions put to him by the Committee, the Applicant was evasive about

whether, subsequent to his removal from the Register, he had legally spayed cats in Calais, France around 2016 / 2017, despite having previously confirmed in his earlier statements that he had done so.

39. In support of his application for restoration, the Applicant called Pricila Tepioglu, a school teacher in Turkey, who gave character evidence on his behalf by videolink. She confirmed that she had known the Applicant for five years and that when the Applicant stayed with her in Turkey, he used to go to the library to work every day. She spoke positively as to the Applicant's character, stating that the Applicant had looked after her children at times. She stated that in all the circumstances, she supported the Applicant's application for restoration.

Submissions on behalf of the College

40. Ms Curtis stated that it was a matter for the Committee's judgment as to whether the Applicant has satisfied them that he is fit to be restored to the Register, taking into account the factors set out at paragraph 85 of the Guidance. 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.
41. Ms Curtis submitted that the Applicant has continued to indicate 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. Ms Curtis submitted 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. She submitted that any statements or letters purporting to go behind the original Committee findings were irrelevant and therefore inadmissible.
42. The Applicant has in effect indicated (as he has repeatedly done in the past) that the purpose of his application is to assist him in achieving recognition for what he described as his herbal and natural remedy discoveries. In the past he has indicated that he has no intention of going back into general practice, and he has repeated that assertion in his email of May 2026, stating that he has been retired since before the original Disciplinary Committee hearing in 1994. 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. Ms Curtis asserted that he would be unsafe to do so, and this would pose a risk to animal welfare.
43. Ms Curtis submitted that the College opposed the application on the basis that he is not fit to be restored to the Register. The College relied on factors (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) within paragraph 85 of the Guidance, namely:
- (a) Whether the applicant veterinary surgeon has accepted the findings of the Committee at*

the original inquiry hearing;

(b)...

(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).

44. Ms Curtis submitted that 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 in relation to factors (a) and (c) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance.

45. The Applicant has now been off the Register for some 32 years. She submitted that the Applicant 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) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance).

46. The Applicant has on previous occasions indicated that he has practised veterinary surgery, including two spay procedures in Calais whilst off the Register. He has also admitted using his own animals in order to try out new, untested remedies. She submitted 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. As a result, she submitted that this presents a real and significant risk to animal welfare (factors (e) and (g) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance).

47. She also submitted 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) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance).

48. In conclusion, Ms Curtis invited the Committee to note that thirty-two years have passed since the Applicant had practised as a Veterinary Surgeon. 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 would inevitably be a serious risk to the welfare of animals and the wider public interest if the Applicant were to be restored.

The Committee's Decision

49. The Committee noted that it is for 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, including the oral submissions provided by the Applicant, Ms Curtis, and the evidence of the live witness.
50. The Committee has read and considered the large volume of documents in the College's bundle and in the bundle produced by the Applicant. The Committee considered that many of the documents produced by the Applicant in support of his restoration application are not applicable to the factors that the Committee is obliged to consider as set out in paragraph 43 above.
51. The Committee also accepted that the Guidance explains that the obligation is on the Applicant Veterinary Surgeon to satisfy the Committee, on the balance of probabilities, that he is fit to be restored to the Register. It noted that the Committee should consider the public interest and should take into consideration any evidence (including character testimonials) on behalf of the Applicant, as well as any College submissions. It also provides that the Committee will consider a number of factors in exercising its judgment as to whether to restore a veterinary surgeon as set out at paragraph 85 of the Guidance.
52. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor that the legislative framework and guidance documents have been correctly set out by counsel for the College. The Committee also accepts 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 or Ms Tepioglu in relation to the original findings was inadmissible.
53. The Applicant still does not accept the original findings which led to his removal from the Register and even at this hearing, was vehement in his insistence that the original findings

that led to his removal in 1994 were wrong. Over the course of his various applications, including today's, given his refusal to accept the original Committee's findings, the Committee concluded that he continues to lack insight into the conduct underlying those original findings, nor has he shown insight into the matters identified by previous Committees as raising serious concerns in relation to factors (a) and (c) of para 85 of the Guidance.

54. The Applicant has now been off the Register for some 32 years. The College submitted 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, and were he to be restored, would therefore pose a significant risk to animal welfare (factors (e), (f) and (h) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance). The Committee agrees. It took into account the information provided by the Applicant as to the steps he had taken to maintain his knowledge of veterinary matters and the difficulties he had faced in doing so, stating that there were insufficient courses available for those removed from the Register.
55. The Committee noted that the Applicant has provided a lengthy record of 'concentrated revision' which he said was undertaken between September 2024 and April 2026. However, the Committee attached little weight to that record in demonstrating that the Applicant had kept his knowledge and skills up to date given the Applicant's inability to explain the nature or relevance of much of the learning undertaken, and because of the absence of CPD course certificates or any factual or reflective notes. When questioned, he was unable to provide any further information on the nature and scope of his "revision", even in the case of work he listed as having been performed just three months previously.
56. In the circumstances, the Committee did not consider that the steps taken were sufficiently detailed or structured to ensure that the Applicant had the knowledge and skills required to be considered clinically competent having been removed from the Register 32 years ago.
57. The Applicant had previously indicated that he has practised veterinary surgery, including two spay procedures in Calais, whilst off the Register. His view was that this was lawful as it was outside the RCVS jurisdiction. He has also admitted using his own animals in order to try out new, untested 'herbal remedies'. He argued that his qualification as a herbalist made this lawful. The College submitted that this conduct is indicative of someone without due regard to the importance of the current level of skills, experience and qualifications required in order to undertake veterinary surgery competently. Again, the College submitted that this presents a real and significant risk to animal welfare (factors (e) and (g) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance). The Committee noted that at today's hearing, the Applicant referred to only one procedure in Calais, and that this was only performed to demonstrate that he had the necessary skills to his French counterparts. The Committee considered this explanation implausible and

inconsistent with his submissions to earlier Committees. In the circumstances, the Committee agreed that the Applicant continued to pose a significant risk to animal welfare (factors (e) and (g) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance).

58. The College also submitted 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) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance). Given the extremely long period of time that has elapsed since the Applicant's removal from the Register, the Committee agreed with the Council's assessment.

59. The College invited the Committee to consider that where, as here, some 32 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 (factor (d) of paragraph 85 of the Guidance). The Committee agreed and considered that the Applicant has neither shown the required insight nor has he taken the necessary learning steps needed to return to safe veterinary practice. In the absence of any demonstrable meaningful insight, the Committee concluded that there remained a significant risk to animal welfare should he be restored to the Register.

60. The Committee noted that the focus of the Applicant's concerns was not on his personal responsibility for his failings or his professional obligations, but on his desire for credibility in promoting his herbal therapies. The Applicant in his oral and written submissions stated that he does not want to return to the Register to practise veterinary surgery, but that in the absence of restoration, he would be denied the credibility for his research that he felt he deserved. The Committee noted that the requirements for licencing of therapeutic agents was not dependent on professional registration. Removal from the Register did not remove the Applicant's academic qualifications. As such the Committee concluded this is an immaterial consideration in the determination of the suitability of the Applicant in being readmitted to the Register. His desire for validation and recognition for his research (which had not been the subject of meaningful peer or scientific review), did not in itself justify restoration to the Register.

61. The Committee has also had regard to the case of *GOC v Clarke [2018] EWCA Civ 1463*. It concluded that the correct approach was to consider whether a practitioner is fit to practise unrestricted, rather than a deliberation of whether, because of retirement, there is any likelihood of a return to practice and, thereby any risk occasioned by that. As the court

observed *"a person could hardly claim to be a fit person to practise...because he had no intention of doing so"*.

62. The Committee also considered the evidence of Ms Tepioglu who gave evidence as to the Applicant's good character to the best of her knowledge. Whilst the Committee found her evidence well intentioned, seen in the context of all the above factors, most notably his continued denial of wrongdoing and negligible insight, her evidence was of limited value and was insufficient to outweigh the other identified factors present.
63. For the reasons set out above, 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 and that to do so would be detrimental to animal welfare.
64. The application for restoration is therefore refused.

Disciplinary Committee

5 August 2026