

Pierre Genevier
711 South Westlake Ave., #205
Los Angeles, CA 90057-4128
Email: pierre.genevier@laposte.net

Mrs. Janet Napolitano, DHS Secretary
Mr. Michael Ayles, USCIS A. D. Director
Mr. John P. Torres, ICE A. Director
Mr. Michael Dougherty, USCIS Ombudsman
Mr. Eric Holder, Attorney General
Mr. Salvador Hernandez, LA FBI office
Mr. Edmund G. Brown, CA Attorney General
Mr. Ray G. Fortner Jr, County Counsel

Mrs. Drew Faust, Harvard
Mr. Steven Sample, USC
Mr. John Hennessy, Stanford
Mr. Lee Bollinger, Columbia
Mr. Henry S. Bienen, Northwestern
Mr. Richard Levin, Yale
Mr. Scott Cowen, Tulane
Mr. John DeGioia, Georgetown

Los Angeles, February 5, 2009

Copy: Mr. Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann, UNGA, Mr. Ban Ki-Moon, Mr. Michael Bloomberg, Mr. Barack Obama.

Object: Petition for review of Mr. DeMore's deportation order or appeal brief in 08-55492 [[exh.1.1](#)], + list of exhibits [[exh.1.2](#)]; related cases [DC no 05-7517, AC 07-56730; DC 07-5548, AC 08-55236; DC 08-5681; BC 364736]; my 2-27-08 letter addressed to some of you [[exh. 2](#)]; recent USCIS decisions and ICE-DOJ answer brief in 08-55492; and repeated judicial misconducts and complaints. [This letter's Internet address is <http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letalladmin-uni2-5-09.pdf>, to use the exhibits' links].

Dear Madam, dear Sir,

Referring to my 2-27-08's letter addressed to you or your colleagues [[exh. 2](#)], I take the liberty of writing 'you' again (1) to forward you the appeal brief in 08-55492 or **petition for review** of Mr. DeMore's deportation order [[exh. 3](#)] I filed on 11-3-08, (2) to make some comments on the recent USCIS decisions, on the ICE-DOJ answer brief in 08-55492, and on the case, and (3) to ask you again to show some reason and to settle the case. I address also my letter to the 8 Universities Presidents I contacted in 2002 to ask them, among other, to please contact me as soon as possible if they have any information about (or plaid a role in) my grant of refugee status in 2002 (see section F).

As seen in [exh. 1.1](#) p. 29-41, the deportation's case issues (and the long delay in resolving the various problems) **concern all of 'you'** (LA County, CA AG, LA FBI, not just the DHS and US Attorney offices), and they are **first criminal and management** problems. They are also, of course, **civil legal issues** because I suffered a grave prejudice over the past 7 years almost. The criminal and management aspects are critical to have a fair resolution of the dispute, so I must come back on them briefly in section B below. I also would like to try to analyze **why** 'you' avoided to address them or the administrations' dishonest objectives (in C), and **how** this strategy was possible over such a long period of time by looking at the role of (and the wrongdoing at) the LA US Attorney office (in D), and the various courts (in E), and finally I look again at **the consequences** for me or the grave prejudice I suffered, and at the political and intellectual aspects of the case (in F). But first, please let me present you the USCIS recent decisions and the ICE -DOJ answer brief in 08-55492, and make some comments on them.

A Recent USCIS decisions, the deportation order, the cover up of criminal wrongdoings and the recent answer brief on the deportation case.

The USCIS sent me on 12-5-08 a new **A03 refugee EA card** (!) [exh.6, p. 1], and I presented it to the LA ICE office (Mr. DeMore), US Attorney office, and SSA Counsel with a request to cancel the full of lies deportation order, and to pay me the SSI benefits, but the USCIS Nebraska Center Director sent me 3 weeks later an ‘intend to revoke’ the card [exh. 7], and the LA USICS office sent me a denial of my application to adjust to permanent resident status that had been pending since 2003 (!) [exh.10.1]. Their decisions’ statements of facts are **incorrect and incomplete** since ‘they’ deliberately ignore that the INS granted me the refugee status and (**or at least**) issued me a verification of status listing me as refugee [exh. 12.1], which was confirmed to be a valid evidence of my refugee status by ALJ Tolentino [exh.13.1], and later by the USCIS Refugee Center Director who issued my refugee A3 EA card in 12-10-04 [exh. 15.1], so I explained this in my 2 responses [exh. 8.1, exh. 11], but the Nebraska Center Director sill revoked my card [exh. 8.2] without addressing my response’s arguments or the issues of the intend to revoke the EA card, which is dishonest, I believe. The USCIS Missouri office acknowledged the receipt of my motion to reconsider the I-485 application denial [exh. 11.2] sent to Chicago [see my letter exh.11.3], so I am waiting for a new decision.

As you can see in [exh. 3], Mr. DeMore had also lied in his deportation order when he stated that I never applied for asylum and never had any permission to remain here because I obviously applied for asylum [see my asylum application AR, exh. 4.1] and always had a permission to remain here [see explanation in exh. 8.1, and my EA cards exh. 15.1, exh. 15.2]. I had presented my refugee status evidences including my A3 refugee card to the LA ICE police officers who came to arrest me on 1-10-08, and explained to him (and earlier several times to the AUSAs, judges) that this A03 refugee EA card **was also an evidence of my refugee status** (since one must bring proof of refugee status to get it), but they all ignored my comment [the ICE police officers who handed me out the deportation order told me that it was not an evidence of refugee status, and only a temporary permission to work]. The letter sent with the new card confirms that I was right and that they were not only wrong, see page 2 ‘**Your card is also evidence of your status**’ statement [at exh.6, p. 3], but also very **dishonest**. Even after I filed my motion to reconsider [exh. 4.2], or my petition or appeal [exh. 1.1], they maintained the deportation order and proceeding which is criminal I believe, and as seen below.

The objective of the false statements is obvious: if they ignore the refugee-verification-of-status the INS issued to me in 2002 [exh. 12.1], then **they ignore that the INS computer record has listed me as a refugee from 9-2002 to 11-2002 at least** (and that someone imputed the refugee status) [again several status verifiers confirmed me on 11-13-02 that they did not make a mistake when they issued the verification of status and that they even had the date I was granted asylum! See explanation in exh. 16, exh.1.1, p. 8], and **therefore they ignore that** someone fraudulently erased the refugee status and the date it was granted on the INS computer record [during my official immigration proceeding to influence the decision] **without following the official procedure 8 CFR 207.9** to terminate a refugee status granted by mistake, **which is a felony** [viol. [18 USC 1512 \(c\) \(1\)](#), [18 USC 1519](#)]. At the same time, they ignore that the 4 INS employees who lied about the situation of the record corruptly concealed a record, obstructed and influenced a legal proceeding (my asylum immigration court case), and falsely maintained it, **which are also felonies** [[viol 18 USC 1512 \(c\) \(1\) and \(2\)](#), [PC 182](#)]. And by doing so, Mr.DeMore, his lawyers,..., engaged in a

'misleading conduct ...to (3) hinder, delay, or prevent the communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense' and covered up these (possible) crimes, continued to harass me and falsely maintained again a legal proceeding [the deportation proceeding], which are felonies also [[viol 18 USC 1512 \(b\) \(3\)](#) and (c), [PC 182](#)].

They also put the responsibility on me for not resolving the problems earlier during the past 7 years although obviously I made many efforts to resolve the problems: wrote letters to the management and politicians, and filed several administrative, civil and even criminal complaints immediately after the problems started in 2002. In 2005 I went to the FBI office in LA to explain that **someone had fraudulently erased my refugee status on the INS computer record**, and that later **someone issued a fraudulent altered verification of status** [see altered document, [exh. 20](#)], but the FBI agent I saw did not want to take any written documents (of course!), and he said that the FBI worked hand in hand with the US Attorney office (which I understand), and that without the US Attorney office, there is little they can do (I never heard of him after that). So I prepared a **written criminal complaint** [[exh. 39.1](#), [exh. 39.2](#)] and filed it at the US Attorney office criminal section (and other offices, DA,), but the LA USA office responded that they did not do any investigation, and put the responsibility on the FBI for not pursuing the matter (!) [[exh. 39.3](#)] which was very dishonest, I believe since even the Police Commissioner wrote to me that the US Attorney office **was the proper** office for these crimes [[exh 41](#)].

After a new criminal complaint dated 4-4-05 [[exh. 40.1](#)], they wrote to me that they thought the wrongdoings should be presented at the civil court [[exh. 39.5](#)]. In 10-2005 about, I filed two new civil lawsuits, including one describing a deprivation of civil rights claim (also hate crimes,), a common law conspiracy claim (also criminal conspiracy) and a negligence claim (more precise) [[exh. 27.3](#)], but this lead to new treacheries and lies (retaliation and cover up) at the US attorney office civil division and at the courts (see section E below) [the Judges and US attorneys knows that some wrongdoings are felonies of civil servants against an alien, and they sides with the criminal civil servants against me (!)]. Finally, after two complaints in 9-05 and 6-06 [[exh.40.2](#)], I filed a new criminal complaint on 12-14-07 [[exh.18](#)], but again the US Attorney office put the responsibility on the FBI for not investigating or prosecuting the criminal wrongdoings [[exh.19](#)] although after the civil lawsuits the investigation of what happened was (or should have been) done already (through the administrative claims I filed, see section D). So the criminal wrongdoings (alteration of record and document, lies,) were covered up; and now the USCIS I-485 application denial decision, the revocation of my EA card, and the deportation order refer to the DHS computer record that has been fraudulently altered on my case or simply lie about the facts, which is extremely dishonest [they also ignore that my A3 refuge EA card **is on their DHS computer record**, and that **it is also an evidence of my refugee status** ([exh.6](#), p. 3) (!)],

The refugee-verification-of-status [[exh.12.1](#)] was **issued through an official INS-DPSS procedure** (to verify an alien immigration status and entitlement to social benefits) and therefore **it entitled me to several thousands of dollars** in refugee benefits [[exh. 12.2](#)], GR and even to ten of thousands of dollars in disability benefits [see explanation about SSI requirement in [exh. 29.4](#)], so when the USCIS, US Attorney office, and indirectly the DPSS and DSS ignore this fact, they simply **argue (1) that it is ok to deprive me (or anybody) of these thousands of dollars of social benefits** (and indirectly to send me in the street **and almost kill me**) simply on the word of a deportation officer, INS lawyer or even status verifier that **an error was made** when the

verification was issued or the refugee status imputed **without** any other control (on who imputed the status or if an error was really made), and at the same time that it ok to deprive me of the due process in the related administrative proceeding. **This is very wrong, of course,** and not conformed to the existing law, **especially when the status verifiers confirm that they made no mistake in issuing the document** (!), when to issue a fraudulent immigration document is a felony [viol. [18 USC 1546](#)], and when there is as special procedure to terminate a refugee status granted by mistake that only the INS District Director has the authority to use after allowing the alien to respond first – the [8 CFR 207.9](#) procedure.

On 1-15-09 AUSA Laske filed his answer brief [[exh. 48](#)] in the deportation case. His brief as usual **is full of lies** [see draft of reply brief, [exh. 49](#)]. For example, he writes [in [exh. 48](#), p. 20] that **I allege** in my opening brief ([exh.1.1](#) p. 7) that the status verifier made '**clerical error**' when he wrote 'refugee' on the GR verification of status form [[exh.12.1](#)] although as you can read in ([exh.1.1](#), p 7 and all my other pleadings) **I always explained** (since 11-14-02) that several status verifiers confirmed me on 11-13-02 that Mr. Mahoney made **no** 'error' in issuing the refugee verification of status, that I was granted refugee status and that **they even had the date the refugee status was granted**. He also argues that the appeal court has no jurisdiction to review the petition, of course, and again that I am '*removable under visa waiver program because I overstayed without any permission and was denied asylum*' which as explained above, is not true and has for objective to cover up the criminal wrongdoings. In one of his arguments he mentions that the collateral estoppel doctrine I use to justify that AL Tolenino's final decision confirming the validity of my refugee status **certified my refugee status** is not valid; and that the US cannot be estopped because I did **not** allege that the 'government engaged in affirmative misconduct going beyond negligence', which as you understand is not true at the light of my many criminal complaints and explanation given above [see draft of reply brief, [exh. 49](#)].

B The fact that I am necessarily a victim of grave wrongdoings in this case and the issues are first criminal and management issues.

After 'you' gave me the GR verification of status listing me as a **refugee** in 9-5-02, [[exh.12.1](#)], and it was confirmed to be a 'valid' evidence of my refugee status (grant of asylum) **(a) by the administrative law judge** on 2-5-03 [[exh. 13.1](#)], whose decision was confirmed to be conformed to the law by the rehearing unit [[exh. 14.1](#)], and later **(b) by the Director of the USCIS Nebraska National Refugee Center**, Mr. Christian, when he issued my first refugee EA card on 12-10-04 [[exh. 15.1](#)], **you could (and still can) not blame me anymore in any way for believing that I was given refugee status** (granted asylum) by the INS in 2002, especially not when you know **(a) that the collateral estoppel effect applies to ALJ Tolentino's decision, (b) that the INS district director never terminated my refugee status pursuant to 8 CFR 207.9, and (c) that, for me, the persecutions in France were real and led me to suffer a very grave prejudice, and therefore that the refugee status was justified on the merit (for me and it seems at least for some INS officials too)**. [As mentioned in [exh. 11.1](#), two INS duty Attorneys told me that I did not have to go in front of the immigration judge with my refugee-verification-of-status in 2002 (and it makes sense), and the Immigration Court Clerk Supervisor had told me also it was not unusual for an asylum seeker to receive his refugee status after his case is referred to the immigration court].

If an ALJ and the Director of the National Refugee Center think that one or two documents are evidences of my refugee status, why should I not think the same (especially after the status verifiers confirmed they made no mistake)! (?) Moreover and as explained in [exh. 2, p. 4] you know that **I have shown my good faith several times and immediately after the problems started** in 2002 since I immediately explained the problems to a DSS AL judge on 11-14-02 [exh. 13.2], and later I even asked the DSS rehearing unit to confirm his decision on the various issues (although it was not in my interest as you surely understand, exh. 14.1). I also immediately filed a complaint of employees' misconduct at the INS Audit office on 1-14-03 [exh. 22.2, exh. 22.3] and forwarded to them the ALJ decision and the immigration court decision [unlike some USCIS and ICE officials who ignored my refugee documents, I did not ignore the immigration judge decision]. At no time did I ignore the contradictions on my immigration status or did I **try to hide them to the INS official or the courts, on the contrary**, I made many efforts to explain as precisely as possible what happened and to try to resolve the problems **outside the civil court system**, either through administrative proceedings, or letters to the management and to politicians.

So even if the Appeal Court **decide** [or LA ICE and LA USA offices **can now prove beyond any doubt** that an error was made on my refugee status or documents (the ICE-DOJ answer brief does not)], I would **still be an obvious victim of what happened** and would still deserve **(a) to keep the refugee status** and **(b) to receive a compensation** for the almost 7 years of suffering I experienced here **because** whatever error 'you' find or invoke, it would still have deprived me of my chance to have a fair review of my case **while maintaining me in an extremely difficult situation during more than 6 years**. As seen in exh. 1.1 p. 29-41, the problems (could and) **should have been resolved a long time ago**, by the LA County that had to formally appeal ALJ Tolenino's at the Superior Court, by the DSS legal officers who had to force them to do so, by the INS audit office and management that had to respond properly to my complaint, to inform the FBI, and/or either to terminate or confirm the refugee status [the USCIS could have also addressed the issue of my status through my I-485 application in 2003 as seen above, instead of waiting until 12-2009], and by the LA US Attorney office (see C) or even by the SSA. What happened is an unusual problem, but it is still a real life situation obviously since it did happen, so the DHS management should have an official point of view, not a succession of contradictory decisions, instead of blame me for it. [Mr. Laske pretends in his brief that I should have filed a motion to reopen the immigration case, but I could **not** until or before the frauds and criminal wrongdoings be investigated or explained or before the DHS responds properly to my complaint of employees' misconduct, which it still has not done yet, and when the imm. judge was dishonest in this case.].

As seen above, the lies on the INS record situation of the 4 INS employees (concealment of record) **during and to corruptly influence** and obstruct my immigration proceeding **were/are obvious felonies** [[viol 18 USC 1512 \(c \) \(1\) and \(2\), PC 182.](#)]. **The issuance of an altered** verification of status [exh.20] during and to influence my administrative proceeding against the LA County and to repeatedly send me in the street was/is also a felony [[viol. 18 USC 1546, 18 USC 1512 \(c\) \(1\)](#) that states: (c) **Whoever corruptly— (1) alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, or attempts to do so, with the intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding'** (the proceeding against the LA County); **'or (2) otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both**], since there was an obvious '**intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an official**

proceeding' and it was an obvious fraud to cover up the initial lies on my status and the **fraudulent alteration** the INS computer record (that erased my refugee status and the date it was granted). The fact that the altered document was an immigration document also led to a violation of [18 USC 1546](#), which refers specifically to immigration documents.

The status verifiers and their supervisor could not go in front of the District Director and explain that this alien (me) was listed as refugee, and that they or another INS employee had erased the refugee status and the date it was granted (without following the formal procedure -8 CFR 207.9 to do so) to make this alien (me) loose his refugee status (and his asylum case), so when they were asked to issue the date the asylum was granted by the DPSS [after ALJ Tolentino's decision], they simply used the '*easy and dishonest way*' and altered the initial verification of status listing me as a refugee they were presented with! These felonies evidence also management problems because they involved other administrations, the County and the DSS, and because there is little doubt that the INS LA District Director was (at least later) informed of these problems by the Audit office [the INS Audit office mentioned in its response that it was forwarding the case to the INS manager concerned, [exh. 22.1](#)], so there should have been some kind of interaction with the County at management level to resolve the problems and an effort to discourage (if not punish) the INS employees to follow (for following) this dishonest path to resolve the problems.

Similarly, the LA County DPSS employees and 3 DSS legal officers who **used the altered** verification of status [[exh.20](#)], '**knowing it to be altered**', as a valid document to establish that my refugee status had been changed [see the DPSS NOAs [exh.36](#), and the DSS officials letters in [exh. 37](#), [exh. 38](#)] and **refused to follow** (or to force the DPSS to follow) **the appropriate procedure** [[CCP1094.5](#), MPP] to appeal the ALJ decision [[exh. 13.1](#)] that had just confirmed the validity of the initial-non-altered-refugee-verification-of-status [[exh.12.1](#)], committed also felonies [[viol. 18 USC 1546](#), and [18 USC 1512 \(b \) \(3\), \(c\) \(2\), \(d\) \(2\)](#)] and **deprived me** of the due process in the administrative proceeding (not to mention the opening of the homeless letters at the DPSS). The **altered** verification of status was/is necessarily a fraud because on 9-5-02 the date it was issued, I did **not** have an employment authorization yet [the first EA card is valid until dated 9-16-03, and did not start before 9-16-02 [exh. 15.2](#)], so the INS status verifier could **not** have issued the altered document as it is written on 9-5-02 – I explained this to the DPSS and DSS judges who were legal experts and knew exactly what they were doing when they accepted it to repeatedly send me in the street (!).

Even if you 'missed' these criminal wrongdoings during the 'administrative proceedings', your lawyers [Maranga, CA AG office, and **particularly the LA USA office see section C**] should have pointed them out to you immediately after I filed my first civil complaint instead of harassing me, and hurting me during all these years, and letting the damage increases significantly. The INS (DHS) problems described above should be (or have been) an important **concern for the County (DPSS,) and State (AG,) officials** because they obviously affect the way the DPSS and DSS assume their responsibility of distributing the social benefits to aliens; just like the problems at the DPSS and DSS mentioned above should also be (or have been) a serious **concern for the LA USCIS and ICE officials** who have the responsibility to issue valid immigration documents (not altered ones) and **to make sure aliens are properly treated according to their immigration status** [especially when the bad treatments of asylum seekers are extensive at the DHS as seen in the report made to congress in 2005, [exh. 30](#)].

You should also determine together how ‘you’ (DHS, California, and LA County,) want to address this kind of problems in the future to avoid that they happens again [it seems that the DHS is going paperless, so if every DHS employees can alter the DHS computer record without any control, you will have a lot of trouble (!)]. For example, you could set up some sort of ‘escalation procedure’ at the LA County so that if there is any contestation on an alien immigration status or document after a DSS ALJ decision confirming its validity, the problem is escalated to the DPSS Director or County Counsel who would have the responsibility to contact the USCIS Director to obtain a clarification and the appropriate documents to have the dispute legally or formally resolved by the Superior Court or the DSS rehearing section during a formal ALJ decision appeal – this would prevent possible coordinated frauds from DHS and DPSS employees (as in this case) or from an alien while guaranteeing due process during the administrative proceeding, but again since some procedures (8 CFR 207.9, CCP 1094.5) were not properly followed, it is **critical** to point that out **first** by admitting what went wrong.

C The dishonest objectives and/or advantages of your refusals to address the criminal and management issues of the case.

Given **the gravity of the wrongdoings** (criminal wrongdoings and efforts to cover them up,) and **of the prejudice I suffered, and the special work I have done for the international community** [see project proposal exh. 46.1, exh. 46.2, and recent letters, exh. 42, exh. 43], the wrongdoings are not ‘random errors or coincidences’, and I must try to analyze ‘*your strategy*’ (or why and how all this happened) and to analyze why the problems were not resolved much earlier. Your refusals to respond properly to my complaints of employees misconduct and to my letters to the management, and to investigate/prosecute the criminal statutes’ violations **had/have three dishonest advantages:** **First, they avoid (ed)** ‘you’, the administrations, to admit obvious criminal wrongdoings (mentioned above) for which there are no immunity, admissions that would have led to an almost automatic liability and financial compensation for me; and since civil servants who violate criminal statutes **are not ‘working within the scope of their employment’**, you also cover (ed) up the employees’ individual wrongdoings and civil liability.

For example, when the INS Audit office (and INS manager involved) refused to respond to my complaint of employee misconduct (in 2003) because it was too busy [exh.22.1], it also avoided to inform the FBI of the obvious criminal behavior of the employees who lied on the situation of (and then altered) the INS computer record to falsely maintain an official legal proceeding, and of the ones who issued a fraudulent **altered verification of status** [exh. 20] to try to cover up their initial dishonesty [a seen above]. The INS Audit office **had the responsibility to inform the FBI** of such criminal wrongdoings [it was at least a policy at the time and written on their website also]; and the audit office (with the INS manager concerned) should have resolved at least the problem of contradictions on my refugee status or of opposite conclusions of two different legal decisions [exh. 1.1, p. 31] to avoid me all the difficulties that followed and to save the community the associated costs of lawsuits and other legal proceedings. When there are two legal decisions that have different conclusions, it is a serious problem and since the administrative proceeding against the LA County **was still pending until 2-4-04**, they had plenty of time to intervene and to furnish to the county the appropriate documents instead of having the status verifier issue an **altered verification of status** [exh.20] to the DPSS.

Second, the press and media did/do **not** talk about the case, and indirectly did/do **not** talk about my ‘political’ proposals – computer project proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the world wide level [[exh. 46.1](#), [exh. 46.2](#)], and the 65 years old age limit proposal for Country Leaders and IO chiefs [see letter to US officials in 1-14-2003, [exh. 47](#)]. The 65 age limit for ‘leaders’ could have prevented the Iraq War in 2003 [I had explained this in my 5-29-02 letter to the 8 University Presidents, [exh. 42.1](#), long before the US administration started talking officially about a war in Iraq], but the administration was **pushing for war** at that time, early 2003, not trying to promote peaceful solutions, so they had no interest in talking about the 65 age limit proposal publicly. Moreover, the 65 age limit proposal is not ‘popular’ here (like in France) among politicians, judges,, who keep the highest public responsibility long after 65 for some [see Supreme Court judges and senators over 75, or even, not long ago, over 100, Sturmond, I believe, although some private companies have already implemented such a 65 age limit for their CEOs, I believe, like Intel or Wells Fargo, and I had presented several good sense and/or logical or scientific arguments supporting it.].

It is very rare to see a refugee from France, and if the Audit office (or the INS management) had admitted that I was granted refugee status in 2002-2003, the press and media would have certainly talked about my case as they did in 2001 talk about the case of another Frenchman who was granted asylum in LA [this case was also in the French press and media during several days]. I informed the press and media after I was granted the refugee status in 2002, and they may have tried to obtain a confirmation from the INS, and some politicians and INS managers may have thought it was better not to give any (confirmation) to prevent a ‘public debate’ on the case and my proposals - the DHS was created just at the time in 3-2003, and a new INS (USCIS) commissioner was appointed (Mr. Aguire), so some of the persons involved in my case were probably reassigned to other administrations, making it easier to refuse to respond, and again the US administration was pushing (even lying) for the war in Iraq in early 2003.

Third, ‘you’ maintained a doubt on my refugee status and unfairly deprived me of the ‘refugee’ benefits [RCA, SSI,] when ‘your colleagues’ did not follow the appropriate procedures [MPP, 8 CFR 207.9, CC1094.5,], and ignored my refugee status evidences; **you continued to hurt me** by repeatedly sending me in the street or keeping me in extremely difficult situation (again I was sent more than 16 times in the street between 2002-2003, and for 3 years I had only \$1 every month while on disability); **and ‘you’ forced me** to complain over and over at the civil court to try to discover what happened and to resolve the problems while knowing it was impossible for me (a poor alien) to obtain justice. This made it of course, impossible for me to resettle and to find a job, and was a constant threat, harassment, and retaliation to discourage me from complaining or even from continuing to seek asylum [it is not an unusual behavior at the DHS according to [exh. 30](#)]. I had no other honest choice than to sue and complain over and over to try to resolve the problems because the immigration status is critical for an alien, because I had already been victim of persecutions in France, and because of the work I have done for the international community, I could not take the blame for your administrations’ dishonesty.

The unfair deportation order that ignores my refugee status evidences and the fact that I applied for asylum and contains the same lies the AUSA (Robinson) made was/is also extremely unfair and dishonest because the immigration laws are ‘so technical and unsettle’, as seen in [exh. 1.1](#),page 21-27, that to determine **who has proper jurisdiction**

to review the order is a little like finding the next ‘lotto’ winning numbers, so of course for a poor who cannot afford a lawyer (cannot find one or was unfairly deprived of a pro bono one by treacheries, see section D and E), the chances of coming up with the appropriate petition for review **within 30 days** are very low, especially when you put him under even more pressure with a home detention [Mr. Lakse is asking the Appeal Court to decline jurisdiction in his answer brief to have me deported on a full of lies deportation order!]. **And** after seeing the judges and Courts dishonest rulings and other treacheries **during 4 years**, there were/are very strong chances that they would continue do the same thing during the deportation proceeding (!) and so far they have done so as seen in E. **It** also made it impossible for me to defend properly the other cases and it made me look guilty although I am necessarily a victim as seen above and it is the INS employees who commit (ted) crimes!

D The central role of and the wrongdoings at the LA US Attorney office.

As mentioned above, ‘your’ dishonest and cover up ‘strategy’ and the repeated wrongdoings would not have been possible without the dishonest ‘positions’ of your lawyers, **and in particular of the LA US Attorney office**. After 2-2004, the LA US Attorney office plaid the central role in all my difficulties, it also committed crimes and civil overacts, and encouraged and coordinated at least several of the next grave (criminal) wrongdoings. For example, the lies of the AUSAs (Robinson, Laske,) on my refugee status evidences **were critical** to cover up the initial INS criminal wrongdoings . Robinson argued from 2004 to recently June 08 that I was ‘*a illegal alien who had overstayed his visa*’ [exh. 26.3] although I always **had a permission to stay here** as seen above and in exh. 8; In one of her pleading she even argued that my complaint was against **one** INS employee only [see exh. 26.3, p. 6, Dotson who worked across the hall from her in the federal building] although I had listed 4 INS employees including the INS lawyer in charge of my case. She wanted only to cover up his wrongdoings, in fact he was the one who was supposed to give me a new document (I94,) listing my refugee status or to inform the INS Director of an error, it seems, and the one who told me that the ‘*status verifiers were lower than nothing*’ which you understand is not a professional behavior.

Then AUSA Laske pretended in his pleadings (1) that ‘*I was short in proof and did not present my 2 pages refugee verification of status*’ [exh. 26.4] although it was the first exhibit of my complaint [exh. 29. 2, p. 12] (!), (2) that ‘*my 4 frivolous lawsuits were due to my inability to understand that I was not a refugee*’, and (3) that my refugee A3 EA card did not give my refugee status [exh. 26.4] although as seen above the A3 EA card was an evidence of my refugee status and obviously I am not the only one who does not understand when you look at the evidences, exh. 12.1, exh. 15.1, exh. 13.1. If the AUSAs (or AUSA office) had not lied about the evidences of my refugee status and simply admitted that I applied for asylum [exh.4.1] and was given a verification of status listing me as a refugee [obviously], then they had to admit that someone granted me the refugee status (asylum - **rightfully or by mistake**), and therefore that their INS colleagues (particularly the deportation officer and INS attorney,) committed a felony when they **lied about the situation of INS computer record** (corruptly concealed a record) during (and to maintain and influence) an official legal proceeding [viol 18 USC 1512 (c) (1) and (2), PC 182,], which again would have led to an almost certain civil liability, and some problems for the INS employees. As seen above, now Mr. Laske argues that it is I who allege that the status verifier made a ‘clerical error’ when he wrote ‘refugee’ on the verification of status, this is outrageous.

Again to issue a **fraudulent** immigration document allowing an alien to live and work here is **grave** crime (viol . 18 USC 1546), **especially since 9/11**, so the error on my refugee document **by the status verifiers** and/or on the grant of my refugee status was very unlikely [especially given my French nationality], and they had to pretend I overstayed my visa and never was given refugee documents to cover up their colleagues criminal wrongdoings and by doing so they also committed felonies themselves since **they engage in a ‘misleading conduct ...to (3) hinder, delay, or prevent the communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense’** and covered up these (possible) crimes, continued to harass me and falsely maintained my immigration proceeding [viol 18 USC 1512 (b) (3) and (c), and (d) PC 182]. Mr. Laske continues to lie on everything in his answering brief as seen above, this is unbelievable and outrageous. They were/are able to lie like this because the AUSA office criminal section refused to address the criminal statutes violations presented in my complaints [as seen above,] and put the responsibility on the FBI for not ‘investigating’ the crimes [see 08 response, exh. 19, an 05 response exh. 39.3, and also because of the courts, as seen in E below].

The proofs of criminal wrongdoings are written black on white [see for example the altered verification of status, exh. 20], and the investigation was not complicated [who has granted or imputed the refugee status, when, who has altered the record and verification of status, when was the record altered ...] and **was most probably (or should have been) done already** by the DHS in 2003-2004, since I filed a complaint of employee misconduct and several administrative claims at the DHS [one for case 04-1857,, one for 04-7877, and one for the last case 05-7517] **whose purpose is to give the agency a chance to investigate** what happened [not to mention my letter to Senator Feinstein who wrote to DHS also to describe the problems, see exh. 28, she never gave me any appropriate response, but she did write to the DHS]! The AUSAs pretended in their pleadings that I had **not** filed administrative claims (they had to hide the wrongdoings), but it was not true [as seen for example in case 05-7517, exh. 27.4], and they ignored the fact that they had the responsibility to investigate a little the wrongdoings to defend the civil case honestly, instead of relying blindly on some employees parties in the case’s statement, again to cover up the criminal wrongdoings [Robinson could have also easily presented her arguments about my immigration status to the judge during my first complaint for misrepresentation of my status in 2004 instead of lying and asking for an immunity, and immediately resolve the issues of the validity of my refugee document problems (!)].

After the AUSAs defending the civil cases had lied on the obvious proofs of my refugee status, and on the claims, and did cover up the INS employees criminal and civil wrongdoings, the criminal section simply refused to review the wrongdoings to cover up everyone **including their colleague AUSA’s**. There is also very little doubt that ‘they’ have an important responsibility in the fact that I did not get any form of legal help although I made many efforts to find a pro bono lawyer over the years. The most recent evidence of this is when a **former** LA AUSA took the pro bono CA9 assignment to make me loose the only chance to be helped by lawyer I had in 6 years [see in D]. I also never obtained any legal help from the pro bono LA agencies in particular from Public Counsel, the biggest here in LA, although I contacted them several times - the wife of the no 2 at the LA USA office (Chief Assistant US Attorney, former acting LA US Attorney) is director of the Appeal Clinic at Public Counsel, so when you are a poor who complains about the US Attorney office repeated wrongdoings, you don’t get help, especially not

when your complaint involves also the LA County that finances them and the CA AG office with whom they (almost) share offices at the state Appeal Court!

In April 08, 'they' also [had the DOJ immigration lawyer] sent a **pleading saying that I was not a refugee** ('by mistake') to the DPSS to have my GR and food stamps terminated [the DPSS opened the letter that was addressed to me and immediately terminated my GR and food stamps], **and they would have succeeded without the County Counsel's immediate intervention.** There was also incorrect information that were imputed on the DHS computer record [someone imputed that I had appealed the BIA decision at the CA9 Appeal Court (to make it look like a normal case), which was not true, I did not because my refugee status was confirmed by a AL judge and there was obvious frauds on my case], and this record fraud required the AUSA knowledge of the various cases, I believe [see explanation in motion to reconsider deportation order exh. 4.2]. Recently, they (with the help of District judge) harassed me again with the service of complaint against the SSA to obtain the SSI benefits - they refused to accept a copy of the complaint I hand delivered to them as the SSA order asked me to do (!), and the judge refused to order the service by the US Marshal and delayed again the time to respond in this case.

Of course, the LA US Attorney office cannot do all these obvious treacheries in this particular case without 'your' implicit consent [CA Attorney General, LA ICE and USCIS Office Directors, the LA FBI Director, and County Counsel, (I admit that** the County Counsel prevented the termination of GR in April 08, **which helped me a lot**, and I tend to believe that 'he' waited more than 3 weeks after the required date to respond to the last negligence complaint at the Superior Court **because he knew** that the Federal Court rendered an unfair ruling and had no valid reason to dismiss the LA County as it did, (unfortunately it did not help because the court clerk cheated and the judge refused to enter default!)]. Again 'you' are legal experts, 'you' are informed of (and understand) the problems at the INS (DHS,), and 'you' are all jointly responsible in this case as seen above (and all benefit from the USA office treacheries), so the LA USA office could not cheat as it does if 'you' simply pointed out the wrongdoings (**in the worse case scenario pointed them out to the press and media**), or if the LA County and CA AG settled the case independently, I obviously deserve it as seen above and below. Unfortunately, the various Courts have also covered up everyone wrongdoings.**

E The treacheries at the various Courts and my 3 judicial misconduct complaints.

Of course, the various Courts (district and superior courts, and federal and state appeals courts,) also helped the LA USA office and other administrations (lawyers) to cover up the (criminal and civil) wrongdoings when they unfairly prevented liabilities **and any discovery** with treacheries, lies, sometimes also criminal wrongdoings, or simply with undeserved immunities after ignoring obvious existing legal authorities. For example, the LA County obtained the **immunity for misrepresentation** [in the first case 04-1857] although there are several legal authorities stating that this immunity does **not apply in the social service area** as in this case (even one against the LA County, Michael J. B...!); and then the Superior Court unfairly refused to enter default despite a delay of more than 3 weeks to respond to the third complaint for negligence as I explained above. The DSS obtained the immunity for negligence because of the 'judicial' immunity of ALJs **although there exists** a legal authority stating that GC 815.6 imposes liability for

negligence in state agencies (in certain conditions that were met in this case) **despite this judicial immunity of employees** (again even a case against the state, Bradford!).

The INS (DHS) also obtained the immunity for misrepresentation although there are also legal authorities that justify it was not deserved, and as seen above the employees who lied **also violated criminal statutes for which there is no immunity**. Later the Appeal Court dismissed the appeal for lack of prosecution after they failed to inform me that they had revoked my authorization to proceed in forma pauperis [I had not file a motion to proceed in forma pauperis because I did not know of the revocation!]. There were also grave wrongdoings at the District Court in next case no 05-7517 that led me to file a 1st complaint of judicial misconduct against the 2 judges in charge of case [[exh. 24.1](#)]. For example, documents (proofs of my refugee status, and the certification that my appeal of the order denying an injunction was not taken in good faith,) **were ‘stolen’ or lost** to prevent them from appearing on the docket and to prevent me from appealing the dishonest denial of an injunction whose purpose was to obtain some urgent financial aid while the case was pending and also to resolve the problems of contradiction on my refugee status issue [again the issue of my refugee status should have been resolved with these pleadings, [exh. 1.1](#) p. 34-36].

The case 05-7517 was also **delayed two years** to harass me, to hurt me while I was on disability and to cover up the employee-defendants' wrongdoings. The 2 judges eventually dismissed the negligence cause of action against the US although the US had not criticized it properly [see appeal brief in 05-7517, [exh. 27.1](#)]. The US Attorney office had argued that I did not file an administrative claim and that I did not acknowledge in the complaint that I did, **which was not true** [[exh. 27.4](#), [exh. 27.3](#), p. 27 (see ‘claims filed on ..’)]. I had filed a claim and wrote that I did in my complaint, but the US still obtained the dismissal (again it was critical to prevent any discovery **and to cover up the crimes**). On 12-04-08 the appeal court dismissed the CMJ [[exh. 24.2](#)], but as you can see the order does not address the issues honestly. For example, it is obvious that the 2 judges were informed about the lost or stolen documents since I mentioned it in my next pleadings and the clerk told me she would call the judge. And, the delay was unusual and unfair because I was living in extremely difficult condition and at the same time the SSA ALJ unfairly denied me the SSI as seen below.

At the same time about (3-2007), the SSA AL judge lied about the refugee documents I represented to her to deny me the SSI benefits, a life and death matter again, although the County doctors had put me on disability for 2 years already [she argued for example that I had given only one page of my 2 pages refugee verification status, or that my A3 EA card was not an evidence that I was in the US lawfully (!), please see my recent fax letter to the SSA on this subject [exh. 29.4](#), and see also how the related negligence cause of action vs SSA, [exh. 29.2](#), was unfairly dismissed by the same judges in the appeal brief vs SSA at [exh. 29.1](#),! Recently the SSA counsel and the AUSA filed the record and we had a settlement conference call, it is obvious from the record they presented that the SSA AL Judge lied [for example, there is in the record a transcript of the hearing in which the judge talks about the documents she pretends are not there, and she even takes time off the record to study them!], but both the SSA counsel and the AUSA still argues that the decision is fair and should be upheld! They cannot (or refused to) even admit the most obvious wrongdoings (or lies) when there are obvious proofs that are written black on white, it is unbelievable and by doing so they harassed me of course because I am forced to file more pleadings. And of course the same judge continues to

delay the resolution of the case and to cover them up [see request for status conference [exh. 29.5](#), and denial order [exh.29.6](#)].

On April 17 2008 the CA9 Appeal Court ordered the appointment of a pro bono lawyer to help me (or more precisely to help the Court) and stayed the deportation order in [[exh.5](#)], but the lawyer who accepted the assignment turned out to be a former Assistant US Attorney at the LA US Attorney office, which, of course, was not (**or could not be**) just a coincidence when you know that an Assistant US Attorney was/is a party in the case, and that the LA US Attorney office has had a very important responsibility in the difficulties I had/have as seen above. In fact, he immediately (in 5-08) made every possible effort to delay the appointment to make sure I would not get any kind of help to write my related cases' briefs that were due on 6-30-08 at the time [see briefs at [exh. 27](#), [exh. 29](#)] and to finish the discovery at the Superior Court against the LA County although the 3 related cases are 3 multimillions dollars lawsuits whose issues and wrongdoings he had to (or should have) address (ed) in the deportation case as seen in [exh. 1.1](#), p. 29-41. Given the lawyer's one-hour-consultation-cost, **the refusal** to address the wrongdoings justifying a civil compensation (and a fee for him) although again he necessarily had to look at them to do an honest job in the immigration case is an obvious proofs that his objective was neither to help the Court nor me!

After the appointment on July 8, 08, he waited 3 weeks to organize a meeting although there were only 6 weeks to write the opening brief and I immediately contacted them to offer my full cooperation and to ask for an urgent meeting on 8-9-08. He also asked the AUSA **party against me** (instead of me) for the important case's documents and talked first to her (Robinson) (although she was not even the opposing counsel) (!). During the meeting he had no legal opinion on the type of deportation order or on the fairness of the district court decision, and no will to find any agreement on the contents of the opening brief although it was very important in the context of several related cases already pending in Court. Finally, he **also refused to file an emergency motion** to take me out of home detention and to have me obtain an urgent financial help (disability benefits pending the appeal) although again the deportation order is full of lies and I have obviously been put in extremely difficult financial situation [and the fraud (lies and treacheries,) to deny the disability benefits is obvious!] [a honest lawyer would have probably obtained both **without filing any paper**; the home detention was eventually ended few weeks later on 9-17-08 and without any explanation.].

He withdrew from the case because I asked him to file **or at least let me file** this motion for injunction and he did not want to [I am/was the one suffering from these problems, not him, and **he had nothing to loose in filing the motion**, I even wrote it for him!]. I explained the situation to the Appeal Court and asked them to appoint another pro bono counsel, but they (2 other judges) refused without addressing the issue of the counsel misconduct and without honestly motivating their decision, see [exh. 25.2](#) [and the dishonest pro bono lawyer succeeded in making me loose **the only chance I have had in 6 years to be helped by a lawyer** (!)]. The Appeal Court also denied the motion for injunction with an **un-motivated** decision and refused to allow me the service by fax I had asked for in 1-10-08 because I could not pay for the stamps to send my pleadings to San Francisco. They had implicitly allowed me to file my documents by fax during about 7 months (January to August 08) and all of the sudden they changed their mind to have a reason to deny me the appointment of another pro bono counsel and to deny the motion for

injunction I had filed [see related 2nd judicial misconduct complaint at [exh.25.1](#), referring to the 8-13-08 court order [exh. 25.2](#)].

The CA9 also refused (without any motivation, see [exh. 26.4](#)) to disqualify the two Assistant US Attorneys (Robinson, Laske,) **who had repeatedly and outrageously lied on my refugee status and documents** although their lies covered up crimes as seen above [see motion to disqualify [exh. 26.2](#), and 3rd complaint of judicial misconduct, [exh.26.3](#), (the DC Court had also refused to sanction Robinson for her lies), this 3rd complaint is still pending, I believe]. The CA9 denied and granted motions I did not make or file (!); and waited to grant extension of time to file briefs **after I had filed them or served them** to the defendants, so only for the defendants benefits. They also refused to stay the appeals until the Appeal Court responds to or rules on my judicial misconduct complaints addressing the various treacheries at the District Court and at the Appeal Court although it was/is critical on the pro bono lawyer conduct issue for example since it determined my right to be helped by another pro bono lawyer! These constant judicial errors, misconducts and treacheries make it impossible to obtain justice and also follow the pattern of wrongdoings (from other administrations) which is of course extremely dishonest also [see [exh. 8](#), p. 4 and [exh. 1.1](#), p. 40-41].

F The grave prejudice I suffered, a new request for settlement, and the political and intellectual aspects of the case.

As the result of the grave wrongdoings over 7 years almost, the problems were not resolved and I suffered a very grave prejudice of course [I was repeatedly sent in the street (more than 16 times between 8-02 and 11-03), I was forced to complain over and over, I could not find work and resettle, and I eventually became very sick and was put more than 3 years on disability (for more than 3 years I lived with only \$1 every month, which is not enough to wash clothes buy toothpaste, or even pay for the stamps to send pleadings ...)]. The damage includes wages loss over a 7 years period (with the impossibility to built a retirement pension), loss of earning capacity (impossibility to obtain justice against France,), future medical expense for my health problems (and loss of years of life expectancy as the result of the living condition and health problems), psychological damage (emotional distress,). [The damage is more than \$2.5 millions in 2 lawsuits and more than \$15 million in the other one (against the SSA,) because of the obvious lies to delay the SSI payments (which are life and death matter of course); the objective of lying to deprive me of the most basic social and disability benefits was/is obviously to have me have heart attacks or stroke, or worse, and to keep me out of work, so the damage increases rapidly and is necessarily very important.].

When you know **(a)** that there are 11 millions of illegal aliens going ‘free’ in the US (a part of which are criminals who deserve a home detention and a deportation more than I do!), **(b)** that I suffered a very grave prejudice (and persecutions) in France already and came here to ask for protection, and **(c)** that I made a special work for the international community that was supported by many international and national experts, the administrations’ dishonest efforts to hurt me and the extreme hardship they imposed on me during the past 7 years are completely disproportionate and evidence also the existence of **(1)** hate crimes, **(2)** efforts to cover up the civil servants grave wrongdoings, **and (3) political persecutions** I mentioned above; even if there are also serious general problems of violations of human rights against asylum seekers at the DHS as seen in the report to US Senate on the bad treatments of asylum seekers ([exh.30](#)). Even if you did not want to punish the employees who committed civil and/or criminal overtacts, you had

ways to resolve the problems without punishing and hurting the victim (me), especially when the victim shows its good faith, is very poor, and has done a special work for the international community.

In France even though I had **(1) obvious proofs of the illegality** of my dismissal [I had even obtained a first judgment in my favor giving me a significant compensation], **(2) obvious proofs of the dishonesty** of both the administration and its Senator President who fired me [since the Senator President was sent in jail and the High Court for administration denounced the administration's corruption resulting in a loss of more 300M FF,], and **(3) obvious proofs of my good faith** and of my professional competences [since I had obtained the support of many national and international experts for my computer project proposal, [exh. 46.1](#), [exh. 46.2](#) (I even received the encouragement of the French president, [exh. 46.3](#))], **I did not obtain justice and was even put in a worst situation** (sent in the street, made owe the administration an important amount of money, etc.). **So I know that the political implications of my proposals, the national political context, and the efforts to cover up civil servants' grave wrongdoings** can seriously affect the efficiency of the justice system [that is already particularly unfair for poor], and I believe that **you also know that because the US justice system is very unfair for poor also**, and it **should encourage you to settle the case**.

Given the specific case context, the obvious contradictions on my refugee status at the DHS, the criminal wrongdoings, and your knowledge of the unfairness of the justice system for the poor and of my poverty, you should not wait for a decision from the Appeal Court to **resolve the problems**. You have enough evidences of grave wrongdoings to **(i) immediately cancel** the unfair deportation order, to **(ii) confirm** my refugee status, to **(iii) adjust** my refugee status to permanent resident status, and to **(iv) propose** a fair settlement of the civil cases including an appropriate financial compensation for the grave prejudice I suffered. [There are still 4 civil cases pending: the negligence cause of action against the County at the Superior Court (which is in a discovery phase in some way, BC 4364 736); the appeals against the County, the US and various civil servants no 07-56730, and against the SSA 08-55236 whose answer are due **on 2-13-08**; the complaint against the SSA for SSI, 08-5681, is pending at the District Court; and in the deportation case 08-55492, my reply is due on **2-17-08**; so you can easily resolve everyone of these cases in one time before filing any other pleadings].

One who robes and hurts an individual in the name of the administration is no different than the criminal who goes into a house, beats up the owner to obtain the combination of the safe, and then robes the safe, burns the house and leaves. He/she commit a grave crime (as the violent burglar) that is not excused by the fact that the crime 'saves' some money to the administration and community [at the end the cost ends up greater, as you know]. So when you allow your employees or lawyers to lie, cheat, commit crimes, and ignores existing legal authorities during legal proceedings (or let the judges do so) as they did and continue do in this case [see Laske's answer brief lies, [exh. 48](#), and [exh. 49](#)], you robe and hurt the plaintiff (me in this case) and become criminals yourselves, even if you obtain the unfair and undeserved immunity and the judges have the judicial immunity. Justice is also about finding the truth, so the lies are incompatible. There were/are unfortunately very little else I can do apart from reminding you of this in the present context, and informing the universities I had contacted, and the UN because of the work I have done; sadly the press and media have had 'partisan' position in this case so far.

I write again to the 8 University Presidents I contacted in 2002 [exh. 42.1](#), because I think they ('you') can understand (1) the grave injustice I victim of (and the wrongdoings I described here), (2) the import and political implications of my work for the international community [the computer project proposal,], and (3) the obligations the various letters of support from experts and politicians and my understanding of the project imposed on me, and therefore that 'you' (they) have a responsibility to intervene in some way to explain the complicated implications of my computer project proposal and to denounce the injustice I am victim of because of the political ideas I had and proposals I made and because of the complaints I filed. The letter I sent them 'you' on 4-7-08 [[exh. 42.2](#)] and attached letters [[exh. 43](#), [exh. 44](#)] have confirmed you, I hope, that my work **is closely related to at least one aspect of 'your' (their) work** (research), even if 'you' (they) do not necessarily agree with all my positions and/or with the solutions to some of our global problems I presented you in my letter.

I must also ask 'you' (them) to contact me as soon as possible if **anyone of 'you' (them)** has plaid any role in (or has any information on) my grant of refugee status (asylum) in 2002, so that I can inform the Appeal Court of what happened and can confirm the obvious treacheries and lies of the administrations since **2002** (especially if this letter does not lead to a rapid resolution of the problems, **my reply is due on 2-17-09**). If you have information or plaid any kind of role in the grant of my refugee status, and you do not inform me of it, then you indirectly cover up the lies and the dishonest behavior of the various administrations for the past 7 years [which, I believe, would make 'you' almost as guilty as them even if of course you will most surely not be prosecuted by the DOJ for that in the present context, the DHS and DOJ are trying to have me deported based on lies and to cover up their criminal wrongdoings !]. And if you had nothing to do with my grant of refugee status (asylum), which is possible of course, it does not change the fact that I was given refugee documents and status, that I am necessarily a victim of a grave injustice for defending political proposals and ideas, and for denouncing some civil servants grave wrongdoings as explained above, and that my case is worthy of your interest and intervention because I have worked in everyone's interest.

G Conclusion.

As explained above and in [exh. 1.1](#), p. 29-41, the deportation case's issues are **first criminal and management problems that** concern all of 'you' (LA County, CA AG, LA FBI, not just the US Attorney and DHS offices). Your refusals to respond to my employee's misconduct complaints and to address the criminal and management aspects of the case, prevented a rapid resolution of the problems and were **very prejudicial to me** of course although I had shown my good faith several times, and immediately after the first problems occurred in 2002, and although **I am necessarily a victim** who has suffered a very grave prejudice over more than 6 years here (and 15 years if we count the time of persecutions in France that led me to seek asylum in the US).

The extreme hardship you imposed on me during the past 7 years almost [after the persecutions in France, and given the special work I have done for the international community] **is completely disproportionate and evidences also the existence of (a) hate crimes, (b) efforts to cover up the civil servants grave wrongdoings, and (c) political persecutions** I have described in this letter and in my complaints, so I must ask you to show some reason and not to wait any longer to resolve the problems. **There is no need** to risk new treacheries or dishonesties from the Courts or from the LA US Attorney or ICE offices;

you have enough evidences of grave wrongdoings to **(i) immediately cancel** the unfair deportation order, to **(ii) confirm** my refugee status, to **(iii) adjust** my refugee status to permanent resident status, and to **(iv) propose** a fair settlement of the civil cases including an appropriate financial compensation for the grave prejudice I suffered.

Mrs. Napolitano, I came here to ask for protections because I was victim of political scandal and persecutions in France, and was threatened to have problems for the rest of my life. 7 years later I was handed a full of lies deportation order stating that I never had a permission to remain here and never applied for asylum although as seen above I always had a permission to remain here and applied for asylum, and 11 months after that I received a **new** refugee A3 EA card (!), so obviously some of your new colleagues (and predecessors) were/are very dishonest on my case. There are about 3 billions people living with less than \$2 a day in the world and defeating poverty is one the main objectives of humanity, and some your new colleagues harassed and hurt a French refugee homeless during 7years who has made a special work for the international community, this **cannot** be in the US, in France's or in everyone's interest, so I must ask you to please review the case personally, to correct the errors of your predecessors and to work with other administrations to propose a fair settlement and end my difficulties.

The Attorney General, Mr. Holder, has the authority to settle the case for the US and to end the treacheries and lies at the LA USA office (and perhaps to encourage Mr. Hernandez to investigate the wrongdoings), I believe; Mr. Brown has also the authority to settle the case against the State of California, I believe; and Mr. Fortner can surely recommend a settlement to the LA County Board of Supervisor also, so I must ask 'you' (them) to please end this madness, the repeated lies and the violations of criminal statutes, and to propose a fair settlement of the case. Mr. Hernandez, I often contacted your predecessors without success as you could see above, and since the US Attorney office put the responsibility on you for not doing its work and also violates criminal statutes, I must send you again all the documents and denounce the crimes I am victim of.

Finally, I must ask the 8 Universities Presidents I wrote to in 2002 to contact me as soon as possible if they have any information on or plaid any role in the grant of my refugee status in 2002, so that I can inform the Court. Moreover, you can understand the complicated implications and the import of the proposals I presented you, so I believe you have the responsibility to intervene in some way to denounce the injustice I a victim of and to help find a solution to this madness. I also copy my letter to the UNGA, to Mr. Ban Ki-Moon, to Mr. Bloomberg and to Mr. Obama to whom I presented my work and my difficulties [see [exh. 45](#)]. I look forward to hearing from you and remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Genevier

PS: I have put all the documents listed as exhibits on the Internet, so that you can access them through the links easily, and if you have any problem to access them or need a hard copy of any document, please let me know. This letter is at <http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letalladmin-uni2-5-09.pdf> to use the links.

Exhibits.

Exh. 1: Petition for review of Mr. DeMore's deportation order or appeal brief in 08-55492
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/apbrief08-55492-10-24-08.pdf>, (.1.1), + list of exhibits
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/Suprecordv110-20-08.htm>], (.1.2)]

- Exh. 2:** 2-27-08 Letter addressed to some of you,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letallcalesm2-27-08.pdf>]
- Exh. 3:** Mr. DeMore's Deportation order, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/deportorder1-11-08.pdf>]
- Exh. 4:** Acknowledgment of receipt of my asylum application (4.1.),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/asylumappliackreci5-14-2.pdf>]; + Motion to reconsider (4.2), [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/motionrecremoval1-18-08.pdf>];
- Exh. 5:** CA9 decision staying the deportation (3 p.);
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/pdf/order4-17-08in08-55492.pdf>];
- Exh. 6:** New A03 refugee EA card dated 12-3-08,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/refeacard12-3-08-2.pdf>],
- Exh. 7:** Notice of Intend to Revoke new card,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/GenevierNOIR122208.pdf>];
- Exh. 8:** My response to the notice of intend to deny my EA card dated 12-29-08 (8.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/nebraska12-29-08-3.pdf>]; + revocation decision (8.2),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/revokeacdec1-6-09.pdf>]
- Exh. 10:** Recent denial of my I-485 application to adjust to permanent resident status (10.1.),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/i-485denialdec12-19-08.pdf>], + I-485 application filed in 2003 (10.2.),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/i-485appli-5-27-03.pdf>];
- Exh. 11:** My response to denial of I-485 application (motion to reconsider) (11.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/motionreopen1-12-09.pdf>]; + AR of my motion to reconsider (11.2)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ARmoreopeni-4851-21-09.pdf>];+ my letter acknowledging error (11.3),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/appealAR1-29-09.pdf>],
- Exh. 12:** Verification of status listing me as refugee (12.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/verifstat9-5-02s.pdf>]; + verification of refugee benefits (12.2)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/verif-benefits-9-26-02.pdf>];
- Exh. 13:** ALJ Tolentino's decision (13.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/aljtolentinodec2-5-03-2.pdf>]; + hearing documents (13.2),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/dpsshearing2002s.pdf>];
- Exh. 14:** Rehearing unit decision confirming its legality (14.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/rehearingdec4-17-03.pdf>]; + rehearing documents (14.2),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/dpssrehearing2003.pdf>];
- Exh. 15:** First refugee A3 EA card dated 12-10-04 (15.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/pdf/eacard12-10-04+explanation.pdf>]; + previous C8 EA cards 02-03 (15.2),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/eacards02-03.pdf>];
- Exh. 16:** Letter to Mr. Christian dated 11-04 -04;
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letchristian11-4-04.pdf>];
- Exh. 17:** Letter to Mr. Neufeld dated 2-16-05;
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letneufeld2-16-05.pdf>];
- Exh. 18:** 12-14-07 criminal complaint letter,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/fbiusdojcomp12-14-07.htm>]
- Exh. 19:** US Attorney's response to this letter,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/ausarespcrimcomp3-10-08.pdf>]
- Exh. 20:** Altered verification of status issued by INS
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/alteredorverifstatus.pdf>];
- Exh. 21:** Motion to close the case at the Immigration Court,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/icmotionclose11-25-02.pdf>];
- Exh. 22:** INS audit office response to my complaint (22.1, 1 p.),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/respinsaudit4-25-03.pdf>]; Complaint of employee misconduct filed at the INS audit office (22.2) [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ceminsaudit1-14-03.pdf>] + subsequent letters (22.3), [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/cem-2insaudit2-21-03.pdf>];
- Exh. 23:** In absentia decision of Immigration judge dated 1-23-03,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/immjudgedec1-23-03.pdf>];
- Exh. 24:** 1st complaint of judicial misconduct (24.1)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/2ndca9compvabrams12-13-07.pdf>], + court order dated 12-4-09 (24.2)
[http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/CJMdec08_89004.pdf]
- Exh. 25:** 2nd judicial misconduct complaint (25.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ca9JMCv2aj8-29-08.pdf>], + court order 8-13-08 (25.2)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ca9dec08-55492-8-13-08.pdf>];
- Exh. 26:** 3rd complaint of judicial misconduct (CJM) (26.1)

[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ca9JMC-new2-10-3-08.pdf>], + motion to disqualify counsel (exh. 26.2), [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/motdisco07-56730-7-8-08.pdf>] + Robinson's lies (26.3)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/robinsonlies2.pdf>], + Laske's lies (26.4)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/laskelies.pdf>]; + court order 9-10-08 (26.5),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ca9dec07-56730-9-10-08.pdf>];
Exh. 27: Appeal brief in 07-56730 (27. 1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ab07-56730-9-30-08.pdf>]; +second amended complaint (27.2)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/secondamendcomp.htm>]; initial complaint (27.3)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/neglicomplast.pdf>]; + proof of claims filing (27.4),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/claimAR05-7517.pdf>];
Exh. 28: Letter from Senator Feinstein about her contact with the DHS,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/respfeinstein3-31-06.pdf>];
Exh. 29: Appeal brief vs SSA (no 08-55236) (29.1)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ab08-55236-9-30-08.pdf>]; + negligence complaint vs SSA (29.2),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ssineglicomp.pdf>]; + complaint for SSI (29.3),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/ssifedcourtappeal8-25-08.pdf>];
+ Fax to SSA and USA to request immediate SSI payment (29.4),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/SSASettlefax2-1-15-09.pdf>]; + request for status conference (29.5),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/SSAconf1-20-09-2.pdf>] ; + DC decision 1-22-09 (29.6),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/abramsdecssa1-22-09.pdf>];
Exh. 30 : Article on the bad treatments of asylum seeker by DHS,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/artasylumseeker2-8-05.pdf>];
Exh. 31 : 18 USC 1519 and 18 USC 1546, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/18USC1519and1546.pdf>];
Exh. 32 : 18 USC 1512, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/18USC1512.pdf>];
Exh. 33 : 18 USC 1513, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/18USC1513.pdf>];
Exh. 34 : PC 182, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/PC182.pdf>];
Exh. 35 : 8 CFR 207.9 and CCP 1094.5, [http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/8CFR207-9and_cc1094-5.pdf];
Exh. 36: DPSS NOAs or compliance reports, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/dpssnoaonaljdec.pdf>];
Exh. 37: DSS ALJ Letters of May 2003, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letsdssaljs5-03.pdf>];
Exh. 38: Campbell letter of October 2003, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letcampbel10-2-03.pdf>];
Exh. 39: First criminal complaint dated 2-21-05 letter (39.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/crimcomp2-21-05.pdf>];
+ criminal complaint attached (39.2), [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/crimcomp2-2005.pdf>], + US Attorney office response (39.3), [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/cc-resp-usa-3-26-05.pdf>]; +DA response (39.4), [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/cc-resp-da-3-21-05.pdf>]; + 2nd US Attorney office response (39.5), [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/cc-resp2-usa-4-28-05.pdf>]
Exh. 40: Second criminal complaint dated 4-4-05 (40.1)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/dacrimcompl4-4-05.pdf>]; + third and fourth criminal complaint (40.2),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/CrimcompFBI9-5-05and7-18-06.pdf>];
Exh. 41: Police commissioner response, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/bopolicerep3-21-05.pdf>];
Exh. 42: letter to US university president dated 5-29-02 (42.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/htm/let5-29-02.htm>]; + letter to 16 universities dated 4-7-08 (42.2)
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/uniall4-7-08.pdf>];
Exh. 43: Letter to Mr. Bloomberg dated 3-25-08, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letblo3-25-08.pdf>];
Exh. 44: Letter to the UNGA dated 3-28-08, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letunga3-25-08.pdf>]
Exh. 45: Letter to the UNGA dated 2-5-09,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/letunga2-5-09.pdf>];
Exh. 46: Computer Project proposal to INCO program and letters of support (46.1),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/incopropandletsup1.pdf>]; + additional letters of support (46.2),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/incoletsup2.pdf>]; + Chirac response (46.3),
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/respchirac5-18-98.pdf>];
Exh. 47: Letter to US officials dated 1-14-03, [<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/gwb1-14-03.pdf>];
Exh. 48: Mr. Laske answer brief in 08-55492,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/answerbrief08-55492c.pdf>];
Exh. 49: My draft reply brief in 08-55492,
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/replybrief08-55492-2-5-09.pdf>];
Exh. 50: My future final reply brief in 08-55492 will be at
[<http://pgenevier.110mb.com/npdf/replybrief08-55492-2-15-09.pdf>] on 2-15-09.