

Pierre GENEVIER  
18 Rue des Canadiens, App. 227  
86000 Poitiers

Phone: 09 80 73 50 18; Cell: 07 82 85 41 63; Email: [pierre.genevier@laposte.net](mailto:pierre.genevier@laposte.net).

Mr. Rik Daems, President of the Parliamentary Assembly, and Mmes/MM. the Members of the Assembly  
Mr. Heiko Maas, President of the Committee of Ministers, and Mmes/M. the Members of the Committee  
Mr. Vladimir Putin, Mr. Sergey Lavrov  
Mr. Boris Johnson, Mr. Dominic Raab  
Mrs. Angela Merkel  
Mr. Alexander De Croo, Mrs. Sophie Wilmès  
Mr. Jüri Ratas, Mr. Urmas Reinsalu  
Mr. Pablo Iglesias  
Mrs. Fatou Bensouda  
Mr. Antonio Guterres

Poitiers, November 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020

**Copy:** Mrs. and MM. the Representatives of countries members of the UN Security Council (and the Representatives of newly elected countries, Kenya, India, Mexico, Ireland, Norway); Office for democratic institutions and human right.

**Object:** United Kingdom's response ([Exh. 2](#)) to my 7-10-20 letter ([Exh. 1](#)); request for a preliminary examination at the ICC on the *crime against humanity* accusations described on 7-10-20 [and following the 5-15-20 letter ([Exh. 16](#)) linked to my first ECHR request dated 3-18-20 ([Exh. 20](#), [Exh. 21](#), [Exh. 22](#), [Exh. 23](#))]; contents of my 3<sup>rd</sup> ([Exh. 3](#), [Exh. 4](#)), 4<sup>th</sup> ([Exh. 5](#), [Exh. 6](#)) and 5<sup>th</sup> ([Exh. 7](#), [Exh. 8](#)) ECHR requests against France dated 11-6-20; and application for the *Chief Information Technology Officer* position ([Exh. 43](#)). [PDF French version at: <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-CPI-UNSC-COE-reqno3-5-FR-23-11-20.pdf>; English version at: <http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-CPI-UNSC-COE-reqno3-5-EN-23-11-20.pdf>].

Dear Mr. Daems and Mmes/MM. the Members of the Parliamentary Assembly,  
Dear Mr. Maas and Mmes/MM. the Members of the Committee of Ministers,  
Dear Mr. Putin and Mr. Lavrov,  
Dear Mr. Johnson and Mr. Raab,  
Dear Mrs. Merkel,  
Dear Mr. De Croo and Mrs. Wilmès,  
Dear Mr. Ratas and Mr. Reinsalu,  
Dear Mrs. Bensouda,  
Dear Mr. Guterres,

1. Referring to my letters dated 7-10-20 ([Exh. 1](#)) and 5-15-20 [([Exh. 0.1](#))] describing my accusations of crime against humanity and the contents of my ECHR requests dated 3-18-20 ([Exh. 20](#), [Exh. 21](#), [Exh. 22](#), [Exh. 23](#)), and 6-23-20 ([Exh. 18](#), [Exh. 19](#), [Exh. 17](#)), I take the liberty of writing you again **(1) to comment briefly** the United Kingdom's response ([Exh. 2](#)) to my 7-10-20 letter; **(2) to justify** – more precisely and formally – the opening of an investigation at the ICC on the situation described on 7-10-20, and to ask Mrs. Bensouda to launch a preliminary investigation on these accusations from 2002 to today; **(3) to describe** the contents of my new ECHR requests [proofs of the crime against humanity, 3<sup>rd</sup> ([Exh. 3](#), [Exh. 4](#)), 4<sup>th</sup> ([Exh. 5](#), [Exh. 6](#)) and 5<sup>th</sup> ([Exh. 7](#), [Exh. 8](#)) requests] dated 11-6-20; **(4) to study briefly** certain consequences of my 7-10-20 accusations; and **(5) to ask** Mr. Putin, Mr. Johnson, Mrs Merkel, Mr. De Croo, and Mr. Ratas **(a) to take into consideration** the precisions presented here (supporting the opening of an ICC investigation) in their analysis of *the situation* described on 7-10-

20 ([Exh.1](#)), **(b) to organize** a vote at the UN Security Council (if possible in December to allow Germany and Belgium to vote) to transmit the situation at the ICC (and to ask for an investigation **from 1991 to today**), and **(c) to ask** the UN Secretariat *(i)* to launch the project to develop the 2 global computer applications (and the associated international information system) necessary to improve the legal aid (LA) systems around the world (see details at **no 66-67**), and *(ii)* to consider my application the position of *Chief Information Technology Officer* (described on the UN Website, [Exh.43](#)) to allow me to supervise this work from inside the UN.

[1.1 I am sorry for the length of this letter, but I must study in details the well-founded of my accusations and discuss several other subjects that are linked and important. I must also talk about my criminal proceeding, and therefore about personal matters, but it is in the sole purpose of establishing the well-founded of my accusations and the criminal responsibilities of certain French politicians in the difficulties I encountered. Also, I am using a 1,5 spacing to facilitate the reading of the letter, so this too makes the letter a little bit longer.].

### **A The United Kingdom's response to my 7-10-20 letter.**

2. In its brief answer dated 9-2-20 ([Exh.2](#)), United Kingdom's ministry of foreign affairs explains that, even if the unconstitutionality (or the non compliance with the ECHR) of the French legal aid law (LA) were established, *the attacks against the more than 14 millions poor dependent on the French LA system* (described in my letter) resulting from the dishonest LA law, would not fit the definition of a crime against humanity and would therefore not justify (a) the International Criminal Court (ICC) jurisdiction and intervention [*'Thank you for your email of 19th July to the Foreign Secretary. In your email you requested a referral to the International Criminal Court (ICC), via the UN Security Council, alleging French officials have committed crimes against humanity. Crimes against humanity are certain acts that are purposely committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian or an identifiable part of a civilian population. This definition applies both in times of war and peace. Any claims on the inadequacy, or not, of the French legal aid system do not meet this basic definition. Therefore, we cannot support your call for a referral.'*], and, implicitly also, not justify (b) the intervention of the UN Security Council.

3. Unfortunately, this response does not directly comment (1) the LA law's problems, and not at all (2) the propositions I made to improve the LA systems in France and around the world. The refusal to comment the LA law's problems is – for me – **unfortunate (1)** because the experts from the United Kingdom [that spends for its LA system **5 times more than what** France spends to render the same service to a total population similar to the one we have in France, and although its wealth level is also equivalent France's wealth level] necessarily understand well that the French LA law is much more than inadequate [if the service rendered by the French LA system were *adequate*, the UK experts would surely have recommended the use of the French LA system to **decrease the cost of the service for the UK** (!), except if they were not honest on this subject, which is not obvious at first sight]; **and (2)** because the study of the LA law's problems in France allows us to understand better both **the gravity** of the crime against humanity I described, and **the well-founded** of the proposals I made to improve the LA system around the world (including in the UK) at a lower cost.

4. The *'any claim of inadequacy, or not'* bother me also because, during the past 20 years, I have presented several QPCs in France and requests at the ECHR **to denounce** the dishonesty (*'inadequacy'*, unconstitutionality) of the LA law (...) **and to demand the judgment of this question**, and each time the judges cheated or lied to avoid responding to the question [including **the Constitutional Court's judges in 2015**; and this

although this court usually takes 3 months to give an answer on this kind of simple questions!], therefore the problem described in my letter ([Exh.1](#)) and the dishonesty of the French politicians (and judges) on this LA subject are not only due to the fact that the LA law [the OMAs (obligation to have a lawyer), the short delays] is (are) dishonest, but also to the fact that the French judges and politicians have refused to give a precise and honest response to this particular question, '*Is the LA law unconstitutional*' (or not *non conformed to the ECHR*) [this type of behavior is one of the elements used by the ICC to **determine whether an inquiry should be opened on a crime against humanity** (as we will see it at no 12), so the UK should note it].

5. Finally, the most important remarks here remains, of course, the fact that the UK experts or diplomats **do not** think that the use of the dishonest LA law (and the OMAs and the short delays) to rob **systematically** the French poor who present themselves in front of the justice, constitutes *a crime against humanity* or **a large scale attack against** a vulnerable population, **the more than 14 millions poor who depend on the LA law in France**, over a 30 years period about [see '*Crimes against humanity are certain acts that are purposely committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian or an identifiable part of a civilian population. ... Any claims on the inadequacy, or not, of the French legal aid system do not meet this basic definition.*'], and there I am forced to say that I do not agree with this conclusion. I will therefore now study in details the questions of the ICC competency and of the nature and gravity of *the crime* described; and I would be grateful to MM. Johnson and Raab if they could (a) take into account the precisions I will give now to reconsider their point of view, and (b) share their experiences and point of view on this LA subject. Few years ago, (I can make a mistake, but I believe that) I read an article in which Mr. Cameron talked about (eventually) quitting the ECHR because, according to him, the guarantees offered by the UK justice system were greater than the ones the ECHR gives to the people who seize it; and, if we just look at the efforts made by the UK on the LA subject in comparison to other countries depending on the ECHR, his remark seems pertinent on this subject at least. Unfortunately, M. Cameron did not encourage the other countries, and, in particular France, to make progress on this domain.

### **B The request for a preliminary examination presented to Mrs. Bensouda.**

6. I am going to (1) **mention here** certain ICC legal authorities and legal references **to justify** the request made (a) to Mrs. Bensouda to launch *a preliminary examination* on the *situation* described in my 7-10-20 (without waiting for the UN security Council vote requested on 7-10-20, [Exh.1](#)) and (b) to Mr. Putin, Mr. Johnson, Mrs. Merkel, Mr. De Croo, and Mr. Ratas to organize a vote at the Security Council to transmit the situation to the ICC (and request for an investigation **starting in 1991**); and (2) **describe** the elements that the ICC uses to determine if there is *a reasonable basis* to open an investigation, namely, I believe, **the jurisdiction** (*temporal, subject-matter, territorial or personal*), **the admissibility** (complementarity and gravity), and the **interests of justice**.

#### 1) The ICC jurisdiction for this situation.

##### **a) The temporal jurisdiction.**

7. For *the temporal jurisdiction*, it is obvious that the *crime* [against humanity that I denounce and that falls under the ICC's jurisdiction; the systematic violations of the depending-on-legal-aid's poor fundamental rights

when they present themselves in front of the justice] was committed between **2002 and today**, is being committed, and is about to be committed in France. Moreover, since the UN Security Council can ask the ICC to investigate crimes committed before **2002** ([Exh. 14, no 37](#)), I am asking Mr. Putin, Mr. Johnson, Mrs Merkel, Mr. De Croo, and M. Ratas to recommend to the Security Council to widen the period on which this crime should be investigated by the ICC and to start it in **1991**; but, of course, Mrs. Bensouda does not need to wait for the Security Council's vote to officially start the preliminary investigation on this situation (**from 2002 to today**). We can therefore say that the ICC's *temporal jurisdiction* is established without any doubt.

**b) The ICC subject-matter jurisdiction (and the territorial or personal jurisdiction).**

**8.** For *the subject-matter jurisdiction*, I must first come back on the elements of the crime against humanity of *persecution*. The elements of this crime are: 1. The perpetrator severely deprived, contrary to international law (21) **one or more persons** of fundamental rights. 2. The perpetrator targeted such person or persons by reason of the identity of a group or collectivity or targeted the group or collectivity as such. 3. Such targeting was based on **political**, racial, national, ethnic, cultural, **religious**, gender as defined in article 7, paragraph 3, of the Statute, or other grounds that are universally recognized as impermissible under international law. [3. "*Attack directed against a civilian population*" in these context elements is understood to mean a course of conduct involving the multiple commission of acts referred to in article 7, paragraph 1, of the Statute against any civilian population, pursuant to or in furtherance of a State or organizational policy to commit such attack. The acts need not constitute a military attack. It is understood that "policy to commit such attack" requires that the State or organization actively promote or encourage such an attack against a civilian population (6).]. 4. The conduct was committed in connection with any act referred to in article 7, paragraph 1, of the Statute or any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court (22). 5. The conduct was committed as part of **a widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population**. 6. The perpetrator **knew** that the conduct was part of or intended the conduct to be part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population.

[8.1 I would like to remind you also that **the systematic violation of the right to a due process** (art. 6.1) enters also explicitly under the definition of War crime of denying a fair trial. Elements: 1. *The perpetrator deprived one or more persons of a fair and regular trial by denying judicial guarantees as defined, in particular, in the third and the fourth Geneva Conventions of 1949.* 2. *Such person or persons were protected under one or more of the Geneva Conventions of 1949.* 3. *The perpetrator was aware of the factual circumstances that established that protected status.* 4. *The conduct took place in the context of and was associated with an international armed conflict.* 5. *The perpetrator was aware of factual circumstances that established the existence of an armed conflict.*]

**9.** First, we can speak of « *attack directed against a civilian population* » because the (criticized) behavior consists of using the dishonest LA law (...) to systematically violate the poor fundamental rights; and there is no doubt that the State deliberately and actively encourages (ed) the attack against the poor when it maintains (ed) the dishonest LA law (...) [and when it ignores (ed) my well-documented critics against the LA law ...]. [As explained in my 7-10-20 letter, [Exh. 1, no 2-10](#), and my ECHR requests dated 3-18-20 ([Exh. 20, Exh. 21, Exh. 22](#)) and 6-23-20, ([Exh. 18, Exh. 19](#)),]

**The perpetrators** [of this crime, the high level officials (politicians and others) of the successive governments and assemblies (Mr. Macron, Mr. Philippe, Mrs. Belloubet, Mr. Le Maire, Mr. Hollande, Mr. Valls, Mrs. Taubira, Mr. Larcher, Mr. Bartolone, ..., Mr. Sarkozy, Mr. Fillion, Mr. Jospin, Mr. Toubon,...), of administrations (Mr. Toubon,) of concerned justice' courts (Mrs. Belloubet, Mr. Stirn, Mrs. Arens, Mr. Louvel, Mr. Guérin, Mr. Soulard, Mr. Debré, Mr. Jospin, ...) having any responsibility in the maintenance and functioning of the LA system] **have used** and are still using the dishonest LA law (...) to violate the poor fundamental rights (and to obtain undue advantages), and have deliberately targeted the vulnerable population for **political** motives (including the victims' increased vulnerability, the gain of undue advantages,); **the reprehensible acts committed** (the violation of rights described in art. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,

13, 14 ... of the ECHR,) were (are and will be as long as the law is not abrogated) **systematic** [as have confirmed it the lawyers' representatives, the parliamentary reports on the LA law, my QPCs, and other elements of proofs like the fact that UK spends 5 times what France spends for it LA system, see [Exh. 34, p. 20](#)], and **widespread** because the number of **direct** victims of LA system (the OMAs, short delays) every year is significant [even if, of course, everyone of the + 14 millions poor depending on the LA system do not go in front of the justice every year. The reasonable estimation of my 7-10-20 letter gives a number of **88 000** (grave) victims since 2000, so we can use the word '**widespread**'].

**10. The perpetrators** (who are either **high-level legal experts** or **high-level and experimented politicians**) **knew (1) that** their behavior (leading to, among other, the retention of the LA law ...) had for consequences the systematic violation of poor (depending on the LA law) fundamental rights, a civilian population; and **(2) that** the retention of the dishonest LA law, the OMAs, and the short delays had for objective (and for result) **(a) to facilitate and encourage** the systematic violation of the fundamental rights of the poor who present themselves in front of the justice (even though the official objective of the law was *to insure the respect of the poor rights*), and, of course, also, **(b) to gain** undue advantages [including, among other, a form of immunity when they fight in Court against poor, the increased vulnerability and the impoverishment of (and difficult living conditions for) the victims (**more than 14 millions poor**) depending on the LA law; see R2 [Exh. 18, Exh. 19](#)]. The **subject-matter jurisdiction** is therefore established also. And the ICC **territorial or personal jurisdiction** is also established because France is a State party to the Rome Statute, and the crime was committed in France and by French officials.

*2) The admissibility of the case (complementarity and gravity).*

**a) The question of complementarity.**

**11.** For the admissibility, the **question of complementarity**, '*the complementarity assessment is case-specific and relates to whether genuine investigations and prosecutions have been or are being conducted in the State concerned in respect of the case(s) identified by the Office. 3*' ([Exh. 15, no 46](#)). Here it is obvious **(1) that** the parliamentary (and others) reports on the LA law that were published (since 2000, [Exh. 41, Exh. 40, Exh. 39, Exh. 38, Exh. 37, Exh. 36, Exh. 35, Exh. 34](#)) can be called **investigations** on the functioning and efficiency of the LA system (for the poor and Society), and **(2) that** these reports put forward (a) obvious and grave functioning problems that affect the quality of the service rendered to the poor, and (b) the *systemic* nature of these problems, and **yet (3) that** nothing was done to resolve the described problems, in particular, (i) to change the LA system's architecture that is one of the most serious problems, and (ii) to put in place a sufficient and appropriate financing. It is also obvious that everything has been done **to avoid (1)** that the justice (Conseil constitutionnel, ECHR,) admits the unconstitutionality of the LA law since 2012 (and even 2000 for the ECHR), and investigates the criminal wrongdoings and the corrupt system resulting from the dishonest LA law (...) despite the complaints I filed [and even though the reports on the LA law put forward systematic violations of the poor fundamental rights], and **(2) that** criminal responsibilities be attributed to the people responsible for maintaining the law and to those (judges, prosecutor, lawyers,) who used it to rob the poor ... [as my ECHR petitions dated 18-3-20 ([Exh. 20, Exh. 21, Exh. 22](#)) and 23-6-20, ([Exh. 18, Exh. 19](#)) explains it, I have filed 2 criminal complaints in Poitiers and one at the '*parquet national financier*' (PNF) to denounce the corruption system linked to the LA law that robs systematically the poor **without obtaining any response**.]

*(i) The domestic inactivity and the frauds of the judges.*

12. According to an ICC legal authority ([Exh. 15 no 47](#)), ‘*The absence of national proceedings, i.e. domestic inactivity, is sufficient to make the case admissible*’; and here the different governments since 2000 did see that the successive parliamentary (and others) reports put forward obvious problems (without mentioning my QPCs, my letters, ...), and yet the French State (politicians and highest judges in the country) did and does (do) nothing to act and correct the injustices resulting from the law. And as I explained it in my ECHR petitions, I presented several QPCs in France that were unjustly (illegally) and deliberately rejected to maintain the dishonest law, and to (knowingly) continue violating the poor fundamental rights. In the context of my 2015 QPCs studied by the Constitutional court, the Justice minister, the president of France, and the presidents of the national assembly and senate had the possibility **and the duty** to give their point of view on the law; and I did ask them to do so in writing ([R2-D17](#) and [R2-D16](#)), but they remained silent and let the Constitutional court and the prime minister cheat and lie to reject the QPC [this, among other reasons, is why we can say that they have a **direct** responsibility in the poor fundamental right violations, and that they are **perpetrators** of the crime against humanity, here no 9-10, see [R2-D16](#)], **therefore** there is more than *domestic inactivity*, there is an obvious effort to dissimulate the crime against humanity.

[12.1 It is important to note that, in this case, there has also been an obvious effort **on the** government, representatives and senators, and **journalists** part to prevent the described LA law problems **from being discussed publicly** in the press and medias , see [R2-ann 34, Exh. 19](#); I have written to numerous newspapers including *le Canard Enchaîné*, an investigative newspaper that regularly reveals scandalous affairs, and that could have talked about the different LA law problems, but the *le Canard* kept silent, and its lead investigator in the justice area, Mrs. Dominique Simonot, has been **recently** (rewarded) named by Mr. Macron to an important position (*Contrôleur des prisons*); and Mr. Macron also named a journalist as *Défenseurs des droits* (to replace Mr. Toubon), although the press and medias have obviously dissimulated the dishonesty of the LA law over a 30 years period.].

*(ii) The inactivity of the UN special rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders and of European Council.*

13. The inactivity of the UN special rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders and of European Council is not (it seems) taken into consideration by the ICC, but the crime lasted 30 years about, so the maintenance of the dishonest LA law necessarily required the implicit consent of certain international instances; and since I described the problem to Mr. Forst in 2019 (...), and to Mrs Mijatovic and Mrs. Pejcinovic Buric in 2020, and they did not respond (honestly) to the problems I described, the LA law problems are necessarily minimized by these institutions and persons. In my 5-15-20 letter ([Exh. 16, no 9](#)), I explained (that I thought) that my accusations against the LA law made me a *human rights defenders* and were, in part, the cause of the persecutions I was victim of; and I asked for the help that the human rights commissioner grants to *human rights defenders* [see the Commissioner Website, ‘*The work of human rights defenders is essential for the advancement of human rights, democracy and the rule of law. Human rights defenders play a central role in making state policies human rights compliant and authorities accountable. Human rights defenders are also instrumental in defending victims of human rights violations and ensuring their access to redress and remedy. Human rights defenders are key partners of the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights. .... Support for the work of human rights defenders, their protection and the development of an enabling environment for their activities lie at the core of the Commissioner’s mandate.* ’].

14. Then in my emails, I asked Mrs. Mijatovic to correct me if she thought that I made an error in calling myself a *human rights defender*, but she did not respond to this question; and recently she finally

sent a response (*unfair*, I believe, [Exh. 13](#)) that refuses to discuss the question of the unconstitutionality of the LA law and of the fact that my critics make me *a human rights defenders*, and explain the persecutions I am victim of. I will come back on this subject that is linked to another criteria below; but, after reading the important elements taken into consideration to establish the commission of the crime against humanity, you will surely understand why neither the Court of Cassation, the Constitutional Court, the European Council, nor the human right commissioner (among others) want to admit the unconstitutionality of the LA law; to admit the unconstitutionality of the LA law, is admitting *the character systematic* of the attacks against the poor (and of the poor fundamental rights violations) that is **an important element** to establish the commission of the crime against humanity by the French political leaders and judges (!). In short on this subject, we can say that *the complementarity* criteria is met.

**b) The question of the gravity of the crime.**

**15.** The question of the crime's gravity is tricky of course because all the crimes entering in the ICC jurisdiction are necessarily grave; 'The Office's assessment of gravity includes both quantitative and qualitative considerations...', and '*the factors that guide the Office's assessment include the scale, nature, manner of commission of the crimes, and their impact.*' ([Exh. 14 no 61](#)); '*The scale of the crimes may be assessed in light of, inter alia, the number of direct and indirect victims, the extent of the damage caused by the crimes, ...*'; '*The nature of the crimes refers to the specific elements of each offense such as killings, rapes ..., persecution, ...*'; and '*The manner of commission of the crimes may be assessed in light of, inter alia, the means employed to execute the crime, the degree of participation and intent of the perpetrator (if discernible at this stage), the extent to which the crimes were systematic or result from a plan or organised policy or otherwise resulted from the abuse of power or official capacity, and elements of particular cruelty, including the vulnerability of the victims ...*'. Et '*The impact of crimes may be assessed in light of, inter alia, the sufferings endured by the victims and their increased vulnerability ...*'.

*(i) The nature and scale of the crimes (the number of direct or indirect victims, the extent of the damage caused by the crimes...).*

**16.** Even if the committed crimes are not (*directly*) murders, rapes, (a) they can be their indirect **cause**, (b) they can be the absence of the legal recognition of a murder or a rape [... ; as explains it my 7-10-20 letter taking as example the affair *Saoud c. France* judged at the ECHR, [Exh. 19, R2-ann no 5-6](#)], and (c) they are without any doubt the violation of the poor fundamental rights (and sometimes, as in my case, *degrading treatments* and *forced labor*), therefore the suffering caused to this population (vulnerable, the poor) **are real and grave**. Also, it is clear that the crime constitutes *a persecution* of a population of more that 14 millions individuals, the poor depending on LA, and therefore that the number of **direct** victims of the crime **is significant** (my 7-10-20 letter put forward a potential number of victims **of 88 000** since 2000, here, [no 9](#), and [Exh. 1, no 5-8](#)). Finally, my 7-10-20 letter put forward also a considerable number (**more than 7 billions**) of **indirect** victims due (a) to the work **(1) that I was doing at the time** in 1997, 1998, 1999 [...; and (b) to the import of the proposal presented to the INCO-Copernicus program, and (c) to the French government behavior, [Exh. 1, no 26-33](#)] when I was victim of the LA system, the OMA for the first time, and **(2) that I am doing now** (see proposal to improve the LA systems around the world and its import, [Exh. 31](#), [Exh. 32](#), [Exh. 29](#), [Exh. 30](#)).

*(ii) The manner of commission (the means employed, the degree of participation and intent of the perpetrator ..., the nature more or less systematic of the crimes) and the impact of the crimes (suffering endured by the victims and the increased vulnerability).*

**17.** When it comes to the manner of commission of the crime (as my 5-15-20 letter explains it, [Exh. 16, no 9.1](#)),

the use of the LA system and the OMAs (...) to rob the poor is a **perfect crime** because the poor are vulnerable; and it is difficult for them to defend themselves against the attacks for numerous reasons [most of them do not have (1) the knowledge and experience necessary to defend themselves in front of the justice, (2) the financial means (and others) and the time; as an example, the presentation of my 5 ECHR requests represents **about 8 months of work**, and just the photocopies and the stamps to send the requests cost **more than 300 euros** (more than half the minimum salary), (3) the access to the useful resources if they are in jail ...]. Moreover, the problem is not just the dishonesty of the LA law, but also of the **OMAs** that **force** the poor **to use** the dishonest LA system (and the short delays); and, of course, **the** (dishonest) **behavior** of judges and prosecutors, who make the LA system work and who benefit from it with undue advantages, **makes** all critics from the poor impossible also (see here section c). Therefore we can say (1) that the means employed to commit the crime (including the number of persons involved) are important, (2) that **the degree of participation** of the perpetrators is necessarily important too [**the fact that there are an important number of perpetrators does not diminish the degree of participation of each of them**], and (3) that the intent of the perpetrators is obvious. The violations of the fundamental rights **are systematic** (as seen above), even if the gravity of the consequences necessarily varies; as I explained it, in the context of a divorce by mutual agreement, the LA system will not lead to any injustice (because of the nature of the proceeding and of the allocated sums by the LA law for this proceeding), but it is a notable exception that is (wast) mentioned in all the reports (or almost).

**18.** Concerning the **impact of the crime**, it is necessarily **considerable** for the victims, who are already vulnerable, and for society [of course, it is more difficult to imagine for someone who has never been poor, but it remains measurable]. The suffering are obvious for the victims of violations of articles 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 of the ECHR due to (or not recognized because of) the dishonest LA law (OMAs, shorts delays.). For the victims of violations art. 6.1 only, the suffering can also be considerable, for example when they lead (a) to more poverty (or even when they impose a new unjustified debt on the victims) and (b) to moral harassment, or when they transform the victim into a delinquent (...). In my case, the dishonest LA law (and OMAs, and short delays) caused me prejudice in several cases over more than 20 years, and maintained me into poverty over **more than 20 years** (...). the increased vulnerability of the victim is also automatic. For society, the impact of *the crime* is also considerable because *the crime* has for consequences the corruption of society, and in particular of the justice, and this has negatives consequences on the functioning (and the integrity) of administrations and of businesses (among others); and it increases social spending (...). To conclude on this criteria used by the ICC, we can say that **the admissibility of the case** (complementarity and gravity) is established.

### 3) Interests of justice.

**19.** The last criteria that must be studied, **the interests of justice to investigate**, is also critical, I think. ‘*The Office will consider, in particular, the interests of victims, including the views expressed by the victims themselves as well as by trusted representatives and other relevant actors such as community, religious, political or tribal leaders, States, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations.*’ [the parliamentary (and others) reports (attached here) were written, among others, in asking people who know well the LA system and its problems, so the ICC will be able to use them]; ‘*feasibility is not a separate factor under the Statute as such when determining whether to open*

*an investigation*’, it seems, but, here, the investigation that could be costly in term of time (...), is not unfeasible; certain cases will surely be more evident or easier than others, like the cases that were already studied on the merits by the ECHR, or when the victims will present by themselves well documented files as I hope I will do. I have already briefly talked about this question of the interest of justice in my 7-10-20 letter, but I would like to come back briefly on some important points.

**a) The interest of victims.**

**20.** First, the *interest of the victims* (passed and future) in an ICC investigation on this crime against humanity, is obvious. An ICC investigation on this grave problem is the only way to render – completely – justice to the tens (if not hundreds) of thousands (if not millions) of French poor, victims of the dishonest LA law (...) since 1991, for the sufferings and others prejudices unjustified that they have endured for about 30 years. (As my 7-10-20 letter explains it, [Exh. 1, no 9](#)) The ECHR corrects only partially the graves injustices and prejudices the poor endured for several reasons; and, in addition to that, it is difficult to present a petition at the ECHR, and the ECHR studies on the merits only a very small percentage (about 5%, I believe) of the petition it receives [and probably an even smaller percentage of the petition presented by a poor **without a lawyer**]. My case is a good example of the difficulties to complain at the ECHR for a poor, and a proof of the commission of the crime against humanity since I suffered of it **during 23 years**, and in **5 different affairs**. In the affair I study here (**no 31-66**), it took me about 8 months [after more than 8 years of proceeding and treacheries and lies on everything from the magistrates (of moral harassment...)] to write 5 petitions (that may not be perfect, but that show, I hope, an obvious effort to be precise and to use pertinent legal references and legal authorities); and the 8 months of work do not change the fact that the **probability** that the Court accepts to study it on the merits or simply to transmits the petition, is very small [much less than 5% probably for a **non lawyer**]. Also, the ECHR does not have any *guidelines* to submit a complex case requiring the presentation of several petitions (like my case), and it did not respond to my letters’ requests to simplify the petition’s presentation ([Exh. 10](#), [Exh. 23](#)), and this also complicates the petition’s preparation.

**21.** Moreover, the participation of judges and prosecutors in the fraud linked to the LA law is obvious, therefore it is impossible for a poor to obtain justice in France [even under the *surveillance* of the ICC probably. As we are going to see it below, in my criminal case, the judges lied and cheated on everything to transform me in a delinquent and an imbecile incapable of describing his accusations (and even in a sort of monster, **no 45**), and threatened me of criminal prosecution in writing and implicitly]; and it is important that the ICC investigates this situation, explains the problem, and denounces the harmful and grave behavior of French politicians, judges, (...). Also, if the ECHR decides to study my petitions, it could take years before it does a detailed legal and factual analysis on the LA law problems, while the ICC would do this analysis **in its phase 2** of the preliminary examination (and **therefore relatively rapidly**); the investigation will therefore be without any doubt important and useful to the victims [the documents that I attached here (my ECHR petitions, QPCs), allow you to evaluate certain of the poor suffering and the manner of commission used to cause prejudice to the poor (...); and I will do everything I can, and will bring all the necessary additional information to help the prosecutor’s office take its decision to investigate on this situation].

**b) The fundamental question of the use of religion to violate human rights.**

**22.** An important underlying question of this affair is, I believe, the use of religion to violate human rights (and, **in particular here, to violate the poor fundamental rights**); and, for numerous reasons, it is in the interest of justice to address this important question rapidly. Indeed, one of the main reasons of the systematic violation of the poor (depending on LA) fundamental rights in France, is the fact that LA law pays to the lawyers only **1/10<sup>th</sup>** [**or even 1/20<sup>th</sup> or even less**; for example, the LA law **pays** a lawyer specialized in the highest courts **382 euros** to defend a supreme court's petition, which probably represents only one hour of work for most of these high level lawyers, and although certain cases require at least 10 hours of work **just to read the file!**] of what they ask to their normal clients to do the same work, and therefore that the lawyers are forced **to do charity** (to give to the poor their own money or their time which is the same thing) to the poor to guarantee the respects of human rights, which they cannot do (**most of the time**, and therefore cannot do in a systematic manner), and **which they do not do**, of course, even though the French government (among others) uses the commandments of the catholic church, '*help your neighbor*', and the **interested** belief of the population that the lawyer's promise to do the charity to the poor is enough to guarantee the respect of the poor fundamental rights [(!) **the fact that many people** (probably a majority of people) think that the poor should not have the right to legal aid, even in the criminal defense area for which it is an obligation guaranteed by the ECHR (as my 2<sup>nd</sup> petition explains it), **helps** the politicians rob the poor of course; not long ago, a French senator presented a law project to deprive the poor terrorists (who survive their attacks and are presented to the justice) of legal aid (!); this was doubly dishonest, (1) because the LA system is so dishonest that the poor terrorists, who present themselves in front of the justice, are not well defended by their LA lawyers, and (2) because it is an international obligation to provide a lawyer to a poor (who ever he is) in criminal defense matter (!)].

**23. In theory**, the catholic Church should be my greatest *supporter* on this LA subject; and it should explain to everyone that the concept of charity and the commandments of the catholic church do not allow us to guarantee that the lawyers will furnish the necessary work to defend efficiently the rights of the poor, and that the (French) State must therefore **absolutely change** its LA system, and put in place a new system that pays the lawyer enough and in proportion to the factual and legal difficulties of the cases; but in real life, it does not do it obviously [probably because this gives it some power in front of politicians and governments that wrongly use its commandments to rob the poor (!)]. I am not trying to kill the catholic religion (**and the others**), religions play an important role in society, but it seems obvious **(1) that** numerous crimes are committed in the name of (or in using) religion, and therefore **(2) that** the different religions should discuss this problem and re-think about their role in a modern society to avoid this type of problems [see my point of view presented in 2016 in the context of my informal application to the UNSG position ([Exh. 49.2, p. 5](#)) ; recently in France, a professor was decapitated by a young Islamic terrorist, and 3 other persons were killed in a church in Nice by another Islamic terrorist; and, of course, millions of poor are deprived of their fundamental rights in the name of the pretended strength of catholic religion commandments]; and **(3) that** the governments (starting by the French one) should avoid taking advantage of religions to escape their legal obligations and to rob the poor in particular. Also, the fight against (or more exactly the eradication of) poverty is the UN **number one goal** (goal 1 of the SDG), and justice can and must help resolve this grave problem, and it can do it in investigating on this affair.

c) **Other countries have LA problems, the interest of defining norms of quality for LA systems (...).**

24. Moreover, France is not the only country to have problems with its LA system; as explained in my 7-10-20 letter ([Exh. 1, no 11.1](#), and the attached New York Times article, [Exh. 54](#)), the LA system in USA is also very imperfect, even in the criminal defense domain. And a recent article (report on the European council website) criticized the absence of lawyer for the poor in police custody **in Poland**, I believe. The judgment of this affair presents therefore an obvious interest for all the justice's administrations around the world (and **for the ICC** that is at the top spot in the criminal justice area because it judges the most serious crimes); indeed, an investigation on this situation will allow us to study the (and eventually to define some) standards of quality that are necessary to guarantee the respect of the poor rights, and could help the Security Council to make good recommendations to improve the situation at the international level. Also, justice is very expensive, and one of the means to decrease the cost of justice, and indirectly to improve the efficiency of justice, is to **mutualise** (share) certain spending with as many countries as possible, and to define common norms, and the justice (the ICC) can (help to) do this in investigating on this affair and in recommending the use of common computer applications by the largest (possible) number of countries.

d) **The interest of an investigation for the maintenance of international peace and security.**

25. The Court (ICC) does not try to know if an investigation on a particular situation is in the interest of the maintenance of international peace and security because this is one of the prerogatives of the UN Security Council ([Exh. 14 no 69](#)), but, as this letter is also addressed to leaders of countries members of the Security Council, I mention this particular point and refer the persons concerned to the arguments presented in my 7-10-20 on this subject ([Exh. 1, no 21-42](#)). **The interest of an investigation** (on this situation) for *the maintenance of international peace and security is obvious*, so, even though Mrs. Bensouda can launch a preliminary examination without having the Security Council decision, *you* must organize this vote and underline this fact (in addition to widen the period on which the ICC should investigate).

4) Conclusion on the request for a preliminary examination presented to Mrs. Bensouda.

26. In conclusion, even if the analysis presented here is succinct, it leaves no doubt, I believe, **(1) that the situation** that I described you in my 7-10-20 letter, and that is linked to the dishonesty of the LA law (the OMAS and the short delays to present certain pleadings) in France, **put forward** '*(a) a situation that appears to fall within the jurisdiction of the Court, (b) matters which are neither manifestly outside the jurisdiction of the Court nor related to situations already under preliminary examination or investigation*', and **(c) therefore warrant further analysis**', ([Exh. 14 no 78-79](#)); and **(2) that there is already a reasonable basis** allowing you to think that the alleged crimes fall under **the subject matter jurisdiction** of the ICC, and therefore that a preliminary examination (**phase 2**) is justified. During the phase 2 of the preliminary examination, '*the ICC analysis entails a thorough factual and legal assessment of the crimes allegedly committed in the situation at hand with a view to identifying the potential cases falling within the jurisdiction of the Court*' ([Exh. 14 no 81](#)), I have already done this detailed **factual and legal** analysis of the LA law problems in my QPCs, certain of my letters, and my ECHR petition, that the Office (of the prosecutor) will be able to use, but it is possible that the Office will make an even more detailed

analysis than mine, **and will study in details**, among others, **(1) the LA law** (and its application decree, and in particular the amounts of fee paid to the lawyers for the various types of proceedings to evaluate the financial efforts imposed on the lawyers and that they cannot do; and to estimate the number and types of victims), and **(2) the other problems** described (conflicts of interest..., [Exh. 21, no 31](#)). If this can be useful to the prosecutor's Office (and if it can give me a sample of the 3 reports it must write), I can try to rewrite the contents (arguments and legal references) of my QPCs, ECHR petitions, and my letters on this subject, **in the Office reports' format** [also I have written an email to the ECHR press service to ask them if they could give me a list of all the cases presented to ECHR since 2000 in which **the French LA system has been criticized** in one way or the other, **but they did not respond yet**; they may be more helpful if the ICC makes this same request, but it may not be easy to do also.].

**27. This crime** (*against humanity*) is *sophisticated*; and it was imagined, organized, and (is) executed by **high-level** politicians, judges, lawyers and experts, including politicians who intervene regularly in international summits [and who, for certain, **have been sentenced for various other frauds** (or whose political parties have used various and frequent frauds) to enrich themselves (or to finance their political campaign...), see [Exh. 1, no 34-37](#)], therefore it is not the type of *crimes* and of *suspects* on which the Court investigates (and that it judges) normally, but this does not diminish the gravity of the *crime* and the responsibility of *the perpetrators*, on the contrary, because, among others, the consequences *of the crime* are (a) grave and numerous, (b) not limited to the suffering of the victims (since they include also, among others, the lack of integrity of the entire justice system), and (c) largely exceed the national perimeter (since, among others, the number of indirect victims is considerable, and the **eradication of poverty** is the **no 1 UN objective** as we have seen it); and you must judge crimes like this one to diminish the number of the other crimes you judge regularly. Mrs. Bensouda and her colleagues will note also that since July [and after I informed the French députés and senators and government (through its UN mission, among others) of my accusations of crime against humanity], M. Macron and his government, and the *députés* and senators (and the press and medias) made no effort (1) to talk **publicly** about the problems I described (and about which I had talked to them many times since 2013, and even before) or (2) to correct the injustices I am victim of (and improve my living conditions), although each of the 4 subjects discussed in my letter [(1) the unconstitutionality of the LA law in France, (2) the accusations of crime against humanity, (3) the proposals to improve the LA system around the world, and (4) the criminal proceeding against the CA (...)] concern all the French people and even all the Europeans (...).

**28.** And, this also, although Mr. Macron and his government hurried to react to Mr. Navalny's (injustice and) poisoning and to demand to the other EU heads of states to sanction Russia for this injustice [(!) for me at least, this is an additional proof of the efforts that the government and the députés and senators (among others) make **to dissimulate** the dishonesty of the LA (and justice) system (s) and to cover up their responsibilities in the systematic violation of the poor rights]. Of course, I cannot identify (or describe precisely to the ICC the persecutions endured by) the 88 000 victims (estimation of the 7-10-20) to help the ICC in its work, but, as I am one of these LA law victims, I can (and will) describe what happened to me, and explain why the attacks against me (linked to the dishonest La law, OMAs ...) are sufficiently serious to be qualified as persecutions and systematic violations of my fundamental rights. I have been victim of the dishonest LA law (the OMAs and the short delays) in 5 different affairs since 1998 [requests at the ECHR of 2001 ([Exh. 26](#), [Exh. 27](#), [Exh. 28](#)), of 2012 ([Exh. 25](#)), of 2016 ([Exh. 24](#)) ...], but I study here in details only one of them, and I will describe the other to the ICC in good time. [no 29-30 reserved].

### **C The summary of my criminal case, its stakes, my petitions no 3, 4 et 5, proofs of crime.**

**31.** I talk here only about my criminal case against the Crédit Agricole (CA, among other defenders) that started in 2011 (even if it refers to the theft of my identity in 1987), and about the numerous violations of art. 6.1 that were committed in this proceeding. In my 7-10-20 letter, I talked briefly about my dishonest dismissal case against the Department of Essonne ([Exh. 1, no 28](#), petition of 2001, [Exh. 26](#), [Exh. 27](#), [Exh. 28](#)) and, of course, I will bring to Mrs. Bensouda and her colleagues all the other information (and documents) they may need. These 2 cases show (1) how the politicians (judges, business leaders ...) use (and benefit from) the dishonest LA law (OMAs, ...) to rob (harass morally,) the poor, and to escape criminal prosecutions (among others.); and (2) the interest they have to commit the *crime* (against humanity) described above.

#### 1) A brief description of the criminal case against the CA (...) and of the unusual circumstances.

**32.** I have already described briefly my proceeding against the Crédit Agricole (CA, among other defenders) in my letters [dated 12-7-17 to the UN [Exh. 29, no 27-30.1](#), 3-30-19 to Mr. Macron (...) [Exh. 30, no 9-50](#)], and a summary is given in each of my ECHR petition ([Exh. 3, no 58-59](#)), but I still must go over certain important points here to help you understand better the **stakes** of this case.

#### **a) The theft of my identity to make a loan in 1987 when I lived and worked in the USA.**

**33.** Someone (probably my mother) made a loan in my name without my consent on **5-11-87** to buy 35000 FF of furniture; and, according to the content of the contract given by the CA on 9-5-11, a certain Pierre Geneviev pretending to live in Poitiers (at my mother domicile), to work at Schwarzkopf, and to have a bank account at the Caisse d'Épargne (the number mentioned is the number of my saving account), would have made this loan; and a certain *Renée* Geneviev would have acted as guarantor (the 1<sup>st</sup> name of mother was *Jane*, and *Renée* was her 2<sup>nd</sup> name). Finally, according to the CA's letter also, the loan would have been reimbursed from July 87 to August 90, then it would have stayed unpaid and transmitted to the legal department (at the beginning of 91), some agreements with the **pretended** guarantor would have been reached, and a part of the amount due would have been reimbursed, but not everything, this is why they were contacting me on **3-23-11** and asking me to reimburse the remaining amount due (**998,81 euros**).

**34.** The problem is that on 5-11-87, I lived and worked at Clemson in the USA where I finished my master degree (therefore I did **not** live and did **not** work in **Poitiers**), and of course I did not make this loan (that I had no interest in making...), I never received the furniture, never reimbursed this loan, and **never received any request for payment before the 3-23-11** (more than 23 year after!). Moreover, on 3-31-87, 5 weeks before my exams of the end of semester (and the week of the **5-11-87**), I had a car accident relatively serious since I spent 2 weeks in *a hospital*, and then 2 weeks at home without being able to move because of a broken and dislocated left foot, and a broken left arm, therefore I could not follow the last month of class (and I could not finish my master project necessary to obtain my diploma), I was very worried that I would not be able to finish my diploma on time to start, **on 9-1-87**, the job I had obtained (at Christmas 86) in Paris (at Schwarzkopf, a cosmetic company), so there is no way I could have come back to France on 5-11-87 and even before the end of July.

**35.** As you understand it, the loan contract is full of lies and is therefore a **forgery**, but it also

contains some information that only someone **close to me** could have known [like the number of my saving account, the name of the company that offered me a job (at Christmas 86) starting on 9-1-87, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> first name of my mother], therefore to prove *the forgery* and *use of forgery* ... is more difficult. The identity thefts inside the same family [husband-(or ex-)wife, parent-children,] are **not** rare; and the frauds to sell furniture (or any good) on credit either; I have in fact presented in my complaint several legal authorities that described similar situations, and in which the bank making the loan was found liable for the amount remaining due [in one case, the furniture salesman admitted that he filled out the contract form alone, not in front of the old lady buying the furniture, and that he changed the amount of revenues and of her rent to obtain the loan; and in another, a man had used an 18 years old identity card of his ex-wife to make a loan in the name of his ex-wife to buy a car, and the bank had been judged liable because it used this 18 years old identity card to make the loan ... ([R3-D38 no 7-8](#))].

**b) The special circumstances in this case.**

**36.** As soon as I received the content of the contract on 9-5-11, I immediately understood that the information contained in the contract could only be known by someone close to me, and I suspected that my mother probably made the loan alone in my name without my consent, and that she acted as a guarantor because she had financial difficulties at the time and for several years already (it was probably her debts that prevented her from making the loan alone in her name), so I immediately explained the special situation to the directors of the CA (MM. Chifflet and Dumont, on 21-9-11, [R3-D49](#)). My mother was a nurse in a factory close to where we lived when my parents separated in 1966, so she found herself alone to raise 6 children, and she immediately took 2 other jobs [as a free lance nurse (at home) and one in *small hospital*, and then in a large hospital in neurosurgery unit (intensive care unit)]; it was supposed to be a temporary situation, but it lasted during 15 years about [until 1981 about]. With such a work schedule, she did not have much time to manage her affairs, and she did not manage them well [she had some trouble to pay her debt on time, but since she had some assets (a house she inherited...) and 3 salaries, she did not realize the seriousness of the problem probably].

**37.** The hypothesis (the scenario) that I described, the fact that my mother made the loan alone, is (therefore) plausible (this is even the **only plausible explanation** in the context of the facts described over more than 30 years). My research work at the Clemson university dealt with the problem of creating schedule for the nurses working in hospitals ('*nurse scheduling problem*'), so I read some research studies made in USA that showed that nurses who work the **3 types of shifts** (night, days, evening) in **intensive care unit** of hospitals (that are very stressing units because the patients often die) encounter various specific difficulties in their live due to the special difficult working conditions [especially the fact that **working the night shift** affects *the circadian rhythms*]; and the fact that she had 3 jobs and that she slept (very) little (over a long period of time), must have over time diminish her alertness, and explains in part her financial difficulties (and it creates also **a situation of vulnerability**). Of course, this is not an excuse to commit a misdemeanor (and in particular to make a forgery on a loan contract), but it helps understand the situation (and it is an attenuating circumstance, I believe).

*2) The delinquent behavior of Sofinco, CA (...) from 1987 to 2010 and starting in 2011 and their grave consequences.*

**a) The loan banker's duties violations, the agreement with pretended guarantor and the intellectual forgery.**

**38.** From this brief summary of the case, we can already deduct that the bank Sofinco, that made the loan on 5-11-87, did not do any of the **background checks** it should have done before granting the loan, and that it **violated its loan banker's duties** [duty of **due care**, of **caution**, of **counsel** (...)]; and it also paid the loan **without** obtaining my signature on the delivery form for the furniture because I was still in the USA in July 87 (a **violation of the consumer code**), and I never received the furniture. It is therefore possible that the bank **knew already** in 1987 that the loan contract was *a forgery*. Then, when the loan stayed unpaid in August 90, and it was transferred to the litigation (legal) department in February 91, a detailed study of the loan file was necessarily done by experts in law [and **M. Valroff**, the general manager (**GM**) from 91 to 2007, [R3-D7](#), [Exh. 11](#)] to know if they needed to start a legal proceeding to obtain the remaining unpaid monthly payments, and they necessarily realized that I had never reimbursed the loan and that they had never been in contact with me [personally, I never received any request for payment for the loan before 2011], therefore starting February 1991, they could not have any doubt anymore that the loan contract was full of lies and *a forgery*, and that some *use of forgery* had been committed since 1987; yet they still did not force me to reimburse the loan [or even sent me the least request for payment (formal notice...), registered mail or even a simple mail], and they did not file any suite.

**39.** And, instead, they made their **so-called agreement** with the **pretended** guarantor, and this put forward – without any doubt – the commission of criminal wrongdoings including ‘*an intellectual forgery*’ because, to make these agreements with the **pretended guarantor**, they were forced to pretend that the loan contract was **legitimate** (legal), although they perfectly well knew that it was **a forgery**. The contract was full of lies, and I never received any request for payment of the loan (registered mail or even a simple mail, **before March 2011**), never reimbursed the loan, and never wrote or told anyone that I had made this loan and that I did not want or could not pay it back (and my mother never asked me to reimburse or even talk to me about the loan). Of course, when they made these agreements with the **pretended** guarantor, they also (a) **dissimulated** the criminal wrongdoings committed by the identity theft (and the furniture salesman ... also surely), and (b) **committed** the criminal offenses of *use of forgery* and *concealment* (of the product of the criminal offenses of *forgery* on 5-11-87, and *use of forgery* from 1987 to 1991, and even until 2010). This is not difficult to understand why they did this, they had made obvious grave faults when they made **none** of the background checks they should have done in 1987, so if they tried to force me to reimburse the loan, I could have filed a lawsuit against them, and they could have lost the loan, and, perhaps for some of them, their jobs, so they committed other criminal offenses instead (and they caused me prejudice, and to my mother as well).

**b) The abuse of weakness, the dissimulation of offenses, the concealment from 1987 to 2010, and their grave consequences.**

**40.** Then, it is obvious that, after they made the agreements, the loan (that had been almost entirely reimbursed) became unpaid **again soon**, and yet, although, from 1991 to 1993 I worked and lived in Evry at about 1 km from the Sofinco headquarters, and that I had a monthly salary sufficient to reimburse the loan, **they again avoided to force me to reimburse the loan**; and they did not put me on *the bad payers file* at the *Banque of France* (although the law required them to do so), and, instead, they **insisted** on forcing the

**pretended** guarantor (who necessarily had financial difficulties). From 1993 to 2001 (when I left France), my employer (from 1991 to 1993), the Department (of Essonne), always had my address because it paid me the unemployment benefits (...), and I defended a lawsuit in court for my illegal dismissal until I left for the (Switzerland and then) USA in 2001. And, of course, the **pretended** guarantor necessarily always had my address also (!), so they could have easily found me and forced me to pay the loan, if they had wanted to, but they did not.

*(i) The grave consequences of the criminal offenses committed between 1987 and 2010.*

**41.** The criminal offenses committed by Sofinco and its concerned employees (including its GM, M. Valroff), *use of forgery, intellectual forgery, and concealment* (of forgery, use of forgery,) between 1987 and 2010, year of the merger to create CACF, had grave consequences for me and for my family because, among others, at the end of 1992, my mother lost her house (it was sold at auction because of an unpaid mortgage). As I explained it at **no 34-35**, she had financial difficulties, so she first stop paying the *false* loan (**it seems**), the employees of Sofinco put pressure on her (abused of her weakness, and threatened her probably) instead of denouncing the contract *forgery* (the fraud); and, she eventually could not pay her house loan, and she did not ask for the help of her children (including me) so that she would not have to admit that she made a false loan on my name without my agreement, and her house was sold (by the bank) at the end of 92 [my brother, who lived in London, had bought a house in the center of Poitiers of 4 apartments that he rented; my brother of Los Angeles had bought 3 apartments in Poitiers that he rented also; and me, I had reimbursed my student loans, and had started saving money to buy an apartment (and I saw her regularly), so there was no will to abandon my mother to her debts, on the contrary; and if Sofinco (...) had not dissimulated the fraud they made in common (the loan forgery) and not abused of her weakness, we (me and my brothers) would have been informed of my mother's difficulties and her house (indirectly our inheritance) would not have been sold.].

**42.** Then few weeks later, on 1-18-93, **I was fired** from the Department of Essonne. One of my colleagues told me that one had told her that I had been fired because I had financial problems [a motive used to justify dishonest (or unjustified) dismissal in front of the other employees, **it seems**], which was **incorrect** since I had reimbursed my student loans, and I had a good salary and some money saved. I was not fired because of my mother money problems (or because this **forgery loan contract** in my name), I was fired because I developed a computer system which allowed the Department to control **more efficiently** the employees (including politicians) travel expenses, and therefore that would have exposed Mr. Dugoin's (the President of Essonne) fraud (and similar frauds from other politicians of the council) on travel expenses [at the end of 1992, I went to install the system at the Department Council to control **the politicians'** travel expenses, and I was fired less than a months after that, just after Christmas, [Exh. 1, no 35](#), petition of 2001, [Exh. 26](#), [Exh. 27](#), [Exh. 28](#)], but they could not explain that to my colleagues, so they talked about financial problems. My mother paid harshly her fault, and, me, I also paid harshly for what happened [for the frauds of Sofinco (...) and of the **Department of Essonne**] since I lost my salary (and was forced to sell my car, to leave my apartment l... ; just when my mother needed my help most); and they even threatened me to have problems for the rest of my life ([Exh. 1, no 35](#) !), although I was the obvious victim of the criminal offenses committed by Sofinco (...) and of those committed by the Department of Essonne (by the **politicians of Essonne, M. Dugoin**...); but the top managers (...) of Sofinco who committed the criminal offenses, were never bothered [and M. Dugoin and his colleagues of Essonne **were never bothered either** for my illegal dismissal to facilitate the travel expenses fraud.].

*(ii) The close ties between the Crédit Agricole and its leaders (M. Valroff ...) and Mr. Chirac's party (RPR, UMP, LR).*

**43.** On contrary, Mr. Valroff, GM of Sofinco starting in 1991 (Sofinco's headquarters were at Evry), who had worked at Paris town hall for Mr. Chirac, before arriving at Sofinco, has had a great career at Crédit Agricole ([R3-D7, Exh. 11](#)) and then on the surveillance board of Lagardère (see actual position, [R4-D50, Exh. 12](#)). We see also that there are fairly strong ties between the Crédit Agricole and MM. Chirac, Sarkozy, Fillon's political party (**RPR, then UMP, then LR**) to which belonged also Mr. Dugoin (the President of Essonne at the time, and an strong support of Mr. Chirac until the accusations of frauds) [Mr. Musca, CA's DGM, was secretary general at l'Elysée under M. Sarkozy; Mr. Dumont, CACF's GM, worked in the cabinet of Mr. Fillon before he became prime minister of Mr. Sarkozy], so it is not surprising that Mr. Chirac, who was implicated in *a fictitious employment fraud* as Mr. Dugoin, did refuse to support my project in 1998 and let the justice rob me the judgment I had obtained in 1998 for the illegal dismissal in 1993 ([Exh. 1, no 28](#)); and that Mr. Dugoin (or his colleagues) were informed of the unpaid loan and of the financial difficulties of my mother at the end 1992. M. Valroff (and his colleagues) knew that they had committed criminal offenses, so, between risking to be prosecuted for fraud (and losing the great career prospect), and destroying my career and creating difficulties to my mother, he probably did not hesitate very long; and, in 2011, when he had the chance to correct the injustice, he remained silent again [and Mr. Dugoin (and his colleagues), who were committing also criminal offenses, had also an obvious interest to threaten me and to destroy my career.].

**c) The commission of similar criminal offenses when I returned to France in 2011 after 10 years of absence.**

*(i) The top CA, CACF managers' refusal to cooperate in 2011, 2012 (...) and the commission of new criminal offenses.*

**44.** When I returned to France (**on 2-4-11**), after 10 years of absence in the USA, CACF (formerly Sofinco and subsidiary of CA) mandated Intrum Justicia, a debt collecting agency (**on 2-7-11**), supposedly to find me and force me to pay the remaining amount due on this loan. But, there again, they committed several criminal offenses because, first, to find me so fast after my return to France, they necessarily had to inform someone that I had made a loan that remained unpaid (*violation the banking secrecy*), and, in exchange, this someone told them that I had returned to France (**on 2-7-11**); I suspect that the employees of the bank that opened me an account on 2-7-11, informed the CA or Intrum of my presence in France. Then, as we have seen it at no 36, I immediately explained that I did not do this loan, and as soon as I learned about the content of the contract on 9-5-11, I informed CA's top managers (M. Chifflet, and of CACF, M. Dumont) (1) that the loan contract was full of lies, (2) that my mother had probably made the loan alone [in explaining the context of this affair that I described you above, [R3-D49](#)], and (3) that the employees of Sofinco and Sofinco had necessarily committed criminal offenses.

**45.** And I also asked them to send me all the information and documents they had on this file, but they did not cooperate, and did not send any of the documents (and information) I had asked for; and, instead, they *destroyed* (according to one employee) or *let loose* (according to another employee) **the file on this loan**, which establishes the commission of several criminal offenses also (*destruction of proofs* CPP 434-4, *concealment* ...). And they also (a) let the judges and prosecutors lie and cheat to rob me and to harass me morally, and (b) used the dishonest LA system (...), to escape their duties (managerial duties ...) and to cover the criminal offenses that Sofinco (...) had committed and that they committed themselves. After having received my

letters laying grave accusations *of forgery and use of forgery*, at least, CA and CACF's top managers had a **legal obligation** to investigate and *to verify that their concerned employees had not committed any criminal offenses or violated any internal rules*, but, instead, they chose to commit several other criminal offenses, to continue to cause me prejudice, and to transform me in a **delinquent** who lays false accusations against them, and, even, in **a monster** who planned a fraud in his hospital bed in the USA in 87, and then who, in 90-91, refused to pay the amount remaining due on a loan he would have made to ruin his mother and send her in the street, although she had worked 3 jobs during 15 years to raise her 6 children! The fact that I was poor and unemployed, and that the LA law is so dishonest for the poor, is surely **one of the** main reasons that encouraged them to behave the way they did, but it was not the only one, I believe.

*(ii) he CA managers covered the criminal offenses committed by Mr. Valroff (...), and benefited from the dishonest LA system (...).*

46. The fact that Mr. Valroff [former Sofinco GM from 1991 to 2007, then members of CA' managing board until end of 2010 and recent colleague of Mr. Chifflet, CA GM, **no 43**] had necessarily committed criminal offenses in this case, and that he would probably be prosecuted if they admitted any fault or cooperated with the investigation, was surely also a reason to let the file be destroyed and to refuse to cooperate. I have written several time to CA and CACF top managers to remind them **(1) that** I did not make this loan and **(2) that** if some of their employees told them that I lied and that I admitted making the loan and not wanting (or being able) to reimburse it, they lied; and to explain **(3) that** the destruction of the documents (loan file, contract,) and the agreements made with the **pretended** guarantor confirmed the commission of criminal offenses (including *the intellectual forgery*) by their colleagues (!); **(4) that** the LA system was very dishonest for the poor, **(5) that** the magistrates behaved badly in this case, and **(6) that** they should not take advantages of this situation, but they kept silent; so they have no excuse to have let the judges rob me, and the proofs of their criminal responsibility are obvious, I believe, as well as the one of Mr. Valroff that they have covered.

47. Finally, according to a Reuters article dated 9-27-17 ([R2-D11 no 24.1](#)), these big international banks spend between \$800 millions and \$1,3 milliard **per year** in average to defend themselves in front of the justice and to pay the fines imposed by the justice, so the strategy to cheat and to lie on everything to avoid any condemnation, and then, if they are sentenced (which seems to happen **sufficiently rarely** to be interesting), to pay big fines to escape individual criminal prosecutions, seems to be their usual strategy [in the affair in which BNP-Paribas paid a **7 billions dollars** fine to the US justice for example, they knew they were committing criminal offenses (3 US law firms had confirmed this) yet they continued to fraud, and they paid a big fine to avoid the individual prosecutions; and the bank's number 2 even obtained a promotion and became governor of the Banque of France soon after]. **The behavior of the bank (Sofinco) in 1990** [when the loan stayed unpaid, and the faults of the 1987 employees (who had made none of the back ground checks they should have made to grant the loan) appeared], **and the one from CACF (and CA) in 2011** [as soon as their employees learned that the contract as full of lies and that their colleagues had surely committed wrongdoings], **are the same** since they tried twice to dissimulate the criminal offenses and grave fault committed (!). In this case, the government protected them (covered them since **2013**) because I have written also to the government [M. Macron, M. Philippe, Mme Belloubet, M. Le Maire, and before them, M. Hollande ...] to explain the problems that I encountered, including with the dishonest LA system, and to describe the dishonest behavior of the bank's managers ([R2 Exh. 18](#), [Exh. 19](#)).

3) The stakes of the criminal proceeding against the CA (...).

**48. The stakes** of the proceeding are (and were) **therefore, among others:** (1) **criminal convictions** (jail time,) for the top managers of CA [the 10<sup>th</sup> biggest bank in the world in terms of assets, and of CACF; Mr. Brassac (GM), Mr. Musca (DGA, former Secretary general of the Elysée), Mr. Dumont (GM of CACF, and former cabinet member of Mr. Fillion, minister), and of business personalities ..., members of CA's Board], and for Mr. Valroff, president of the council of surveillance of Lagardère; and perhaps criminal convictions for complicity in the *crime against humanity* described; (2) criminal convictions for complicity in the commission of the criminal offenses in the proceeding against the CA, and **criminal convictions for the crime against humanity** for MM. Hollande and Macron and their concerned (by this case) ministers (prime minister, minister of justice, minister of economy,) since 2013 to whom I wrote regularly [to explain to them the problems of the dishonest LA law (...) and to describe them the treacheries and lies of the judges and prosecutors, and the delinquent behavior of CA and CACF top managers]; and who kept silent, and cheated (or let the judges of the Constitutional court cheat) in 2015 in the context of my QPC proceeding [for example, the economy minister is in charge of the **public order**, so he is responsible for purchasing the dishonest service rendered by the lawyer in the context of LA; and, he is also concerned if the top managers of one of the biggest French corporations commit criminal offenses and risk to be forced to quit their job in group. Here the director of cabinet of Mr. Le Maire until recently, **Mr. Emmanuel Moulin**, was also an adviser of Mr. Sarkozy at the Elysée and a close collaborator and friend of Mr. Musca (DGA of CA), so it is easy to understand why he did not respond honestly to my 2017 letter (see his response, [R2-D12](#), to my letter dated 27-6-17, [R2-D12](#), and my commentary, [R2-D11 no 22-24.2](#)).]

**49. Finally, the stakes** of this proceeding are also **criminal convictions** (including for the *crime against humanity*) for certain judges and prosecutors who worked on this case, and not only those who prevented the judgment on the merits of my QPCs on the LA law, the Omas and the short delays. As I explained it in my letters dated 15-5-20 ([Exh. 16](#)) and 10-7-20 ([Exh. 1](#)), and in my 2 ECHR petitions [dated 18-3-20 ([Exh. 20](#), [Exh. 21](#), [Exh. 22](#)) and 23-6-20, ([Exh. 18](#), [Exh. 19](#)), and of 2016 ([Exh. 24](#))], the highest judges, including those from the Constitutional Court, cheated to prevent the judgment on the merits of my QPCs, and therefore to maintain the LA system that robs the poor in front of the justice, and are the accomplice of the top managers of the Crédit Agricole, and, for certain, guilty of *crime against humanity*. You understand therefore why this case will never be judged honestly in France, and why my petitions 3, 4 and 5 describing, among others, the violations of art. 6.1 in every steps of the proceeding, put forward an obvious effort to cover up the responsibility of the top managers and employees of Sofinco, CA and CACF, and to harass me morally, among others, and establish also the violations of articles 3 and 4 of the ECHR.

4) The contents of petitions 3, 4 and 5 describing the violations of art. 6.1, 3 et 4.

**50.** As we have seen it above, the criminal offenses' proofs were obvious as soon as the proceeding started (because the loan contract is full of lies, I was in the USA at the time...); I made the effort to search for the legal authorities and rules that were appropriate for this type of cases [and that addressed **the legal difficulties** of the case, including the problems created by the fusion of Sofinco (...) to create CACF in 2010, and the ones linked to the statutes of limitation for the old facts]; and the CA (and its subsidiary CACF) had also almost all the documents and information necessary to resolve the case, so the case could, – and should –, have been resolved relatively rapidly, but when the judges and prosecutors want to rob a poor who requests justice, they can do it easily, and they do not just

rob him of his right to justice, they also harass him morally, they threaten him, and they transform him in a delinquent (necessarily) and an illiterate imbecile during years (8 here), without that anyone says anything. Here the prosecutors and judges have, among other, lied (and cheated) on the clarity of my accusations, on the pertinence (and the existence) of the presented proofs, and on the legal rules used and appropriate (on everything), so the petitions no 3, 4 and 5 put forward **obvious** errors of facts and law, **undeniably inaccurate** assessments, oversights, inventions of facts, completely absurd reasoning in each decisions and each acts of investigation or proceeding [see 3<sup>rd</sup> ([Exh. 3](#), [Exh. 4](#)), 4<sup>th</sup> ([Exh. 5](#), [Exh. 6](#)), and 5<sup>th</sup> ([Exh. 7](#), [Exh. 8](#)) petitions]. I give here only few significant examples of the problems described.

**a) The petition no 3 addresses the first part of the proceeding from 12-1-12 to 31-12-16.**

**51.** The petition no 3 addresses first **the absence of preliminary investigation**, that was critical in this case because the preliminary investigation could (and should) have led to an amicable resolution of the case (as we have seen it above), and that was necessarily a grave fault, (almost) a criminal offense that they had to cover up; this is why they sent **the dishonest (illegal) request** for my hearing by the judge **dated 2-11-13**, allowing the judge to distort the precise accusations of my PACPC (civil party complaint) with absurd questions during the 7-10-13 hearing and with incorrect transcriptions of my responses. Of course, I immediately denounced the dishonest behavior of the police, the prosecutor, and the judge in a request for nullity, but this did not encourage them to change their behavior, on the contrary; and, the judges at the CI (instruction chamber) and at the CC (Court of cassation) also closed their eyes on this dishonest behavior when they cheated to reject my request for nullity (and the QPC that was linked for the Court of cassation Ch.crim president, M. Guerin).

**52.** The attorney general (of the appeal court, and now a **European député**) had the chance to step in early in this case; and he used this chance **to threaten me** of prosecutions in pretending that this case was not a **criminal** case, and that my QPC on the LA law (...) had for only objective to put forward my conflict with the lawyers association (!). Then, despite the Court of cassation's refusal to judge immediately this request for nullity (which for me was a violation of art. 6.1), the proceeding started again, the prosecutor wrote an indictment full of lies and of errors of law (also) which retained only two (out of 9) criminal offenses; and the investigative judge sent letters rogatory that were imprecise and that transgressed the limits of the dispute; then she rejected my requests for hearings and requisitions to make sure that no proof would be collected, before she was promoted in August 2016 (more than 4 years of proceeding, and almost no proof collected). A new judge was named for 2 months; and she used this 2 months to stop the last letter rogatory which was ongoing and to prevent the hearings of the 2 main CA and Sofinco's managers accused of having committed criminal offenses [and few months later the former CA' GM (until 2015) whose hearing was requested, died, so he was never heard (!), see R3, [Exh. 3](#), [Exh. 4](#)].

**b) The petitions no 4 and 5, the end of the instruction, the dismissal, the appeals ... (1-1-17 to 5-3-20).**

**53.** The new judge, who was nominated on 2-1-17, did not do anything on the proceeding during one year and a half, then she rejected my requests for investigation with obvious lies (again) in July 2018, organized my hearing on 7-19-18 and sent the end of information notice on 7-24-18 [she was just passing by, she had arrived from a **French overseas island** (overseas department, in the sun), and she was transferred **to Corsica** on 31-12-18 (in the sun again)], and she did not even render (sign) the dismissal decision (!). It is a judge who had never been

assigned to the case who signed it (and in theory wrote it) on 1-14-19, but since he had already been transferred to the Court of cassation in Paris at the time, it is probable that the dismissal decision was written by the clerks. This would explain why the dismissal decision used the **obvious** errors of facts and law, and **undeniably inaccurate** assessments of the prosecutors in their request for dismissal, and it even added some too. And of course, the dismissal decision pretends also that my accusations are not clear to discard several criminal offenses whose proofs were obvious (see R4, [Exh. 5](#), [Exh. 6](#)).

**54.** After 7 years of preliminary investigation **not done** and of judicial investigation **very dishonestly done**, the appeal was shoddy in less than 3 months, and the supreme court appeal also; I suspect that the appeal dismissal decision [signed by the appeal court (CI) judges] and the refusal to admit the supreme court petition (written in less than 2 months of summer, July and August, and signed by a Court of cassation judge) were in fact written by the same person, the appeal court (CI) clerk (**I cannot prove it, and I can make a mistake of course, but it would explain why the contents of these 2 documents are full of the same obvious lies and errors of law**). The initial dismissal decision did not **directly** say that I made the loan, but, with its obvious lies, it exposed me to prosecutions, so the appeal court dismissal decision added up new lies and absurd arguments to say **explicitly** that I made the loan, and to make me a delinquent. And of course, the Court of cassation did not correct these grave and obvious new faults [and many others too (see R5, [Exh. 7](#), [Exh. 8](#)). **The enormity of the lies** does not bother them; in the USA it was the same, to deport me, they pretended that I **never** asked for political asylum and **never** had any permission to remain in the USA, although both are false, I asked for political asylum, and I was given several permits to stay in the US, including **refugee work permits** (!, [Exh. 29, no 14.1-14.5, 31-45.3](#))]. These 3 petitions describe the violations of art. 6.1, 3, and 4, and indirectly they (with R1, R2) prove therefore that I am a direct victim of the *crime against humanity* linked to the dishonest LA law.

5) Conclusion for this section on my criminal case and on a proof of the crime against humanity.

**55.** To maintain a *single senior* in the state of poverty, to harass him morally, to threaten him and to impose on him a forced and important labor (always urgent) as the prosecutors and judges (and the concerned politicians) have done it in this case during more than 8 years, affects the health of the victim, and is a *form of slow assassination*, especially if you take into consideration the other persecutions (violations of art. 6.1 ...) I was victim of **since 1998** [ECHR requests of 2001, [Exh. 26](#), [Exh. 27](#), [Exh. 28](#), of 2012 ([Exh. 25](#)), of 2016 ([Exh. 24](#))]; and, here **the presidents** (Macron, Hollande,) and their concerned ministers, who have an obvious responsibility in the maintenance of the dishonest LA law and in the crime against humanity that allowed the cover up of the criminal offenses committed by the CA top managers in my criminal case, **have an obvious responsibility** in this unfair treatment. Therefore Mrs. Bensouda has at least one victim of *the crime against humanity* (**over a 20 year period**) at this day, and strong reasons to start a preliminary examination; and Mr. Putin, Mr. Johnson, Mrs. Merkel, Mr. De Croo, and Mr. Ratas have good reasons to request a UN Security Council vote to transmit the situation to the ICC and to recommend improvements of the LA systems around the world (see also **no 66-67**).

## **D Some consequences of my accusations, and some forgotten human rights violations.**

**56.** I would like now to discuss (1) certain consequences (that I will call) – *intellectual* – of the well-founded of my accusations of crime against humanity on, among others, the European Union economic sanctions against Russia (linked to the annexation of Crimea...), and (2) certain human rights problems ignored (similar to the unconstitutionality of the LA law in France).

### 1) The well-founded of my accusations affects France's legitimacy to sanction Russia.

**57. The well-founded** of my accusations of crime against humanity against Mr. Macron (Mr. Hollande, and other French political leaders) put forward above [and in my previous letters and my ECHR petitions] **(1) affect** (a) the legitimacy (*i*) of Mr. Macron (and, before him, of Mr. Hollande,) to request economical sanctions against Russia, and (*ii*) of France's participation in these sanctions, (b) the well-founded of the motives behind the sanctions, and, indirectly, (c) the legitimacy of the EU (and of the EU heads of State) that does (do) not point out first (*i*) the problems that we have in France with our LA law (...) since about 30 years, (*ii*) the behavior of French politicians, and (*iii*) the commission of the crime against humanity, and do not speak about the solutions that we have to resolve these problems at the European and worldwide level (to request sanctions). And, in addition to that, some of the economic sanctions, that are not approved by the UN Security Council, are not (already) as legitimate (not to say *as legal*) as they should be; and the obtained result is not the result sought, and does not seem to be in the European and the UN interest [and of the people of Crimea, including those who opposed the annexation, (...), and of human rights defenders in Russia] as we will see it below.

**58.** Moreover, at the time of Crimea annexation, we did not see violent manifestations to oppose the annexation or even any acts of violence on the part of the Russian troops; and it is probable, or at least possible, that a majority of the people of Crimea voted for the annexation; Russia is a very big country with a lot of natural resources, an efficient school system that trains bright scientists (...), and a lot of nuclear weapons to protect itself, therefore to join Russia presented some obvious advantages for a part of Crimea's population, at least. And those who voted against the annexation or did not want to join Russia, were perhaps afraid to protest, that is true, but the sanctions do not improve their lives, they only punish them a second time. Also, the USA did use their veto more than 40 times since 1972 to oppose UN Security Council resolutions directed against Israel, and the EU sanctions were very limited or non-existent, I believe. The *veto system* at the Security Council is not perfect, and we can surely (and we must) find a better one, but *it* presents also certain advantages, so we should be careful not to go around it to often (**no 62**). The accusations presented in the 7-10-20 letter, and precised here, **should** therefore (or could at least) encourage **you** (*the EU heads of state*) to ask yourself (a) what are the real motives behind the sanctions, (b) what are their consequences, and (c) are there not other actions (other than the sanctions) that could be more efficient to improve the living conditions of the European people (...) and of the Russians [more than 50% (probably) of Mr. Macron's actions (and of Mr. Hollande's ... as President) are communication **actions** to make him (them) look like efficient and honest President (who respects the laws ...); and it seems that the sanctions against Russia (linked to the annexation of Crimea ...) enter more in this category of actions (**and to exonerate themselves from all responsibilities in the Ukrainian crisis**) than actions intended to defend the interests of the Europeans or to promote the respect of international laws].

2) Are the sanctions against Russia in the interest of the Europeans and the UN.

**a) The consequences of the sanctions on the SDGs and in the context of Covid 19.**

**59.** The European sanctions against Russia have affected (and affect) the Russian economy and **created (create) poverty** (as the 7-10-20 letter explains it **based on information from Wikipedia**), although the UN members states (including European countries) passed 4 years to agree on the SDG whose **1<sup>st</sup> objective is to eradicate (extreme) poverty**; so on one hand, with the UN, '**you**' (the EU heads of state) ask all countries to eradicate poverty; and, on the other hand, **you** do exactly the opposite, **you** create poverty with your sanctions against Russia (!). Moreover, in weakening the Russian economy, **you** diminish the capacity of Russia to help poor countries (through the development aid ..., among other), so **you** diminish also the chance that poor countries reach their development objectives (SDG, and *you hurt the inhabitants in poor countries!*), and **you torpedo** the work done by (and the efforts of) the UN (! without helping the inhabitants of Crimea ..., on the contrary). And the sanctions add up to the economic difficulties caused by the Covid 19 that are (very) serious for all countries; and they diminish the resources Russia can allocate to its health system (the hospitals and morgues are overwhelmed in Russia too) and the capacity of Russia to develop rapidly a vaccine against (and treatments for) the Covid 19 (which affects the Russian population, and indirectly all the other countries that could have benefited more rapidly from these vaccines and treatments, if Russia had not been sanctioned). To create economic growth is difficult for every countries even without sanctions [and there are also regularly grave crisis (subprime...) that lead to recession almost every where], therefore the economic sanctions should be avoided.

**b) The consequences on the respect of human rights in Russia and the protection of environment.**

**60.** Then, **on the human rights subject**, to enforce human rights **(a) requires** to have an efficient justice system, and **(b) costs** therefore a lot of money (money is not the only problem, I agree, **but it is an important parameter if we want to improve our justice systems**), therefore, in weakening the Russian economy, **you** diminish the amounts of money that Russia can spent for its justice system, and **you** diminish the chances of Russia to improve the human rights situation, although, at the same time, **you** (the EU, the EC, Mrs. Mijatovic) denounce regularly the human rights violations that affect *the human rights defenders* in Russia [**I have read at least 5 publications** on this subject **on the Internet site** of Mrs. Mijatovic since I sent my ECHR petition on **18-3-20**, and **no** article on the systematic fundamental rights violations of the poor who present themselves in front of the justice in France]. Also, *your* sanctions against Russia [that affect the Russian economy, and that can be assimilated to acts of war, **or almost** or at least of economic war] transform *the human right defenders* (and **Mr. Navalny**) who criticize the Russian government, **in traitors** in Russia (or at least for certain Russians), since they criticize the government instead of criticizing the EU countries whose sanctions impoverish Russia (!) without having obtained a vote from the Security Council.

**61.** On the subject of **the protection of the environment**, and of **the fight against global warming**; fighting global warming and protecting the environment **costs also a lot of money**; and, moreover, Russia is **the largest (biggest) country in the world** that must protect **11% of the living space** on earth, I believe, and therefore that needs much more money than the other countries to protect '**its (and our common) environment** (the earth)'; therefore, when the EU sanctions and impoverishes Russia, it prevents

Russia (a) to fight (more) efficiently against global warming, and (b) to protect (more) efficiently the environment of a large surface of earth, it hurts the planet, *it torpedoed* the UN work in the area of environment; and it diminishes also the chances that Russia helps poor countries on this subject (!).

**e) The consequences on nuclear disarmament, the reform of international institutions (...).**

**62.** On the subject of nuclear disarmament, Russia (with the USA) is a major actor in this domain of nuclear disarmament, therefore, when *you* sanction Russia [and weaken it in front of its other neighbors, China, North Korea, Japan and the USA], *you* diminish the chances that significant progress be made in this domain or at least *you* slowdown the process. Also, if Russia uses the same reasoning that *you* (the EU heads of state) use, namely *we are economically stronger than Russia, therefore we sanction Russia without asking the UN for permission*; and tells itself '*we are militarily stronger than the EU, therefore we send several nuclear bombs (with our supersonic missiles) on several EU countries*' (**without hitting the US bases** in Europe; and also possibly **without hitting France**, the only EU country to have a Bomb), the EU would be most annoyed, and in a difficult situation; I let *you* imagine the possible scenarios in such an ordeal. Finally, more generally, *your* sanctions against Russia, without asking for a UN Security Council vote, diminish the chances to reform the UN, and in particular its Security Council [if you go around the Security council and do not respect its rules, you could be doing it also after the reform and diminish its usefulness ... and the usefulness of the reform; and we can also question your motives to reform it]. And the sanctions make international cooperation more difficult, although it (international cooperation) is critical if we want (1) to make progress in numerous domains (fight against poverty, human rights, protection of the environment, nuclear disarmament..., fight against terrorism... ), and (2) to realize the proposals I submitted to you to improve the LA systems around the world (and to facilitate the respect of human rights) and other similar projects.

3) The European Union ignores several grave human rights problems.

**63.** In a relatively recent press article (Reuters dated 19-9-20, [Exh. 44](#)), **M. Pablo Iglesias**, the 2<sup>nd</sup> deputy to Spain prime minister, said, I believe, that '*the monarchy was no longer relevant to a younger generation*', and '*less and less people in Spain understand, especially young people, that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century citizen cannot choose who their head of state is and that he does not answer to justice like any citizen and cannot be removed from charge if he commits a crime*', and that '*a financial scandal which has rocketed the royal family has presented a historic moment to push for a republic*'. If less and less people understand why the head of state inherits his job (and immunity) at birth, it is probably because according to **article 1** of *the universal declaration of human rights* '**all human being are born free and equal in dignity and rights**. (...)' ; and therefore that **a country** like Spain (and there are many in Europe, and at the European Council) that keeps a king as head of state violates the most elementary (and important) of human rights. The Reuters article explains also that **56 %** of Spanish people **support the monarchy** against **33,5 %** who are in **favor of** a republic, but, the support of a majority of the population, that makes it easy to understand why Spain and other countries keep a monarchy, does not change the fact that these countries violate human rights (and humiliate billions of people), and one of the basic principles of our political system, democracy.

64. It is not because a majority of persons agrees to violate the fundamental rights of the citizens that it gives them the rights to impose their wish (will) on the entire society [it is a little bit the same thing with the dishonest LA law in France]. Mr. Iglesias surely understands my argument, but he still does use it to justify the creation of a republic; and the EU and the Council of Europe close their eyes on this problem. ‘*You*’ (the heads EU states, including **Mr. Iglesias**) should explain that the monarchy violates *the art. 1 of the universal declaration of human rights*, and that it is important to reform the institutions of the EU countries that continue to keep a king or a Queen as head of state. Finally, (in Europe) there are also soccer players who make **100 millions euros** (or more) in a year, and (in the world) some business leaders can see their fortunes increase by **\$20 – or even \$80 - billions in one year**, although a Head of state or a minister makes **500 time less** (if not more) than the \$100 millions (...), which leads to a *degrading treatment*, a human rights violation (see remarks at [Exh. 29, no 80-83](#)), this is a complicated problem to resolve and we need Russia (and all the other countries) to resolve it, and a problem that we must be tackled urgently (and that is more important that the annexation of Crimea by Russia without violence). MM. Musk, Bezos, and Arnault have multiple talents without any doubt, but being **head of state** (or a high-level politician, judge and civil servant) **honest and efficient**, it is also difficult, therefore *you* should explain this to everyone and for the benefit of all, and reform the system ([Exh. 49.2](#)).

4) Conclusion on this section on the consequences of the crime against humanity.

65. In his recent UN speech, Mr. Putin seems to think that the only possible way to resolve the problems (that led to the EU sanctions), is the dialogue and the respect of the rules put in place at the UN, in particular the referral to the UN Security Council, and his position seems reasonable, especially if we note that France has maintained during 30 years a dishonest LA system to rob the poor and to allow the politicians to escape criminal prosecutions, among others, in front of the justice. We need to cooperate to resolve **certain** of the **complex** problems that we need to resolve and, among others, to improve the efficiency of our justice systems and the functioning of our police forces as I propose to do it; and **the resolution** of these complex problems **(a) would allow us** to avoid the problems that we had in Ukraine, **(b) would help** Russia (and other countries) to improve its (their) justice system (s), and **(c) would be** more efficient than the sanctions that were not as legitimate as they should have been in the first place [the Council of Europe website makes a brief comparison between the European council (**47 countries, 835 millions people**) and the European Union (**27 countries, 448 millions people**) that shows the increasing (political) weight of the EU inside the Council of Europe (and indirectly inside the other international institutions), and there is nothing wrong with that **unless** this political weight is used to minimize or ignore certain grave problems inside the EU and solutions to these problems, and to punish without legitimacy other countries]. I therefore respectfully ask the EU Heads of state (a) to take into consideration the Covid 19 epidemic and the remarks made above to reconsider the decisions that led to the sanctions against Russia and (b) to reinforce (international) cooperation, especially to improve the LA system (and the justice and police systems) around the world.

## **E The maintenance of international peace and security.**

**66.** The new legal aid (LA) system [and the 2 Internet applications and the international information system (international classification and codification of all the cases judged every year around the world...)] will play an important role in *the maintenance of international peace and security* (in addition to giving an efficient legal aid to the poor who present themselves in front of the justice, of course), so the Security Council should ask the UN Secretariat **(1) to launch** the first phases of the project, including, among others, writing the specifications [functional specifications (...) of the 2 systems, estimations of the volume of data needed,], the estimations of the project costs, of the system's maintenance costs, and of the financial benefits for countries, and the creation of the international information system (classification and codification of all types of cases judged every year ...); and **(2) to consider** my application for the post of *Chief Information Technology Officer* (CITO, that the UN Secretariat posted on its Website on 11-6-20, [Exh. 43](#)) to allow me to supervise the project inside the UN; the work that I have already done on the project and the experience I obtained would be useful to the UN Secretariat [Mrs. Riazi quit her CITO position several months ago already, it seems, so Mr. Guterres and his colleagues must have a good idea of the person they want to hire for this position, but the decision may not be final yet; and I already talked to them about the project in my 8-16-19 application ([Exh. 31](#)) and before]. I will send this letter also Mr. Guterres (and my résumé, [Exh. 46](#)).

**67.** Many organizations (OHCHR, OLA, OCT, UNODC, Interpol, ECHR (and the other regional human rights courts), ICC, among others) and national administrations are concerned by the project and will participate in the project (in different ways), of course, but it is still important (for the success of the project) that the Security Council be involved immediately at the beginning of the project and follow up regularly its progress. And, even if Mrs. Bensouda can launch a preliminary investigation without a Security Council vote, it is important that Security Council request this investigation to ICC (1) to underline the serious consequences of the *situation on the maintenance of international peace and security*, (2) to point out the dishonest behavior of French politicians (and judges...) over a 30 years period about, and (3) to encourage the other countries to improve their LA and justice systems in participating in the project. Finally, we can hope also that this project will not be the last one of its kind, and therefore we must be vigilant and think about the best way to organize ourselves to realize this kind of projects and to put in place an efficient system of maintenance for (or an organization to efficiently maintain) all similar systems.

## **F Conclusion.**

**68.** Mr. Johnson and Mr. Raab, the response to my 7-10-20 letter sent by your colleagues is incomplete, and it makes, I believe, an incorrect analysis on the crime against humanity's accusations I had presented you, therefore I would be grateful to you if you could (a) take into consideration the precisions I brought at no 6-55 to reconsider your response, and (b) to comment on the propositions I made to improve the LA system around the world. *You* (the United Kingdom) obviously make more efforts than France (and some other countries) in the LA area to try to respect the poor fundamental rights, therefore your point of view on everyone of the subjects I had discussed is important. Even if the financial efforts you make (in this LA area) do not guarantee that the poor rights are 100% respected, we must think (if we are not trying to insult you) that you

make these efforts for a good reason, and therefore that you have a point of view on this LA subject that could be useful to everyone.

69. Mrs. Bensouda, I have made a more detailed study of the accusations I brought against some French political leaders, magistrates and other personalities to justify the request for a preliminary investigation on the situation described in my 7-10-20 letter. My analysis is perhaps not as precise and exhaustive as the one you would do if you decided to intervene, but it still does put forward elements that leave no doubt that there is **a reasonable basis** to investigate and to launch the phase II of a preliminary investigation, I believe; I therefore take the liberty of asking you (a) to launch a (or more precisely the **phase 2** of the) preliminary investigation on this situation without waiting for the *decision* (the vote) of the Security Council, and (b) to acknowledge the receipt of this request. My QPCs and ECHR requests and their attached (I will send you the PDF version of the exhibits as soon as possible, and the ECHR may also be able to send them too you as well) will give you the information and analysis useful for the phase 2, 3 and 4 of your examination, I think, and, of course, I stay at your disposal to bring you any any additional information and documents you may need.

70. Of course, I would also be grateful to Mr. Putin, Mrs. Merkel, Mr. De Croo, and Mr. Ratas (and to their ministers of foreign affairs) if they accepted **(1) to take into consideration** the precisions I brought at no 6-55 in their analysis of the situation described in the 7-10-20 letter; and (with Mr. Johnson) **(2) to organize** a vote (if possible in December, to allow **Belgium and Germany, that will leave the Security Council, to participate**) at the Security Council to transmit the situation to the ICC [and to ask for an investigation **starting in 1991**], and **(3) to ask the UN Secretariat** (a) to launch the first phases of the project [writing the specifications ...], and (b) to consider my application for the post of CITO ([Exh.43](#), that the UN Secretariat published on its Websites) to allow me to supervise this project inside the UN. It is important that the Security Council underline the importance of an investigation at the ICC for *the maintenance of international peace and security*, be involved as early as possible in the project, and follow its progress regularly.

71. Also, at no 56-65, I discussed certain - *intellectual* – consequences of my accusations of crime against humanity [and in particular the consequences on the legitimacy and the well-founded of the EU economic sanctions against Russia] in the hope that the EU heads of states **(1) reflect** again on the real interest (for Europe and the world) and on the legitimacy of the economic sanctions against Russia (for the Crimea annexation ...), and take into account the remarks made above (at no 56-65) and the grave economic and human consequences of the Covid 19 epidemic (for all the countries, including Russia) to reconsider the decisions that led to the sanctions ; and **(2) reinforce** the international cooperation necessary to realize projects like the one I described here, and to resolve the complex global problems the international community faces (like global warming, protection of the environment, search for the alternative to market capitalism; see more details in [Exh.49.2](#)).

72. As for my previous letter, I will send the English version of the letter to the Parliamentary Assembly members (...) who prefer to work (and to read) in English; and I would be grateful to you if you could forward either version of the letter to your colleagues (members of the Committee of Ministers and of the

Parliamentary Assembly) that I could not contact because of their large number. Thanking you in advance for the interest you will show to this letter, I remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Geneviev

PS.: If you have some difficulties to access some of the exhibits through the Internet links, please let me know, and I will forward you the PDF version of the documents by email. I had very little time to translate the letter in English, so I hope you will forgive me for the many imperfections of my translation, and that you will be able to refer to the French version of the letter in case of serious errors.

### Exhibits (Internet links only).

- Exh. 1 : Lettre du 10-7-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-Co-EU-CEDH-reqvsFR-15-5-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 2 : Réponse du Royaume Uni du 2-9-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rep-UK-For-off-2-9-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 3 : 3ème Requête à la CEDH envoyée le 6-11-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-no3-cedh-vs-FR-30-10-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 4 : Annexe de la 3ème requête du 6-11-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/annexe-form-reqno3-CEDH-3-11-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 5 : 4ème Requête à la CEDH envoyée le 6-11-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-no4-cedh-vs-FR-30-10-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 6 : Annexe de la 4ème requête du 6-11-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/annexe-form-reqno4-CEDH-3-11-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 7 : 5ème Requête à la CEDH envoyée le 6-11-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-no5-cedh-vs-FR-30-10-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 8 : Annexe de la 5ème requête du 6-11-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/annexe-form-reqno5-CEDH-3-11-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 9 : Lettre au greffier du 6-11-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-gref-CEDH-scanned-6-11-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 10 : Lettre à la CEDH du 25-9-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-dem-for-req-3-5-CEDH-24-9-29.pdf> ].  
Exh. 11 : CV M. Valroff, position en 2016 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/valroff-CV-job-2016.pdf> ].  
Exh. 12 : M. Valroff position à Lagardère en 2020 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/valroff-job-lagardere-2020.pdf> ].  
Exh. 13 : Réponse de Mme Mijatovic du 2020 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rep-COE-Com-HR-3-11-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 14 : OTP policy paper, prelim. exam. FRA 2013 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/OTP-Policy-Paper-Preli-Exam-2013-FRA.pdf> ].  
Exh. 15 : OTP policy paper, prelim. exam. EN 2013 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/OTP-Policy-Paper-Preli-Exam-2013-EN.pdf> ].
- Exh. 16 : Lettre du 15-5-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-Co-EU-CEDH-reqvsFR-15-5-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 17 : Lettre au greffier du 23-6-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-gref-CEDH-scanned-23-6-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 18 : 2ème Requête à la CEDH envoyée le 23-6-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/reqno2-art-17-cedh-vsFR-23-6-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 19 : Annexe de la 2ème requête du 23-6-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/Annex-reqno2-art17-CEDH-23-6-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 20 : 1ème Requête à la CEDH envoyée le 19-3-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-cedh-vs-france-18-3-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 21 : Annexe de la 1ère requête du 19-3-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/annex-formulaire-CEDH-18-3-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 22 : Observations sur la recevabilité et le fond du 30-4-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/obs-rec-fond-reqno1-CEDH-30-4-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 23 : Lettre envoyant les observations 30-4-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-fax-receva-CEDH-30-4-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 24 : Requête de 2016, plus décision, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-cedh-vs-fra-et-dec-8-6-16.pdf> ].  
Exh. 25 : Requête de 2012, plus décision, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req-cedh-vs-fra-et-dec-2012.pdf> ].  
Exh. 26 : Requête de 2001, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/req%C3%A9teCEDH-30-3-01.pdf> ].  
Exh. 27 : Réponse au greffier de 2001, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/Rep1-gref-CEDH-9-5-01.pdf> ].  
Exh. 28 : 2ème Réponse au greffier de 2001, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/Rep2-gref-CEDH-29-5-01.pdf> ].  
Exh. 29 : Lettre à l'ONU (...) du 12-8-17, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-ungsg-unga-usa-uni-8-12-17.pdf> ].  
Exh. 30 : Lettre du 30-3-19 à M. Macron (...), [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-pres-parl-bachelet-30-3-19.pdf> ],
- Exh. 31 : Application for the ASG for HR position, 16-8-19, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/asn-HCHR-appli-8-16-19.pdf> ].  
Exh. 32 : Lettre au Président de Clemson University, 2-7-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-dr-Clements-7-2-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 33 : Brouillon, remarques sur rapport Moutchou, 8-11-19, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rem-23-7-19-rap-AJ-8-11-19-draft.pdf> ].  
Exh. 34 : Rapport de Mme Moutchou et M. Gosselin, 7-23-19, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rap-AJ-Moutchou-23-7-19.pdf> ].  
Exh. 35 : Rapport du Député Le Bouillonnet 2014 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-lebouillonnet-9-2014.pdf> ].  
Exh. 36 : Rapport des Sénateurs Joissains et Mézard 2014 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-joissains-7-2014.pdf> ].  
Exh. 37 : Rapport de la mission MAP 2013 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-MAP-11-2013.pdf> ].  
Exh. 38 : Rapport des députés Gosselin et Pau-Langevin 2011 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-gosselin-4-2011.pdf> ].  
Exh. 39 : Rapport Darrois 2009 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-darrois-3-2009.pdf> ].  
Exh. 40 : Rapport du Sénateur du Luart 2007 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rapportduluart.pdf> ].  
Exh. 41 : Rapport Bouchet 2001 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rapport-AJ-bouchet-5-2001.pdf> ].  
Exh. 42 : INCO Copernicus program proposal 1997 (31 p., 23.1), [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/incoproposal7-1-11.pdf> ].  
EU commission evaluation and letters of interest (20 p., 23.2), [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/incoproandletsup1.pdf> ];  
and (23.3) [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/incoletsup2.pdf> ].  
Exh. 43 : Offre d'emploi à l'ONU, poste CITO du 6-11-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/CITO-UN-job-offer-6-11-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 44 : Article, royauté en Espagne du 19-9-20, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/a-reu-DPM-Spain-time-republic-19-9-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 45 : Article sur sur légalité des sanctions vs Russie, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/art-droit-int-sanctions-Russie-Ukraine-2014.pdf> ].
- Exh. 46 : CV PG, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/cvfr-12-8-19.pdf> ].  
Exh. 49 : UNSG application dated 4-11-16, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/UN-cand-UNSG-11-4-16.pdf> ].  
Vision statement (3.2), [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/vision-8-4-16.pdf> ].  
Exh. 50 : Letter addressed to the UN, 23-8-16 (31), [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/UN-cand-UNSG-3-23-8-16.pdf> ].  
Letter addressed to the US congress, 25-8-16 (31.2): [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/let-us-congress-23-8-16.pdf> ].  
Exh. 51 : 1st UNSG application du 6-14-06, [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf/ungeneralassemb.pdf> ].  
Exh. 52 : Lettre envoyée à l'ONU du 11-29-05 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf/uscongress10-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 53 : Lettre envoyée à l'ONU du 1-18-15 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/letunga-7-1-18-15.pdf> ].  
Exh. 54 : Article du New York Times 9-12-14 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/art-nytimes-AJ-9-25-14.pdf> ].  
Exh. 55 : Lettre de la CEDH envoyant le no de requête, 26-5-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/AR-reqno1-cedh-28-5-20.pdf> ].  
Exh. 56 : Accusé réception du cabinet du SG du CO, 25-5-20 ; [ <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/rep-cabinet-SG-COE-25-5-20.pdf> ].

## Table of Contents

<b>A The United Kingdom’s response to my 7-10-20 letter.</b>	P. 2
<b>B The request for a preliminary examination presented to Mrs. Bensouda.</b>	P. 3
<u>1) The ICC jurisdiction for this situation.</u>	P. 3
a) The temporal jurisdiction.	P. 3
b) The ICC subject-matter jurisdiction (and the territorial or personal jurisdiction).	P. 4
<u>2) The admissibility of the case (complementarity and gravity).</u>	P. 5
a) The question of complementarity.	P. 5
(i) <u>L’inaction de l’État et les fraudes des juges.</u>	
(ii) <u>L’inaction du Rapporteur spécial de l’ONU sur la situation des défenseurs des droits et du Conseil de l’Europe.</u>	
b) The question of the gravity of the crime.	P. 7
(i) <u>La nature et l’échelle des crimes (le nombre de victimes directes et indirectes, l’étendue des ravages causés...).</u>	
(ii) <u>Le mode opératoire (moyens mis en œuvre pour les exécuter, degré de participation et de l’intention des auteurs ..... la nature plus ou moins systématique des crimes) et l’impact des crimes (souffrances endurées par les victimes et leur vulnérabilité accrue).</u>	
<u>3) Interests of justice.</u>	P. 8
a) The interest of victims.	P. 9
b) The fundamental question of the use of religion to violate human rights.	P. 10
c) Other countries have LA problems, the interest of defining norms of quality for LA systems (...).	P. 11
d) The interest of an investigation for the maintenance of international peace and security.	P. 11
<u>4) Conclusion on the request for a preliminary examination presented to Mrs. Bensouda.</u>	P. 11
<b>C The summary of my criminal case, its stakes, my petitions no 3, 4 et 5, proofs of crime.</b>	P. 13
<u>1) A brief description of the criminal case against the CA (...) and of the unusual circumstances.</u>	P. 13
a) The theft of my identity to make a loan in 1987 when I lived and worked in the USA.	P. 13
b) The special circumstances in this case.	P. 14
<u>2) The delinquent behavior of Sofinco, CA (...) from 1987 to 2010 and starting in 2011 and their grave consequences.</u>	P. 15
a) The loan banker’s duties violations, the agreement with pretended guarantor and the intellectual forgery.	
b) The abuse of weakness, the dissimulation of offenses, the concealment from 1987 to 2010, and their grave consequences.	P. 15
(i) <u>Les conséquences graves des délits commis entre 1987 et 2010.</u>	
(ii) <u>Les liens étroits entre le Crédit Agricole et dirigeants (M. Valroff ...) et le parti de M. Chirac (RPR, UMP, LR).</u>	
c) The commission of similar criminal offenses when I returned to France in 2011 after 10 years of absence.	P. 17
(i) <u>Le refus des dirigeants du CA et de CACF de coopérer en 2011, 2012 (...) et la commission de nouveaux délits.</u>	
(ii) <u>Les dirigeants du CA ont couvert les délits commis par M. Valroff, entre autres, et profiter de l’AJ (...) malhonnête.</u>	
<u>3) The stakes of the criminal proceeding against the CA (...).</u>	P. 19
<u>4) The contents of petitions 3, 4 and 5 describing the violations of art. 6.1, 3 and 4.</u>	P. 19
a) The petition no 3 addresses the first part of the proceeding from 12-1-12 to 31-12-16.	P. 20
b) The petitions no 4 and 5, the end of the instruction, the dismissal, the appeals ... (1-1-17 to 5-3-20).	P. 20
<u>5) Conclusion for this section on my criminal case and on a proof of the crime against humanity.</u>	P. 21
<b>D Some consequences of my accusations, and some forgotten human rights violations.</b>	P. 22
<u>1) The well-founded of my accusations affects France’s legitimacy to sanction Russia.</u>	P. 22
<u>2) Are the sanctions against Russia in the interest of the Europeans and the UN.</u>	
a) The consequences of the sanctions on the SDGs and in the context of Covid 19.	P. 23
b) The consequences on the respect of human rights in Russia and the protection of environment.	P. 23
c) The consequences on nuclear disarmament, the reform of international institutions (...).	P. 24
<u>3) The European Union ignores several grave human rights problems.</u>	P. 24
<u>4) Conclusion on this section on the consequences of the crime against humanity.</u>	P. 25
<b>E The maintenance of international peace and security.</b>	P. 26
<b>F Conclusion.</b>	P. 26
<b>Exhibits.</b>	P. 28
<b>Table of Contents</b>	P. 29