

Pierre GENEVIER
18 Rue des Canadiens, App. 227
86000 Poitiers
Tel. : 09 80 73 50 18 ; Mob. : 07 82 85 41 63 ; Courriel : pierre.genevier@laposte.net.

The Board of Supervisors of the Los Angeles County (Mrs. Hilda Solis, Mrs. Holly Mitchell, Mrs. Lindsey Horvath, Mrs. Janice Hahn, and Mrs. Kathryn Barger)
Mr. Henry S. Bienen, President of Northwestern, nupresident@northwestern.edu

Poitiers, 5 March, 2026

Subject: Injustices suffered in the context of my 2002 U.S. asylum application and their grave consequences.

Dear Members of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors,
Dear President Bienen,

1. Between December 2002 and February 2011, I filed several administrative and civil complaints against the Los Angeles County Social Services in an effort to rectify a serious injustice I suffered during the processing of my asylum application in the United States. Although Los Angeles County implicitly acknowledged its responsibility for the prejudice I endured, this injustice was never formally corrected nor compensated. Today, I am able to present further evidence regarding the validity of my 2002 asylum application and the grave consequences of the treatment I received in the U.S. I would therefore like to respectfully ask the members of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider correcting and compensating these grievances. This would, indirectly, provide the financial means to defend the proposals I am championing as part of my candidacy for United Nations Secretary-General—proposals which I firmly believe serve the interests of the international community, including the USA. I am also writing to President Bienen because he was one of the eight university presidents I contacted in 2002 to solicit support for my asylum application, and he may be able to shed light on the events of my case.

AA Platform of proposals and a vision supporting my candidacy for UN Secretary-General.

2. Before presenting the details of my legal case, I would like to briefly outline the context of the 2026 selection process for the next UN Secretary-General. The process began on 25 November 2025. Two candidates have already been nominated—Mr. Grossi (Argentina) and Mrs. Bachelet (nominated by Chile, Brazil, and Mexico). The first informal meeting between candidates and Member States will take place on 20 April, with further consultations expected in May and June, and later until the Security Council reaches agreement on a single candidate.

3. Candidates must submit a vision statement and a curriculum vitae. Accordingly, I have submitted my vision statement ([Att. 1](#), EN [Att. 1.2](#)), my curriculum vitae ([Att. 3](#), EN [Att. 3.2](#)), and a revised version of the six-proposal platform I defend ([Att. 2](#), EN [Att. 2.2](#)). Candidates must also be nominated by one or more UN Member States. I have begun contacting several groups of countries to seek such a nomination. Your response to this letter could not only correct a long-standing injustice, but also confirm the legitimacy of the legal actions I undertook between 2002 and 2011,

thereby highlighting the relevance of my proposals to improve legal aid systems worldwide and, by extension, the pertinence of my candidacy.

B My 2002 asylum application and the difficulties that followed.

1) The 29 May 2002 letter to the 8 university Presidents, the 5 September 2002 verification of status listing me a refugee, the error by social services and the 2008 unfair deportation order.

4. I entered the United States on 16 April 2002 and filed an asylum application on 15 May. On 29 May, I wrote to eight university presidents ([Att. 4](#)), including President Bienen, to present my case and solicit support, as my situation was unusual and technically complex. A few months later, after my asylum application had been referred to the immigration court, I was granted refugee status according to the INS office responsible for verifying immigration status. I began receiving refugee social benefits [including Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) ...]. However, the Los Angeles County Social Services employee handling my case failed to request the exact date on which my refugee status had been granted—an essential step at the time to determine the duration of RCA eligibility. Instead, the County erroneously assumed that the refugee status had been granted on my arrival date (April 16, 2002) and terminated my benefits after only two months.

5. This error triggered a protracted legal battle, starting with administrative procedures in December 2002, followed by several civil complaints. It ended on February 4, 2011, with my deportation based on a 2008 order ([Att. 10](#)) containing multiple factual errors. I am fortunate to be able to present these key documents; following an appointment at the immigration office in late January 2011, I was detained for five days and deported without being allowed to retrieve my belongings, including nearly ten years of legal records. I arrived at Roissy airport in mid-winter with only a light sweater, a few immigration papers, and a USB key.

6. Contrary to the statements in the 2008 deportation order ([Att. 10](#)), which claimed I had not requested asylum and had remained past July 15, 2002, without permission, I did indeed apply for asylum ([Att. 5](#)). I was granted refugee status according to INS documents and always maintained legal permission to reside in the U.S.—first through my asylum acknowledgment ([Att. 5](#)), then through the INS verification listing me as a refugee entitled to reside indefinitely ([Att. 6](#)), and finally via my refugee employment authorization cards ([Att. 8](#)). My status and right to assistance were further confirmed by an Administrative Law Judge decision on February 5, 2003 ([Att. 7](#)). While my 2009 employment card was terminated, my refugee status itself was never formally revoked through the legal procedures required under 8 CFR 207-9 ([Att. 6.2](#)).

2) The serious misconduct committed by several immigration officers.

7. How did I end up receiving such a dishonest deportation order in 2008? I believe I did nothing wrong throughout the process; on the contrary, I made considerable efforts to resolve the problems I encountered through legal channels. After my asylum case was transferred to the immigration court on 16 July 2002, I was forced to move to a homeless shelter on 1 August. In early September, I applied for employment authorization as an asylum seeker. I then sought assistance from Social Services, explaining that I was an asylum seeker and that my case had been referred to the immigration court. They gave me a blank verification-of-status form and asked me to have it completed by the INS. The INS status verifier informed me that (1) I had been granted refugee status and filled out the form accordingly ([Att. 6](#)), (2) I should go upstairs in the Federal Building to obtain a document confirming the grant of refugee status, and (3) I should go to the immigration

court to request closure of my case. I returned the completed form to Social Services, which used it to grant me refugee benefits, including emergency housing assistance.

8. When I subsequently returned to the immigration office to obtain the formal grant document, an officer told me the status verifier had made a mistake—even insulting him—and claimed I was not a refugee. I then went to the immigration court, where the clerk, after reviewing my verification of status, noted it was not unusual for an asylum seeker to be granted refugee status post-referral. He advised me to ask the government’s legal counsel to close the case. I did so, but the attorney on duty refused, again claiming the status verifier was in error. After these failed attempts to resolve the issue, I returned to the status verifier (the same one assisted me again) and explained that two of his colleagues had said he had made an error. He re-checked my status, returned with his supervisor, and both confirmed that they had made no mistake and even had the exact date on which my refugee status had been granted—but that they could only provide this information to Social Services, which had failed to request it properly.

9. The status verifiers had no reason to lie, and it is clear that they did not. Either the immigration officer and the immigration lawyer did not see the same information as their colleague (which is highly unlikely), or they knowingly misrepresented the INS record to deprive me of the refugee status (and refugee benefits) and force me to continue proceedings before the immigration court. In the latter case, this would constitute a felony, as falsifying or altering an immigration record is a serious criminal offense. I informed Social Services, which contacted the INS status verifier office. The INS then sent back an altered verification of status, removing the refugee designation and replacing it with “employment authorized 9-16-03” ([Att. 6.3](#)). The RCA benefits were terminated at the end of November 2002. I returned to the status verifier and showed him the altered document; he did not admit to an error but said he had been told that the refugee status had been “imputed by mistake” in the INS record.

3) The administrative complaint and decision confirming the refugee status.

10. The situation was therefore clearly irregular. The INS does not correct an error on such a sensitive matter by issuing an altered verification of status; a specific procedure exists for that purpose (8 CFR 207-9, [Att. 6.2](#)). Moreover the altered document deprived me of the remaining months of refugee benefits to which I was entitled. I therefore filed an administrative complaint to explain the problem and obtain the refugee benefits lost. I also informed the immigration court in writing of the problem I encountered and of the administrative complaint I filed. On 5 February 2003, the Administrative Law Judge ruled in my favor and confirmed the grant of refugee status ([Att. 7](#)). The immigration court nevertheless refused to close the case and claimed that I had defaulted on my asylum application, which was untrue. I was never presented with any evidence that the refugee status had been granted by mistake. As the Administrative Law Judge noted, the altered verification of status was insufficient to establish such a mistake, and the administrative appeal court confirmed that he had the authority to validate the refugee status based on the documentary record. Also, since I had sought assistance from several well-known universities, it was entirely plausible that one of them had reviewed my file and successfully advocated for my case with a local INS office.

11. One possible explanation is that an INS Director (in Washington, New Orleans, Chicago, New York, etc.), who also possessed the authority to grant refugee status, did in fact grant it to me based on a recommendation of one of the universities contacted, and that the immigration officers in Los Angeles refused to honor his decision, committing a fraud to deprive me of the remaining benefits

to be paid and force me to continue proceedings before the immigration court. Regardless of whether the refugee status was 'granted' by mistake or any other reasons, nothing justified to blaming the status verifier or bypassing the formal 8 CFR 207-9 procedure to terminate refugee status. I could not abandon the matter for obvious reasons—reasons that your predecessors on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors also understood, I believe, when they defaulted on my third lawsuit in 2007. This underscores why the social worker's initial mistake—failing to request the date on which my refugee status had been granted—was so consequential: had he requested this information, the County could not have terminated the benefits after two months, and it would have been far more difficult for the immigration officers to blame the status verifier for the error.

12. In February 2004, I filed a civil complaint against the INS (later DHS), the State of California, and Los Angeles County for misrepresentation of my immigration status, hoping to obtain discovery and understand what had happened and who had made the mistake. The case was removed to federal court by DHS, and the U.S. Attorney's Office did everything possible to avoid discovery on the refugee-status issue. While clerical errors occur, they do not justify disparaging a status verifier who correctly read the record, and when an error deprives a homeless asylum seeker of his refugee status (often a matter of life and death) and several thousand dollars in benefits, the administration must document its error and position.

4) The civil complaints for misrepresentation and then for negligence.

13. I believe the first federal judge understood the situation perfectly and deliberately dismissed with prejudice my initial misrepresentation complaint to avoid discovery on the refugee-status issue, which would likely have revealed the fraud committed by the immigration officer and the immigration lawyer who claimed that the status verifier had made a mistake. Subsequently, I filed a second complaint for negligence (and violation of civil rights) against Los Angeles County and DHS in federal court (I omit here the other proceedings against the State of California.). This complaint highlighted violations of administrative procedures by Social Services, particularly the failure to request the date of the refugee-status grant, which was essential to determine the duration of benefits. This time, the federal judge did not dismiss the complaint against Los Angeles County with prejudice; instead, he dismissed it without prejudice to allow me to refile it in state court because he considered the complaint well-founded and admissible. However, he again dismissed with prejudice the complaint against DHS, once more blocking discovery on the refugee-status issue.

14. I refiled the negligence claim in Superior Court in January 2007, and immediately delivered a courtesy copy to the County Counsel, and a copy to the Sheriff's Office who formally served it one month later. I believe Los Angeles County implicitly acknowledged that the third negligence complaint ([Att. 12](#)) was well-founded and that it bore responsibility for the serious prejudice I suffered when it failed to respond on time (and during three months) to this complaint seeking \$2.84 million in compensation since it did not oppose my motion to enter default, although it could easily have done so if the default had been accidental. Moreover the decision to default was likely taken in coordination with the insurance company funding the County's legal defense and with the law firm representing the County. This means that several actors agreed that the injustice I suffered was serious—especially since the federal judge had also found the complaint admissible and well-founded. The Superior Court judge's refusal to enter default, and the appellate decisions upholding that refusal, were therefore deeply unfair.

15. As shown above, the consequences of the Social Services error were extremely serious. It facilitated the presumed fraud committed by immigration officers, sent me 16 times in the street between 9-5-02 to 10-1-03 about (...), led to the issuance of a dishonest deportation order, and upon my return to France exposed me again to the persecution and moral harassment I had sought to escape by applying for refugee status in the United States. Less than one month after my return, I was forced to initiate several legal proceedings, and I have had to file pleading after pleading since 2011 because I denounced wrongdoings—including criminal wrongdoings—by civil servants and employees of a large French bank, and the unconstitutional French legal aid system. My letter to the United Nations dated 12 December 2025 ([Att. 12](#)) describes in its first section (no 4-11) the efforts I made to denounce this unconstitutional legal aid system and some of the unfair and illegal decisions that were rendered in my various cases.

5) Conclusion of this section.

16. President Bienen is the only university president I contacted in 2002 who is still in office today. Even if he probably does not know whether any of the other university presidents intervened in my case, he may be able and accept to clarify whether such an intervention would have been possible and provide a technical assessment of the relevance of an asylum application submitted by an alien. Beyond the threats I received in the context of my illegal dismissal and the unfairness of the related legal proceedings, I had denounced (a) criminal wrongdoings linked to the political scandal that led to the head of the administration being sent to jail, and (b) the unfairness of the French legal aid system and of the mandatory-lawyer rule, which were used to deprive me of the judgment granting significant compensation for the illegal dismissal. I had also submitted a complex computer-science proposal to a European program, which may have played a role in my situation. My asylum case was therefore complex, and a well-known university with expertise in law, computer science, and political science could have provided a valuable evaluation.

17. And even if none of the eight presidents intervened, it does not change the fact that the status verifier never admitted making a mistake, that the termination of the refugee benefits without following the appropriate procedure was highly irregular, and that both a federal judge and Los Angeles County considered the third complaint well-founded—so well-founded that the County defaulted on a \$2.84 million claim in 2007. The difficulties I faced in the United States are very similar to those I faced in France before the 2002 asylum application and again after my return in 2011: in both countries, one or several civil servants presumably committed criminal wrongdoings (frauds), and when this occurs, it becomes extremely difficult—if not impossible—for someone without resources to obtain justice. As in France, a poor person who dares to seek justice in such a context can not only be deprived of justice but also subjected to years of moral harassment. Some of the proposals I defend in the platform presented in the context of my candidacy for UN Secretary-General aim precisely at preventing such problems.

C Conclusion.

18. Los Angeles County officials (likely the Board of Supervisors and the County Counsel) believed in 2007 that I had been the victim of a grave injustice in the context of my U.S. asylum application and that I deserved significant compensation. Today, I present further evidence that my asylum case was never exaggerated: after my return to France, I again suffered grave injustices—moral harassment and various forms of unfair treatments—because I sought justice after being

victim of presumed criminal wrongdoings from civil servants and employees of a large French bank, and because I denounced the unconstitutionality of the French legal aid system (with pertinent proofs including several parliamentary and experts reports establishing this fact). President Bienen may also be able and accept to confirm that I wrote to him and to 7 other University Presidents and shed some light on what may have happened in my case to help you in your decision.

19. Also the vision statement and platform of proposals I defend in the context of my application for UN Secretary General, will confirm that, despite the grave difficulties I encountered in the US and France, I have worked constructively and proposed solutions to some of the grave problems the International community has to resolve, including the imperfection of legal aid systems around the world. A formal recognition and the compensation by Los Angeles County of the injustice I suffered would not only help restore the truth about my situation and help me financially, but would also indirectly strengthen the legitimacy of some of the reforms I advocate at the international level, particularly in the areas of access to justice and the protection of poor individuals facing administrative or judicial abuses.

20. I thank you for your time and consideration and look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Geneviev

Attachments :

- Att. 0 : Lettre du 3-2-26, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-no2-UN-EU-ios-poli-FR-3-2-26.pdf>],
Version EN (0.2), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-no2-UN-EU-ios-poli-EN-3-2-26.pdf>].
- Att. 1 : Vision stratégique du 30-1-26 , [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/vision-strategique-30-1-26.pdf>],
: EN (1.2), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/vision-stratement-EN-30-1-26.pdf>].
- Att. 2 : Plateforme du 30-1-26 , [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/Plat-prop-V2-FR-30-1-26.pdf>],
: EN (2.2), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/Plat-prop-V2-EN-30-1-26.pdf>].
- Att. 3 : Résumé du 20-1-26 , [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/CVFR-cand-unsg-20-1-26.pdf>],
: EN (3.2), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/CVEN-cand-unsg-20-1-26.pdf>].
- Att. 4 : Letter sent to 8 Universty Presidents, **5-29-02**; [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/unipres05-29-02.pdf>].
- Att. 5 : AR de ma demande d'asile politique **du 14-5-02**, [<http://pierregenevier.eu/htm/asylumappliackreci5-14-2.pdf>].
- Att. 6 : Vérification de mon statut de réfugié **du 5-9-02**, [<http://pierregenevier.eu/npdf/verifstat9-5-02s.pdf>];
: (6.2) 8 CFR 207.9 procedure, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/pdf/jpg/8CFR207-9.pdf>].
: (6.3) Altered verification of status, [<http://pierregenevier.eu/npdf/altered-verif-of-status.pdf>];
- Att. 7 : Décision administrative confirmant mon statut de réfugié **du 5-2-03**, [<http://pierregenevier.eu/htm/aljtolentinodec2-5-03-2.pdf>].
- Att. 8 : Premier permis de travail de réfugié (A3) **du 12-10-04**, [<http://pierregenevier.eu/pdf/eacard12-10-04+explanation.pdf>].
- Att. 9 : (A03) permis de travail de réfugié **du 12-3-08**, [<http://pierregenevier.eu/htm/refeacard12-3-08-2.pdf>];
- Att. 10 : Ordre d'expulsion rempli de mensonges **du 10-1-08**, [<http://pierregenevier.eu/htm/deportorder1-11-08.pdf>].
- Att. 11 : 3rd civil lawsuit VS LA County **1-12-07**, [<http://pierregenevier.eu/htm/lacneglicomp2.htm>].
- Att. 12 : Letter dated 12-12-25, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-UN-EU-ios-poli-FR-12-12-25.pdf>],
Version EN (0.2), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf3-2-21/let-UN-EU-ios-poli-EN-12-12-25.pdf>].