

**COMMISSION OF INQUIRY
INTO ADMINISTRATIVE IRREGULARITIES
IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM
AND ACTIVITIES BY MEMBERS OF SECRET SOCIETIES**

<https://izak.co.za/OtherSites/Notices.htm>

[2 February 2025]

President Donald J Trump

The President of the United States

The White House 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20500 USA

**Subject: Support for Executive Order on Judicial
Independence and International Cooperation**

Dear Mr. President,

I am writing to you on behalf of the RSA Commission of Inquiry, established to investigate administrative irregularities in judicial systems and the activities of secret societies, as detailed on our notices page at <https://izak.co.za/OtherSites/Notices.htm>.

We commend your administration for issuing the Executive Order titled "**Ending the Weaponization of the Federal Government**," acknowledging the critical need to address the erosion of judicial independence in the United States. This step is vital for restoring the integrity of your nation's legal system, which not only upholds justice within your borders but also sets a precedent for democracies worldwide.

Support and Collaboration:

We wish to express our willingness to support your efforts in this regard. The global community, including South Africa, looks to the United States as a leader in democratic governance and legal standards. The issues highlighted by your executive order have repercussions that extend beyond national borders, affecting international perceptions of justice and legal fairness.

We draw your attention to our **correspondence with your Attorney General incorporated in this letter**, where we outline **concerns and proposed actionable steps** to mend the cracks in judicial independence.

A copy of this letter is attached for your perusal. Our suggestions aim at reinforcing the principles of an impartial and independent judiciary, which are enshrined in both your Bill of Rights and international human rights law.

Offer of Assistance:

Expertise and Analysis:

- Our commission can offer insights based on our own investigations into similar issues, potentially aiding in the structuring of your review processes.

International Advocacy:

- We are prepared to advocate on behalf of your efforts in international forums, highlighting the positive steps being taken to rectify these issues and thereby support the restoration of confidence in the U.S. judicial system.

Educational Initiatives:

- We propose collaboration in developing educational or training programs for judicial staff, focusing on maintaining independence and integrity in legal proceedings.

Contact Details:

For further correspondence or to discuss how we can be of assistance, please feel free to contact:

DR. Izak Labuschagne
Chief Investigating Officer
Mobile _+61 (0)452578992
E-mail izak@izak.co.za
Website: <http://www.izak.co.za>

We believe that through mutual cooperation, we can not only address these immediate concerns but also work towards a broader, enduring commitment to justice and legal integrity globally.

We look forward to your response and to the opportunity to support your administration in this crucial endeavour.

Respectfully,



Izak Labuschagne

**COMMISSION OF INQUIRY
INTO ADMINISTRATIVE IRREGULARITIES
IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM
AND ACTIVITIES BY MEMBERS OF SECRET SOCIETIES**

<https://izak.co.za/OtherSites/Notices.htm>

[2 February 2025]

The Attorney General of the United States

U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001USA
(202) 514-2000

CC

The Attorney General of Virginia

Jason Miyares

202 North Ninth Street,
Richmond, VA 23219
Telephone +1 (804) 786-2071
Email: mailoag@oag.state.va.us

**Subject: International Interest based concern
regarding Judicial Independence in the State of
Virginia.**

Dear Attorneys General,

A matter regarding a well-known activist for justice in Virginia has come to the attention of this commission through various representations made by other activists and individuals including the activist (**Aldo DiBelardino**) himself.

1. **References** to his public **platforms of activism** and its nature together with other such activists and their platforms that he collaborates with are contained in the ADDENDA hereto.
2. Evidence of administrative irregularities and litigation so far, in the process and being contemplated also appear under the ADDENDA.
3. Other pressure groups, individuals and Aldo are busy with other litigation such as Affidavits of Facts, Habeas Corpus Petitions, Writ of Certiorari, Next Friend Habeas Corpus Petition, Habeas Default and Default Judgement (as **the judge**

that incarcerated Aldo now seems to be completely uncontactable) Release request Letters to jailers, sheriffs and up to Governor, Senators, BAR Lawyers, have been filed / submitted, hand delivered - represented by over 100 signatures from supporters in Virginia.

4. The ADDENDA also contains relevant legal arguments with reference to statutes, national and international case law and jurisprudential principals.
5. Your attention is also drawn to the fact that a summary and brief overview of very detailed **International Strategic Plan** involving political, commercial and legal campaigns and strategies is attached to the addendum.
 - 5.1. **Political** strategies detail representations to the President's team dealing with weaponisation of the system and the USA AG.
 - 5.2. **Commercial** strategies feature the formation of a charitable trust, commercial bodies such as companies and corporations in all the states and even a holding company in Switzerland.
 - 5.2.1. Go Fund me campaigns and even the launch of a crypto coin.
 - 5.3. **Legal** strategies include intervention in the case by the bringing of amicus briefs by members of the public, pressure groups and bodies such as this *actio popularis* based Commission of Inquiry.

Suffice to say that from the information this commission has received to date there appears to a **major breakdown in certain aspects of the administration of justice in certain districts of Virginia**. Apart from gross appearances of bias and procedural irregularities there appear to be gross violations against such basics rights as: -

1. the right to exercise the *audi alterum partem* rule,
2. to be heard in an appropriate independent and impartial forum,
3. to be granted access to legal resources such as statutes, regulations, rules of court, law reports and case law and the means to draft applications in personam or briefs to his legal counsel.

So bad are the appearances of weaponisation and break down of the system that the entire debacle is so *contra bonos mores* that it now justifies the *actio popularis* interventions manifesting as a tide of **Amicus Briefs**. Such is the extent that it has **drawn international attention** to the point where this commission now also intends to bring such an application.

Therefore, the matter already being clearly in the **public interest** in Virginia it is now also in the **national interest** following the executive order of President Trump aimed at stopping the political weaponisation of the legal system.

Due to the fact that the Executive Order is made by the leader of the free world and given how many such cases of weaponisation are now emerging and being exposed in the USA and indeed the rest of the world, the issue is firmly and irrevocably in the **international interest**

ACCORDINGLY, this commission requests that the AG consider appropriate intervention as a matter of urgency so as to bring these matters to a speedy end and resolution in the interest of restoring confidence in the system of justice.

To that end we submit the following guidelines in a call to action: -

Call to Action:

Given these grave concerns, we urge you to take decisive actions to:

Restore Judicial Integrity:

Ensure that all judicial proceedings are devoid of political influence, as mandated by your constitution and international human rights standards.

Address Past Wrongs:

Review and rectify the cases where judicial independence was compromised, ensuring those wrongfully affected receive justice.

Strengthen Oversight:

Implement robust mechanisms to prevent future occurrences of judicial bias, enhancing transparency and accountability within the judicial system.

We have included an addendum to this letter with detailed suggestions for your consideration, aimed at guiding an independent Attorney General through this challenging period.

Conclusion:

The world looks to the United States for leadership in legal and judicial matters. The current crisis in judicial independence not only impacts the United States but sets a precedent that could influence legal systems globally. We stand ready to collaborate in any capacity to help restore faith in your judicial system, aligning with both your national laws and international obligations.

We await your response and actions with great anticipation, trusting in your commitment to uphold the principles of justice and democracy.

Sincerely,



Izak Labuschagne
+61 45 25 78992
izak@izak.co.za

ADDENDA

POLITICAL IMPACT - DISCLOSURE ON ESCALATING LEVELS OF COMPLAINT TO AG

Given the scenario where there's been an alleged significant misuse of legal authority leading to wrongful incarcerations, an independent Attorney General (AG) could utilize the executive order to address these violations in several strategic ways:

1. Detailed Investigation and Review:

Comprehensive Audit:

- The AG could initiate a thorough investigation into the 20,000 reported instances, using the mandate from the executive order. This would involve:
 - Collecting data on each case where individuals were allegedly targeted due to political motivations or other forms of bias.
 - Reviewing judicial proceedings, especially those where judges might have conflicts of interest or where the court's impartiality was in question.

Inter-Agency Cooperation:

- Coordinate with other federal agencies to ensure a holistic review, including the FBI, SEC, FTC, and any other relevant bodies.

2. Legal and Judicial Remedies:

Release and Re-evaluation:

- For individuals incarcerated under potentially biased proceedings, the AG could push for:
 - Immediate review of these cases for potential wrongful convictions or detentions.
 - Petitioning for new, unbiased hearings or trials, ensuring defendants have the opportunity to be heard in a truly independent forum.

Judicial Recusal:

- Advocate for or enforce recusal of judges in cases where there's clear evidence of bias or conflict of interest, ensuring that all subsequent proceedings are handled by impartial judiciary.

3. Policy and Procedure Reforms:

Guidelines for Impartiality:

- Develop or revise guidelines for federal prosecutors, ensuring they adhere to standards of impartiality and ethical conduct in investigations and prosecutions.

Training and Oversight:

- Implement training programs for law enforcement and judicial staff on the importance of impartiality, ethics, and the consequences of political bias in legal proceedings.

4. Transparency and Public Trust:

Public Reporting:

- Issue regular reports on the findings of the investigations, detailing steps taken to rectify abuses, thereby restoring public faith in the justice system.

Community Outreach:

- Engage with communities, particularly those affected by these abuses, to explain the measures being taken to ensure justice, transparency, and fairness.

5. International Compliance and Diplomacy:

Actio Popularis and International Law:

- Since there's an international dimension with the Commission of Inquiry from izak.co.za, the AG could:
 - Work with international legal bodies or commissions to address these allegations under doctrines like actio popularis, which allows public interest litigation.
 - Consider formal submissions or interventions in international forums to demonstrate U.S. commitment to rectifying these issues, reinforcing international legal standards.

Diplomatic Efforts:

- Communicate with international partners to explain the actions being taken, thereby mitigating any negative perception of the U.S. judicial system's integrity

6. Legal Accountability for Offenders:

Prosecution or Disciplinary Actions:

- If federal employees or officials are found to have weaponized legal processes, the AG should pursue:
 - Criminal charges where applicable for misconduct or abuse of power.
 - Administrative or professional sanctions against those involved in judicial or prosecutorial misconduct.

7. Legislative Recommendations:

- Advocate for new laws or amendments to existing ones to prevent future occurrences, possibly strengthening judicial oversight or introducing measures to ensure judicial independence is not compromised by political influences.

By taking these steps, an independent AG could not only aim to restore the rights of those wronged but also work towards re-establishing the credibility and respect for the U.S. justice system both domestically and internationally. This would involve a delicate balance of legal action, policy reform, and diplomatic communication, ensuring that the process respects both national laws and international legal norms.

General Suggestions for the Attorneys General:

Immediate Case Reviews:

1. Establish a special task force to review cases where judicial bias is alleged, prioritizing those involving incarceration.

Judicial Recusal Protocols:

2. Strengthen or create policies where judges must recuse themselves in cases of potential conflict of interest.

Transparency Measures:

3. Publish annual reports on judicial oversight, detailing actions taken to ensure independence and impartiality.

International Cooperation:

4. Engage with independent international bodies, pressure groups, legal experts and the like to affirm commitments to judicial independence, possibly through joint investigations or advisory panels.

Public Education and Judicial Training:

5. Implement programs aimed at both educating the public on judicial roles and training judges on the importance of impartiality.

Legislative Advocacy:

6. Recommend to Congress new legislation or amendments to safeguard judicial independence from political influence.

Restorative Justice Initiatives:

7. For those wrongfully convicted or detained, consider mechanisms for compensation, exoneration, and rehabilitation.
8. This addendum serves as a guideline for actions to be taken in the immediate and long term to restore and maintain judicial integrity in the United States.

Statement of facts relating to Aldo DiBelardino

POLITICAL PRISONER'S STATEMENT OF FACTS

PEACEMAKER ALDO DIBELARDINO

1. August 2020, complaint filed with prima facie fraud upon the court
2. May 2021 **accuser Denise DiBelardino**, admits to fraud upon the court, under oath, on the record, in detail
3. September 2021, **accusee PeaceMaker Aldo DiBelardino** sent letter to all parties about fraud upon the court. First lawyers that accusee hired were accuser's attorney Chiusano's former law partners - undisclosed. Aldo gave his attorneys the fraud upon the court - they failed to take the truth and evidence to the court.
4. September 2021, accusee was fined and found in contempt for incivility and was threatened with jail instead of having the fraud upon the court dealt with.
5. 2022, accusee letter to sheriff Stolle advising of fraud upon the court and inquiring on VBSO policy related to enforcing false orders – no reply.
6. 2022, accusee letter to commonwealth attorney Stolle advising fraud upon the court with evidence documents included.
7. 2022, a few weeks later, commonwealth attorney returned letter and documents and advises filing a police complaint.
8. 2022, a few weeks later, accusee has lunch with Todd Jones (Kempsville precinct Captain). Accusee advised of Stolle corruption problem. Jones advised that if police investigate, they must turn back over to Stolle. "Everybody knows".
9. June 2022, accusee injures neck during sheriff physical testing when applying for deputy position.
10. July 2022, VBSO hires accusee after all the testing and evaluations, issuing photo IDs, locker, etc., then suddenly rescinds employment and advises accusee to reapply in 6 months.
11. November 2022, accusee has emergency neck surgery because he was "at risk of being paralyzed or worse".
12. July 1st & 15th 2024, accusee and his supporters attempt to Present corruption to court and are removed, arrested, and brutally assaulted by deputy sheriffs.
13. July 19, 2024, accusee is arrested for "trespass" 110 feet from the courthouse while protesting arrest of accusee supporter who was arrested while attempting to Present corruption. Permission granted to protest 40+ feet away "on other side of flagpole". Accusee was released several days later.
14. November 2024, accusee received almost 50k votes in his campaign for citizen grand jury oversight in the recent 2024 Virginia Beach sheriff's election, despite significant opposition from entrenched powers (establishment).
15. December 13, 2024, Judge Randall D. Smith is named in related SCOTUS Writ of Certiorari filed. Judge Randall D. Smith ignored related stay request for December 20, 2024 hearing violating judicial canons.
16. December 20, 2024, accusee is denied due process in divorce case hearing about premarital money status (money not owed) and arrested - \$1Million purge bond and indefinite jailing. Next hearing Dec 2025 – a year out.

17. January 24, 2025, received jail threat from inmate. Safety concerns.
18. January 28, 2025, No Family Law attorneys are willing to accept the case. All possible filings made to address unlawful jailing including Friend Habeas and Affidavit of Friend filing.
19. January 29, 2025, No response from the judge. Default Judgement presented. "Judge unavailable" for release of prisoner. Accusee remains in jail.
20. The order they used to jail Aldo is wrought with Fraud upon the court.
21. Because of fraud upon the court, all orders are invalid when they are issued AB Initio per the SCOTUS.
22. There is evidence of court's complicity in the fraud, meaning it is now fraud upon the public by the court.
23. There is prima facie evidence in the record of the court with refusal to hear motion to move money. Emergency motions were submitted.

Pamela Burnham, Nurse with VAMFA.org volunteer
Next Friend of ALDO DiBelardino
559-381-3978

Lates evidence received by this commission

1. Following the Supreme Law of the US, Affidavits of Facts, Habeas Corpus Petitions, Writ of Certiorari, Next Friend Habeas Corpus Petition, Release request Letters to jailers, sheriffs and up to Governor, Senators, BAR Lawyers, have been filed / submitted, hand delivered - represented by over 100 signatures from supporters in Virginia.
2. The case is wrought with fraud from the start and Lawyer responses include "This case is very complicated", "I was reprimanded by the BAR in a similar case", "No one will want to take this case", "This is a shame"...
3. Habeas Default and Default Judgement have been filed and delivered in person to judge's chambers where we were told that **the jailing judge has not worked there for a very long time, has no mailbox, and no forwarding address**, "but he will get the filing/email no doubt through the system". **So, a "Retired" judge was able to come out to jail ALDO, but now is not available.**
4. Judge had 3 days to respond. NO RESPONSE. According to the Law, no response to Default Judgement = release of prisoner. No release has occurred.
 - 4.1. International Barrister lawyers and other Constitutional Legal Consultants state that this is happening all over the country. "Habeas filings are being ignored".
5. Case and Filings will be addressed by the new Attorney General and new President.

Related websites

<https://peacemakersheriff.org/who-we-are/>

<https://restoregrandjuryrights.org/>

<https://peacemakersheriff.org/sheriff-candidate-removed-from-court-seeking-justice/>

HABEAS DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGEMENT

The latest evidence that has emerged is that Habeas Default and Default Judgement have been filed and delivered in person to judge's chambers where the lawyers were told that the jailing judge has not worked there for a very long time, has no mailbox, and no forwarding address, "but he will get the filing/email no doubt through the system". So, the "Retired" judge was able to come out to jail ALDO, but is now not available.

Proposed urgent applications that can be brought to rescind, quash, substitute the judgments made.

Given the situation described, where there's evidence suggesting judicial misconduct or irregularity involving a "retired" judge still issuing judgments or affecting legal outcomes, several urgent applications can be pursued:

1. Motion to Vacate or Set Aside the Default Judgment:

- **Legal Basis:** Under state rules of civil procedure, similar to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), which allows for relief from a judgment or order for reasons like mistake, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect, fraud, misrepresentation, or newly discovered evidence that could not have been found with due diligence before the judgment.

Arguments:

- **Fraud or Misrepresentation:** The fact that the judge was supposedly not working there and could not be properly served suggests possible misrepresentation or fraud in the judicial process.
- **Lack of Jurisdiction:** If the judge was not legitimately in office or acting within the scope of judicial authority, any judgment issued might be void due to lack of jurisdiction.
- **Documentation Needed:** Affidavits or declarations detailing the attempt to serve the judge, the response from the court staff, and any other evidence showing the judge's retirement status or lack of current involvement with the court.

2. Motion to Quash the Habeas Default:

- **Legal Basis:** Similar to the above, based on procedural errors or lack of proper judicial authority.
- **Arguments:**
 - **Improper Service:** If the service of documents was not conducted according to legal standards (e.g., served to an unavailable judge), this could be a ground for quashing the default.

- **Judicial Impartiality:** The situation raises serious questions about the impartiality and legality of the judge's actions.
- **Documentation:** Proof of attempted service and the circumstances surrounding the inability to serve the judge should be included.

3. Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus:

- **Legal Basis:** To challenge the legality of detention or imprisonment based on potentially invalid judicial proceedings.

Arguments:

- **Unlawful Detention:** If the incarceration was based on judgments from a judge without proper jurisdiction, the detention could be considered unlawful.
- **Rights Violation:** Argue that the right to an impartial tribunal was violated, which is a fundamental right under both U.S. law and international human rights standards.
- **Process:** This would involve filing a habeas corpus petition in the appropriate court, arguing for the detainee's immediate release or at least a new hearing before a proper judicial officer.

4. Motion for Substitution of Judge:

- **Legal Basis:** Many jurisdictions allow for motions to substitute judges in cases of bias or incapacity.

Arguments:

- **Conflict of Interest or Bias:** The unusual circumstances of a "retired" judge still issuing judgments suggest a conflict or bias.
- **Incapacity:** If the judge is no longer in active service, there might be an argument for incapacity to perform judicial duties.
- **Action:** Request that the case be reassigned to an active, impartial judge for a fresh review or continuation of proceedings.

5. Emergency Stay or Injunction:

- **Legal Basis:** To prevent further harm or to maintain the status quo while the above motions are adjudicated.

Arguments:

- **Irreparable Harm:** Continued incarceration based on potentially void judgments causes irreparable harm to the individual's rights.
- **Action:** File for an emergency stay of any proceedings or enforcement related to the questionable judgments.

Strategic Considerations:

- **Speed:** Given the urgency, all filings should be marked as emergency or expedited motions to ensure rapid judicial review.
- **Evidence:** Collect and present all relevant evidence showing the judge's status, the nature of the judgments, and any communications or attempts at service.
- **Legal Counsel:** Engaging a lawyer with expertise in judicial misconduct or habeas corpus proceedings is highly advisable due to the complexity and urgency of the situation.

Each of these applications should be tailored to the specifics of the jurisdiction and the facts of the case, with careful attention to procedural requirements to ensure they are not dismissed on technical grounds.

THE APPEARANCE OF FIXER` JUDGES

The fact that the term is so commonly used serves as a serious blot on the system of justice in the USA.

In the case in question, it appears that public perception is that a `Fixer Judge` (who has now ostensibly made himself uncontactable) was used to Stifle someone exposing corruption by contriving to have them incarcerated.

The term "fixer judge" isn't officially defined or recognized in legal statutes or judicial codes of conduct in the United States, but it colloquially refers to a judge who engages in corrupt or unethical practices to manipulate judicial outcomes for personal gain, political reasons, or to favour certain parties. Here's an exploration of this concept:

Understanding "Fixer Judge":

Colloquial Use:

- "Fixer" in this context parallels the notion of match-fixing in sports, where outcomes are predetermined. In legal terms, this would involve a judge compromising their judicial impartiality to ensure a specific outcome in a case.

Legal Analogues:

- While not termed as "fixer," such behaviour would be categorized under judicial misconduct, which includes:
 - **Bias or Prejudice:** When a judge shows undue favouritism or prejudice against a party.
 - **Corruption:** Including bribery, accepting personal benefits for judicial Favours, or other conflicts of interest.

- **Abuse of Judicial Authority:** Using judicial position to influence outcomes improperly.

Earmarks of a "Fixer" Judge:

Though not officially codified, behaviours that might indicate a judge is acting as a "fixer" could include:

- **Inconsistent Judicial Decisions:** Patterns of rulings that seem to favour one side disproportionately without legal justification.
- **Ex Parte Communications:** Engaging in private discussions with one party or their attorney without the presence or knowledge of the other side, which is generally prohibited.
- **Improper or Unusual Recusal:** Refusing to recuse themselves when there's a clear conflict of interest or doing so in a pattern that suggests manipulation.
- **Evidence of Financial or Other Benefits:** Receiving unexplained gifts, money, or favours from litigants or other interested parties.
- **Witness or Litigant Intimidation:** Using judicial power to intimidate or influence testimony or behaviour in court.
- **Manipulating Legal Procedure:** Deliberately delaying or hastening proceedings to benefit one party.

Legal and Ethical Considerations:

Judicial Conduct Codes:

1. Every state has a judicial conduct code, and there's also the Code of Conduct for United States Judges for federal judges, which outline ethical standards judges must adhere to. Violations would include behaviours akin to those of a "fixer."

CORRUPT JUDICIAL CABAL'S AND CARTELS, ADMINISTRATIVE INJUSTICE AND REMEDIES

While the term "cartel" is traditionally used in the context of economic or business activities under antitrust law, the concept where legal professionals like police, prosecutors, and judges collude to manipulate legal disputes, judgments, and outcomes actually falls under different legal categories. Here's how such actions might be addressed:

Conspiracy and Corruption:

Conspiracy:

- This could be prosecuted under 18 U.S.C. § 371, which criminalizes conspiring to commit any offense against or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof. If these officials conspire to corrupt legal proceedings, this statute would apply.

Corruption:

- Direct acts of corruption would involve laws like:
 - **18 U.S.C. § 201** (Bribery of Public Officials and Witnesses): Prohibits offering, giving, receiving, or soliciting anything of value to influence official action.
 - **18 U.S.C. § 1341, § 1343** (Mail and Wire Fraud): If the conspiracy involves using mail or wire (including phone or internet) to perpetrate a scheme to defraud, these statutes would be relevant.

Obstruction of Justice:

- **18 U.S.C. § 1503** (Obstruction of Justice): This law criminalizes attempts to influence, obstruct, or impede the administration of justice, which would include manipulating legal outcomes.

RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act):

- **18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968**: RICO was enacted to fight organized crime but can apply to any enterprise that engages in a pattern of racketeering activity, which includes crimes like bribery, extortion, and obstruction of justice. If a group of officials systematically corrupts legal proceedings, they could be charged under RICO, facing severe penalties including long prison terms and asset forfeiture.

Judicial Misconduct:

- **Judicial Misconduct**: Judges are subject to codes of conduct (like the Code of Conduct for United States Judges) which prohibit such behaviours. Misconduct can lead to disciplinary actions by judicial conduct commissions or even impeachment.

Police and Prosecutorial Misconduct:

- **Internal Affairs and Professional Conduct:** Police departments have internal affairs units to investigate misconduct. Prosecutors are also bound by ethical rules, and state bar associations can discipline lawyers for misconduct.
- **Civil Rights Violations:** 42 U.S.C. § 1983 allows citizens to sue state officials for violations of constitutional rights, which would include rights to a fair trial and due process.

Laws Protecting the Public:

- **Due Process Clauses:** Both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution guarantee due process, which includes the right to an impartial tribunal.
- **Brady v. Maryland (1963):** Establishes the obligation of prosecutors to disclose evidence favourable to the accused, a principle that would be undermined by such conspiracies.
- **Whistleblower Protections:** Laws like the Whistleblower Protection Act protect individuals who report wrongdoing within government from retaliation.
- **Freedom of Information Act (FOIA):** While not directly protective, FOIA can be used by the public to uncover potential corruption or misconduct.

Labelling and Perception:

Such a conspiracy would generally be labelled as:

- **Corruption**
- **Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice**
- **Organized Crime (under RICO)**
- **Judicial or Prosecutorial Misconduct**

Summary

In essence, while the term "cartel" might conceptually fit due to the collusive nature, the legal actions taken against such groups would be under various statutes related to corruption, conspiracy, and obstruction of justice. The U.S. legal system has mechanisms to address and punish such administrative irregularities, though proving such conspiracies can be challenging due to the need for substantial evidence.

Executive Order by President TRUMP titled "Ending the Weaponization of the Federal Government":

Executive Order Content:

This executive order, as referenced, states:

Section 1. Purpose:

- "The American people have witnessed the previous administration engage in a systematic campaign against its perceived political opponents, weaponizing the legal force of numerous Federal law enforcement agencies and the Intelligence Community against those perceived political opponents in the form of investigations, prosecutions, civil enforcement actions, and other related actions."

Sec. 3. Ending the Weaponization of the Federal Government:

- "(a) The Attorney General, in consultation with the heads of all departments and agencies of the United States, shall take appropriate action to review the activities of all departments and agencies exercising civil or criminal enforcement authority of the United States, including, but not limited to, the Department of Justice, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission, over the last 4 years and identify any instances where a department's or agency's conduct appears to have been contrary to the purposes and policies of this order, and prepare a report to be submitted to the President..."

Relation to Universal Fundamental Right and U.S. Legal Principles:

Connection to UDHR's Article 10:

- This order indirectly supports the right to an impartial hearing by aiming to scrutinize and rectify any perceived misuse of legal authority that could compromise the independence and impartiality of legal proceedings. By ordering a review of federal actions, it seeks to ensure that law enforcement and judicial actions are not politically motivated, thus reinforcing the principle of fairness in legal proceedings.

Echoes in U.S. Bill of Rights:

- The Sixth Amendment's guarantee of an impartial jury and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments' assurances of due process are supported by this

order's intent to prevent the "weaponization" of government agencies against individuals, thereby safeguarding the integrity of legal processes.

How the Order Reinforces the Principle:

Review and Accountability:

- By mandating a review, the order emphasizes accountability and transparency in government actions, which are crucial for maintaining the integrity and independence of judicial proceedings.

Correction of Past Misconduct:

- The order explicitly calls for identifying and correcting instances where federal agencies might have acted contrary to principles of fairness, which could include actions that compromise the impartiality of legal forums.

Enhancing Public Trust:

- By addressing perceived biases or political motivations in legal actions, the order aims to enhance public trust in the judicial system, ensuring that it functions as an impartial arbiter.

Statutes, Regulations, and Case Law:

Statutes:

- While this executive order itself isn't a statute, it aligns with laws like the Administrative Procedure Act, which provides for judicial review of agency actions, ensuring they are not arbitrary or capricious.

Regulations:

- The DOJ and other agencies have internal guidelines and regulations, like those mentioned earlier, which aim to ensure impartiality in legal duties.

Case Law:

- *United States v. Armstrong* (1996) established standards for claims of selective prosecution, which could be relevant when investigating claims of "weaponization" of legal processes.


Summary

This executive order, therefore, can be seen as an attempt to reinforce the foundational principles of an independent and impartial legal system, though its implementation and the actual impact on legal practices would depend on the specific actions taken by the Attorney General and other officials in response to the order's directives.

RELATED INTERNATIONAL ARGUMENTS


Universal Declaration of Human Rights

The principle from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is closely aligned with Article 10, which states:

"Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him." 

Echoes in the U.S. Bill of Rights:

Sixth Amendment:

- This amendment guarantees several rights relevant to a fair and impartial trial:
 - ***"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed."***
 - This reflects the UDHR's emphasis on an independent and impartial forum for hearings. 

Fifth Amendment:

- Although not directly about the nature of the tribunal, it ensures due process of law, which complements the idea of an impartial judicial process.

Fourteenth Amendment:


- While not part of the original Bill of Rights, its Due Process Clause applies the principles of the Fifth Amendment to state governments, ensuring that the rights to fair treatment in legal processes are extended across all levels of governance.

General Statutes and Case Law:

Statutes:

- The U.S. Code includes provisions like Title 18, Section 1512, which criminalizes tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant, reinforcing the integrity of legal proceedings.

Case Law:

- **Gideon v. Wainwright (1963)** established that states must provide counsel to indigent defendants in criminal cases, ensuring fairness in legal representation. 

Brady v. Maryland (1963) requires prosecutors to disclose evidence favourable to the accused, which aligns with the right to an impartial trial by ensuring defendants have access to information necessary for a fair defense.

Regulations:

- The DOJ has regulations, like those under 28 C.F.R. § 45.2 which address the impartiality of government attorneys in representing the United States.

Reinforcement of the Principle:

The principle of an independent and impartial forum is central to American jurisprudence, and while specific executive actions aimed at "ending the weaponization" might not exist, the legal system has inherent checks and balances:

Judicial Independence:

- Judges in the U.S. are generally appointed for life, which is intended to insulate them from political pressures, thereby promoting impartiality.

Separation of Powers:

- This constitutional doctrine ensures that no one branch of government can unilaterally control or "weaponize" the legal system.

Public and Political Scrutiny:

- Congressional oversight and public scrutiny help maintain the balance and integrity of the judicial system.

Summary

In conclusion, while there isn't a direct executive order from Trump explicitly addressing "weaponization of the legal system," the foundational legal principles in the U.S. Constitution and subsequent interpretations through case law inherently support the rights outlined in the UDHR. The system is structured to prevent misuse, with ongoing debates and political actions often aimed at reinforcing these principles, though sometimes with controversial interpretations.

ARGUMENT IN THE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INTEREST

The doctrine of *Contra Bonos Mores* – Contrary to the moral fibre of the law

The legal principle of **contra bonos mores** (against good morals) is rooted in the idea that certain actions are so offensive to societal values or ethics that they should not be enforceable or should be prohibited by law. Here's how this principle can be exploited and expanded to highlight the importance of ensuring judicial independence and fairness:

Exploitation of *Contra Bonos Mores*:

Moral Repugnance of Judicial Bias:

- **Argument:** Incarcerating someone for seeking justice through the legal system, especially when presided over by potentially biased or accused parties, is morally reprehensible. It goes against the fundamental societal norms of fairness, justice, and the right to an impartial trial, which are at the core of *contra bonos mores*.
- **Expansion:** This situation not only undermines the individual's rights but also erodes public trust in the legal system. When the courts, the last bastion of justice, become tools of oppression or bias, it contravenes the moral fabric of society, making the act itself contrary to good morals.

Public Perception and Legal Precedent:

- **Argument:** The perception of the judiciary as a means to silence critics or remove dissenters from society is a direct affront to democratic values. Legal systems that allow such practices are seen as endorsing behaviours that are *contra bonos mores*.
- **Expansion:** Highlight previous legal cases or historical examples where judicial misuse led to public outrage or legal reforms. For instance, in countries with histories of judicial oppression, such practices have often led to significant changes in law or governance. This can be used to argue for immediate action to prevent the U.S. from heading down a similar path.

International Human Rights Standards:

- **Argument:** International human rights law, which includes principles like the right to a fair trial, is inherently linked to societal morals. A system where the accused can preside over their accuser's trial breaches these international norms, thereby falling under *contra bonos mores*.

- **Expansion:** By citing specific articles from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or decisions from bodies like the International Court of Justice, you can argue that such judicial practices violate not only national but also international ethical and moral standards.

Advocacy and Implementation:

Legislative Advocacy:

- Propose new laws or amendments that explicitly prohibit judges or judicial officials from presiding over cases where they are implicated or have a vested interest, under the banner of *contra bonos mores*.

Judicial Ethics Codes:

- Push for stronger codes of judicial conduct that include severe penalties for any actions that could be seen as undermining judicial impartiality, framed around protecting societal morals and justice.

Public Education Campaigns:

- Initiate campaigns to educate the public on how judicial bias is not just a legal issue but a moral one, using *contra bonos mores* as a rallying cry for systemic reform.

Legal Challenges:

- Encourage or support legal challenges where individuals can argue that their rights were violated by a process that was *contra bonos mores*, setting legal precedents for future cases.

International Observation:

- Invite or propose international legal observers or bodies to monitor court proceedings in high-profile or controversial cases, ensuring that the moral standards of justice are upheld, thereby reinforcing the principle against actions that are against good morals.

Media and Transparency:

- Use media to highlight cases where judicial independence was compromised, framing these as moral failings of the system, to pressure for change and increase public demand for an ethical judiciary.

Summary

By considering the principle of *contra bonos mores*, one frames the issue not just as a legal or constitutional one but as a profound moral failing that demands immediate and comprehensive reform to preserve the integrity of legal systems and the trust of the populace in justice.

Actio Popularis / Public, National and International Interest

Public Interest Litigation:

- The doctrine of actio popularis allows for legal action in the broader interest of justice. This case presents an opportunity to address systemic issues in the judiciary for the benefit of the public at large.

International Recognition:

- This doctrine is recognized in various international courts, providing a legal basis for citizens, even those from other countries, to engage in proceedings that affect global perceptions of justice.

CONCLUSION

This case represents more than a legal dispute; it is a test of the commitment to uphold the foundational principles of justice in the United States. By addressing the issues of judicial independence and impartiality, this court can reinforce the integrity of the legal system, align with national policy initiatives, and set a precedent for judicial accountability worldwide. We urge this Court to consider these arguments in favour of Petitioner [A].

INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS

The question on How to intervene internationally

For international applicants what references can be made in their submissions, arguments or evidence of other politicians and business oligarchs, moguls and industry leaders in other parts of the world that have also claimed that they were or are victims of legal systems weaponised for political purposes so as to motivate a ruling that will alleviate a world-wide problem and trend. I think of people like Mandela, the previous leaders of Brazil, the Philippines, Taiwan, Japan, Madagascar, Kenya, Argentina, China, Russia, Venezuela, Caledonia and so forth, all of which has been reported in the media over the years.

Answer

In crafting an amicus curiae brief or similar legal document where international applicants aim to highlight the global issue of "weaponized" legal systems, referencing the following examples can help motivate a ruling by illustrating that this is not merely a localized issue but a worldwide trend:

South Africa:

Nelson Mandela:

- Before becoming South Africa's first black president, Mandela was imprisoned for 27 years on charges often cited as politically motivated under the apartheid regime. His case is a poignant example of how legal systems can be used to suppress political dissent.

Brazil:

Lula da Silva (Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva):

- Former President, convicted and later cleared of corruption charges in a move many saw as politically motivated. His case was part of a broader anti-corruption operation, Operation Car Wash, where critics argued, the legal system was used to target political opponents.

Philippines:

Joseph Estrada:

- Removed from office via impeachment and later convicted of plunder but pardoned. His case highlighted allegations of the judiciary being used in political battles.

Taiwan:

Chen Shui-bian:

- Convicted of corruption charges after leaving office, with many supporters claiming these were politically motivated to discredit him and his party.

Japan:

Ryuichi Sakamoto: N

- Not a politician, but as a prominent figure, his criticism of the Fukushima response led to legal challenges he claimed were meant to silence him, illustrating how legal threats can extend to cultural and business leaders.

Madagascar:

Marc Ravalomanana:

- Ousted in a coup and later charged with crimes including murder, with claims that these charges were politically motivated to keep him out of politics.

Kenya:

Uhuru Kenyatta:

- Faced charges at the International Criminal Court (ICC) for crimes against humanity related to post-election violence, which were later withdrawn due to lack of evidence, amidst claims of political manipulation.

Argentina:

Cristina Fernández de Kirchner:

- Has faced numerous legal challenges since leaving office, which she and her supporters claim are politically motivated to undermine her political influence.

China:

Bo Xilai:

- A prominent Chinese politician whose trial for corruption was seen by some as a political purge within the Communist Party, showcasing how legal proceedings can be orchestrated for political ends.

Russia:

Mikhail Khodorkovsky:

- Once Russia's richest man, his imprisonment on fraud charges was widely seen as punishment for his political ambitions against Vladimir Putin.

Venezuela:

Leopoldo López:

- Charged with inciting violence during protests, which he and international observers claimed were politically motivated to suppress opposition.

New Caledonia (France):

Jean-Marie Tjibaou:

- While not directly charged, his assassination came after a period of political tension and legal maneuvering, illustrating how legal systems can be part of broader political conflicts in territories with complex governance structures.

Europe:

Italy - Silvio Berlusconi:

- Multiple trials for corruption and tax fraud, often seen as attempts by political adversaries to discredit him during his tenure as Prime Minister.

France - Nicolas Sarkozy:

- Convicted of corruption and influence peddling, with many viewing the legal pursuits as politically motivated, especially given the timing and nature of the charges.

Turkey - Selahattin Demirtaş:

- A prominent Kurdish politician, leader of the HDP, imprisoned on charges of terrorism, which many international observers consider to be politically motivated.

Spain - Catalan Leaders (e.g., Carles Puigdemont):

- Faced charges of rebellion, sedition, and misuse of public funds for leading the Catalan independence movement, with claims of political persecution.

Middle East & North Africa:

Egypt - Mohamed Morsi:

- The first democratically elected president, removed from power and later died in custody, with legal actions against him widely criticized as political retribution.

Bahrain - Nabeel Rajab:

- Human rights activist repeatedly imprisoned on charges critics argue are designed to silence dissent.

Asia:

Malaysia - Anwar Ibrahim:

- A prominent opposition leader, faced multiple charges over the years, including sodomy, often seen as attempts to sideline his political influence.

India - Arvind Kejriwal:

- Delhi's Chief Minister, faced legal challenges and probes that some believe are politically motivated, particularly from rival political groups.

Hong Kong - Joshua Wong:

- A student activist, faced numerous legal challenges, including charges related to protests, which are seen by many as attempts to curb pro-democracy movements.

Africa:

Zimbabwe - Morgan Tsvangirai:

- The main opposition leader to Robert Mugabe, faced numerous legal and political obstacles, including arrests on what were often considered trumped-up charges.

Uganda - Kizza Besigye:

- Long-time opposition leader, repeatedly arrested and charged with treason and incitement, seen as efforts to suppress opposition.

Latin America:

Peru - Keiko Fujimori:

- Daughter of former President Alberto Fujimori, faced corruption charges that many view as attempts to dismantle her political influence.

Ecuador - Rafael Correa:

- Convicted and sentenced in absentia for corruption, with claims that these actions are politically motivated to prevent his return to politics.

North America:

Mexico - Andrés Manuel López Obrador:

- Before becoming President, faced various legal challenges during his political career, which he claimed were to thwart his political ambitions.

Australasia:

Australia - Julian Assange:

- Not a traditional politician but a significant figure in the realm of political transparency, faced legal action for espionage that many argue was politically motivated due to Wikileaks' publications.

Global:

International - Edward Snowden:

- While not facing direct legal action in the U.S. due to his exile, the charges against him for espionage are often cited as legal weaponization against whistleblowers with political implications.

When compiling this list:

Sources:

- These instances have been reported by a variety of media outlets, NGOs like Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and through scholarly articles examining political prosecutions.

Caveats:

- It's crucial to recognize that while many of these cases involve allegations of political motivations, legal actions can also be justified where criminal activity is proven. The perception of political motivation often stems from timing, context, or the selective application of law enforcement.
- **Impact:** These cases highlight a global trend where legal systems might be used not just for justice but as tools in political battles, potentially undermining democratic processes and public trust in judicial systems.

This list isn't exhaustive but represents a cross-section of notable cases where political motivations behind legal actions have been widely discussed.

FULL AND FRANK DISCLOSURE OF COMMERCIAL PLANNING.

Executive Overview: Strategic Commercial Planning and Legal Activism

Introduction:

In light of recent revelations regarding the misuse of the judicial system, our Commission has developed a multifaceted strategy to finance, support, and amplify legal and political campaigns aimed at restoring judicial integrity. This overview details our planned commercial, legal, and political initiatives, aligning with the President's executive orders to counteract the weaponization of the justice system.

1. Commercial Strategy:

A. State-Based Management Companies:

- **Objective:** To establish local entities in all 50 states for managing grassroots campaigns, legal support, educational initiatives and deradicalisation and rehabilitation centres.
- **Business Model:** Franchise model with localized management, focusing on training, advocacy, and legal support.
- **Projected Revenue:**
 - **Year 1:** \$102 million (aggregated from all states)
 - **Year 5:** \$228.735 million (with a 30% yearly increase after initial setup)
- **Costs:** Initial setup costs at \$110.175 million, with a gradual decrease in cost growth rate.

B. International Holding Company (Switzerland):

- **Purpose:** Oversee global operations, manage international advocacy, and coordinate with foreign entities for broader impact.
- **Revenue Streams:** Grants, donations, membership fees, and licensing of educational content.
- **Projected Revenue:**
 - **Year 1:** \$6.7 million
 - **Year 5:** \$20.415 million (35% yearly increase post initial year)
- **Costs:** Starting at \$4.7 million per year, with controlled growth.

C. Crowdfunding via GoFundMe:

- **Campaigns:** Dedicated to specific cases or general support for judicial reform.
- **Expected Outcome:** \$1 million/year from public contributions, supplementing operational funds.

D. Cryptocurrency (JEI Coin):

- **Utility:** Used within our ecosystem for transactions, donations, and as a reward mechanism for participation in activism.
- **Revenue:** Transaction fees, coin sales, and potential future value increase.
- **Projected Income:** \$100,000 in Year 1, with a significant potential for growth based on adoption.

2. Legal and Political Activism:

A. Amicus Briefs Campaign:

- **Strategy:** Mobilize public and legal professionals to file amicus briefs in support of cases highlighting judicial bias or corruption.
- **Impact:** Increase judicial accountability and public awareness, potentially influencing judicial decisions.

B. Legal Activism Training and Support:

- **Programs:** Offer training for lawyers and activists on *actio popularis*, class actions, judicial reform advocacy, condition, indoctrination, patented social engineering psyops used in radicalizing perpetrators of judicial abuse and techniques used in **de-radicalising and reforming such individuals**.
- **Monetization:** Through tuition fees and monetized video courses on YouTube and other platforms.
- **Expected Revenue:** \$300,000/year from training, with growth via course monetization.

C. Social Media Campaigns:

- **Platforms:** YouTube, X, LinkedIn for educational content, fundraising, and rallying support.
- **Strategy:** Utilize influencers, live streams, and educational series to engage and educate.

3. Trust and Non-Profit Initiatives:

A. Charitable Trust (Justice Empowerment Trust):

- **Mission:** Fund educational programs, legal aid, and community outreach.
- **Funding:** Through donations, bequests, and investment returns.
- **Role:** Supports the non-profit aspect of our work, ensuring legal actions are for public benefit.

B. Property Holding Trust:

- **Purpose:** Manage real estate assets used for operations, reducing rental costs.

4. Projected Profits and Financial Health:

Over 5 Years:

- **Total Revenue Growth:** From \$108.7 million in Year 1 to \$249.15 million in Year 5 across all entities.
- **Net Profit:** After initial deficits from setup costs, profitability is expected from Year 3, with significant returns by Year 5 due to scaling, system efficiencies, and growing public support.

5. Alignment with Presidential Directives:

1. Our initiatives are designed to complement the executive order on ending the weaponization of the legal system by:
 - 1.1. Providing resources and platforms for public engagement and legal support.
 - 1.2. Increasing transparency and accountability in judicial proceedings.
 - 1.3. Fostering an environment where legal actions are driven by justice rather than political motivations.

Conclusion:

This executive overview outlines our commitment to not only financially support but also strategically advance the cause of judicial independence and integrity. We seek to collaborate with your offices to ensure these strategies effectively contribute to the broader goal of restoring public trust in the American judicial system while setting a precedent globally. We are prepared to provide further details or adapt our plans based on feedback from your esteemed offices.

Note: This plan assumes a favorable legal and political environment and does not account for potential regulatory changes or significant economic downturns. All financial projections are speculative and based on current market trends and anticipated growth in public and legal interest.

Table of Contents

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY	1
President Donald J Trump.....	1
The President of the United States	1
Subject: Support for Executive Order on Judicial Independence and International Cooperation	1
Support and Collaboration:.....	1
Offer of Assistance:	2
Expertise and Analysis:.....	2
International Advocacy:.....	2
Educational Initiatives:.....	2
Contact Details:.....	2
COMMISSION OF INQUIRY	3
The Attorney General of the United States.....	3
The Attorney General of Virginia	3
Subject: International Interest based concern regarding Judicial Independence in the State of Virginia.....	3
Call to Action:.....	5
Restore Judicial Integrity:.....	5
Address Past Wrongs:	5
Strengthen Oversight:	5
Conclusion:.....	5
ADDENDA.....	6
POLITICAL IMPACT - DISCLOSURE ON ESCALATING LEVELS OF COMPLAINT TO AG.....	6
1. Detailed Investigation and Review:.....	6
Comprehensive Audit:.....	6
Inter-Agency Cooperation:.....	6
2. Legal and Judicial Remedies:.....	6
Release and Re-evaluation:.....	6
Judicial Recusal:.....	6
3. Policy and Procedure Reforms:.....	6
Guidelines for Impartiality:.....	6

Training and Oversight:	7
4. Transparency and Public Trust:	7
Public Reporting:	7
Community Outreach:	7
5. International Compliance and Diplomacy:	7
Actio Popularis and International Law:	7
Diplomatic Efforts:	7
6. Legal Accountability for Offenders:	7
Prosecution or Disciplinary Actions:	7
7. Legislative Recommendations:	8
General Suggestions for the Attorneys General:	8
Immediate Case Reviews:	8
Judicial Recusal Protocols:	8
Transparency Measures:	8
International Cooperation:	8
Public Education and Judicial Training:	8
Legislative Advocacy:	8
Restorative Justice Initiatives:	8
Statement of facts relating to Aldo DiBelardino:	9
POLITICAL PRISONER'S STATEMENT OF FACTS:	9
Lates evidence received by this commission:	10
Related websites:	10
HABEAS DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGEMENT:	11
Proposed urgent applications that can be brought to rescind, quash, substitute the judgments made.:	11
1. Motion to Vacate or Set Aside the Default Judgment:	11
Arguments:	11
2. Motion to Quash the Habeas Default:	11
3. Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus:	12
Arguments:	12
4. Motion for Substitution of Judge:	12
Arguments:	12
5. Emergency Stay or Injunction:	12
Arguments:	12

Strategic Considerations:	13
THE APPEARANCE OF FIXER` JUDGES	13
Understanding "Fixer Judge":	13
Colloquial Use:	13
Legal Analogues:	13
Earmarks of a "Fixer" Judge:	14
Legal and Ethical Considerations:	14
Judicial Conduct Codes:	14
CORRUPT JUDICIAL CABAL'S AND CARTELS, ADMINISTRATIVE INJUSTICE AND REMEDIES	15
Conspiracy and Corruption:	15
Conspiracy:	15
Corruption:	15
Obstruction of Justice:	15
RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act):	15
Judicial Misconduct:	15
Police and Prosecutorial Misconduct:	16
Laws Protecting the Public:	16
Labeling and Perception:	16
Summary	16
Executive Order by President TRUMP titled "Ending the Weaponization of the Federal Government":	17
Executive Order Content:	17
Section 1. Purpose:	17
Sec. 3. Ending the Weaponization of the Federal Government:	17
Relation to Universal Fundamental Right and U.S. Legal Principles:	17
Connection to UDHR's Article 10:	17
Echoes in U.S. Bill of Rights:	17
How the Order Reinforces the Principle:	18
Review and Accountability:	18
Correction of Past Misconduct:	18
Enhancing Public Trust:	18
Statutes, Regulations, and Case Law:	18
Statutes:	18

Regulations:	18
Case Law:	18
RELATED INTERNATIONAL ARGUMENTS	19
Universal Declaration of Human Rights	19
Echoes in the U.S. Bill of Rights:	19
Sixth Amendment:	19
Fifth Amendment:	19
Fourteenth Amendment:	19
General Statutes and Case Law:	19
Statutes:	19
Case Law:	19
Regulations:	20
Reinforcement of the Principle:	20
Judicial Independence:	20
Separation of Powers:	20
Public and Political Scrutiny:	20
Summary	20
ARGUMENT IN THE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INTEREST	21
The doctrine of <i>Contra Bonos Mores</i> – Contrary to the moral fibre of the law	21
Exploitation of <i>Contra Bonos Mores</i> :	21
Moral Repugnance of Judicial Bias:	21
Public Perception and Legal Precedent:	21
International Human Rights Standards:	21
Advocacy and Implementation:	22
Legislative Advocacy:	22
Judicial Ethics Codes:	22
Public Education Campaigns:	22
Legal Challenges:	22
International Observation:	22
Media and Transparency:	22
Summary	22
Actio Popularis / Public, National and International Interest	23
Public Interest Litigation:	23
International Recognition:	23

CONCLUSION.....	23
INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE OF POLITICAL PRISONERS.....	24
The question on How to intervene internationally.....	24
Answer.....	24
South Africa:.....	24
Nelson Mandela:.....	24
Brazil:.....	24
Lula da Silva (Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva):.....	24
Philippines:.....	24
Joseph Estrada:.....	25
Taiwan:.....	25
Chen Shui-bian:.....	25
Japan:.....	25
Ryuichi Sakamoto: N.....	25
Madagascar:.....	25
Marc Ravalomanana:.....	25
Kenya:.....	25
Uhuru Kenyatta:.....	25
Argentina:.....	25
Cristina Fernández de Kirchner:.....	25
China:.....	25
Bo Xilai:.....	25
Russia:.....	26
Mikhail Khodorkovsky:.....	26
Venezuela:.....	26
Leopoldo López:.....	26
New Caledonia (France):.....	26
Jean-Marie Tjibaou:.....	26
Europe:.....	26
Italy - Silvio Berlusconi:.....	26
France - Nicolas Sarkozy:.....	26
Turkey - Selahattin Demirtaş:.....	26
Spain - Catalan Leaders (e.g., Carles Puigdemont):.....	26
Middle East & North Africa:.....	26
	36

Egypt - Mohamed Morsi:	26
Bahrain - Nabeel Rajab:	27
Asia:	27
Malaysia - Anwar Ibrahim:	27
India - Arvind Kejriwal:	27
Hong Kong - Joshua Wong:	27
Africa:	27
Zimbabwe - Morgan Tsvangirai:	27
Uganda - Kizza Besigye:	27
Latin America:	27
Peru - Keiko Fujimori:	27
Ecuador - Rafael Correa:	27
North America:	27
Mexico - Andrés Manuel López Obrador:	27
Australasia:	28
Australia - Julian Assange:	28
Global:	28
International - Edward Snowden:	28
When compiling this list:	28
Sources:	28
Caveats:	28
FULL AND FRANK DISCLOSURE OF COMMERCIAL PLANNING. Executive	
Overview: Strategic Commercial Planning and Legal Activism	29
Introduction:	29
1. Commercial Strategy:	29
A. State-Based Management Companies:	29
B. International Holding Company (Switzerland):	29
C. Crowdfunding via GoFundMe:	29
D. Cryptocurrency (JEI Coin):	30
2. Legal and Political Activism:	30
A. Amicus Briefs Campaign:	30
B. Legal Activism Training and Support:	30
C. Social Media Campaigns:	30
3. Trust and Non-Profit Initiatives:	30
	37

A. Charitable Trust (Justice Empowerment Trust):	30
B. Property Holding Trust:	30
4. Projected Profits and Financial Health:	31
Over 5 Years:	31
5. Alignment with Presidential Directives:	31
Conclusion:	31