

**SHARON BRIDGEWATER VIA "THE  
50 STATES EX REL SHARON  
BRIDGEWATER PRIVATE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL AND/OR  
RELATOR" PURUSANT TO THE  
RACKETEERED INFLUENCED AND  
CORRUPT ORGANIZATION ACT)  
P.O. Box Box 19631  
Detroit, MI 48219**

---

**THE PEOPLE OF THE 50 STATES COMMON LAW COURTS**

---

**IN RE:**

**BILL OF PARTICULARS**

**RACKETEERING CONSPIRACY  
18 USC § 1962(d)**

**MONEY LAUNDERING**

**RACKETEERING CONSPRACY  
FORFEITURE ALLEGATIONS  
18 U.S.C § 981( 18 U.S.C. § 1963  
AND**

**IN RE:**

**THE STATE of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas,  
California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida,  
Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa,  
Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland,  
Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi,  
Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New  
Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York,  
North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma,  
Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina,  
South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont,  
Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin,  
Wyoming[the Distri et of Columbia, the Common  
wealth of Puerto Rico, The US Virgin Island, Guam,  
the Northern Marianna Islands, the American Samoa]  
EX REL Sharon Bridgewater (A.K.A. Sharon**

**Abusalem, Sharon Davis) PRIVATE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL AND/OR RELATOR(VIA THE  
RACKETEERED INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT  
ORGANIZATION ACT) "REPRESENTATIVE OF  
THE 50 STATES AND/OR THE PEOPLE OF THE  
"50 STATES" AND/OR HUMANITY| FROM Jan. 1,  
1993 and continuing thru present]- (WITH  
AUTHORITY EQUAL TO THE UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY GENERAL TO ACT AS  
PROSECUTOR, and on behalf of myself, my son and  
those similarly situated VICTIMS) IN THE  
INTEREST OF NATIONAL SECURITY(protecting  
the federal judiciary, housing and managing and  
selling seized assets acquired by criminals through  
illegal activities,), one or more of the following  
companies, Specialty Investment Group L.L.C., a  
Georgia Company, Specialty Global Investments Inc.,  
a Nevada Corporation, and Bridgewater & Company  
Inc., a California Corporation, The Coalition for  
Empowerment(formerly Greater Lansing Helping  
Hands)a 501C-3 non-profit organization, a Michigan  
and/or Georgia non-profit corporation, B & B Building  
Maintenance INC. a Michigan Corporation, forced out  
of business-dissolved businesses Health Necessities and  
Accessories Inc., Top Notch Motors, Two Witnesses  
International Ministries(a non-profit organization-  
**501(C )(3) TAX-EMEMPT STATUS MALICIOUSLY**  
**REVOKEK IN RETALIATION ON THE ACCOUNT**  
**THAT S. BRIDGEWATER EXERCISED HER U.S.**  
**CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS) and/or Sharon**  
**Bridgewater and/or James Shannon Bridgewater -**  
**Real parties in interest CLAIMANT(S) AND/OR**  
**PLAINTIFF(S)****

**VS.**

Joe Biden in his official capacity as United States  
President and individually

The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.  
Washington, D.C.

**PRAECLPICE, NOTICE & AFFIDIVANT OF COMMON LAW REMEDIES OF COMMON LAW COURT ROOM, COMMON LAW MAGISTRATE JUDGE COMMON LAW JURY FOR CRIMINAL TRIAL OTHERWISE KNOWN AS "THE 50 STATES EX REL SHARON BRIDGEWATER PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND/OR RELATOR" JUDGE, JURY AND EXECUTOR TO THE RACKETEERED INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATION ACT &Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and/or "common law procedure," the Plaintiff(s) and/or Claimant(s) requires a complaint to contain a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief so as to give the defendant fair notice of the claim and the ground upon which it rests.**

Comes now the "The 50 States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater Private Attorney General and/or Relator" to provide a short plain statement pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) showing that "THE 50 STATES EX REL SHARON BRIDGEWATER PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND/OR RELATOR is entitled to relief and to give all the Defendants fair notice "once again" of the claim and the ground upon which it rests, and to vigorously prosecute all offenders for Racketeering Conspiracy with the duties as the "United States Attorney General and furthermore provide this BILL OF PARTICULARS, FURNISHED BY THE THE STATE of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming[the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, The US Virgin Island, Guam, the Northern Marianna Islands, the American Samoa] EX REL Sharon Bridgewater (A.K.A. Sharon Abusalem, Sharon Davis) PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND/OR RELATOR(VIA THE RACKETEERED INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATION ACT) "REPRESENTATIVE OF THE 50 STATES AND/OR THE PEOPLE OF THE "50 STATES" AND/OR HUMANITY[ FROM Jan. 1, 1993 and continuing thru present]- (WITH AUTHORITY EQUAL TO THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL TO ACT AS PROSECUTOR, on behalf of myself, my son and those similarly situated VICTIMS) IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL SECURITY(protecting the federal judiciary, housing and managing and selling seized assets acquired by criminals through illegal activities), one or more of the following companies, Specialty Investment Group L.L.C., a Georgia Company, Specialty Global Investments Inc., a Nevada Corporation, and Bridgewater & Company Inc., a California Corporation, The Coalition for Empowerment(formerly Greater Lansing Helping Hands)a 501C-3 non-profit organization, a Michigan and/or Georgia non-profit corporation, B & B Building Maintenance INC. a Michigan Corporation, forced out of business-dissolved

**businesses Health Necessities and Accessories Inc., Top Notch Motors, Two Witnesses International Ministries(a non-profit organization-501(C )(3) TAX-EMEMPT STATUS MALICIOUSLY REVOKED IN RETALIATION ON THE ACCOUNT THAT S. BRIDGEWATER EXERCISED HER U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS), Sharon Bridgewater and/or James Shannon Bridgewater - Real parties in interest CLAIMANT(S) AND/OR PLAINTIFF(S)**  
**IS as follows:**

- 1. MIRANDA WARNING**
- 2. INDICTMENT**
- 3. DEFAULT JUDGMENT**
- 4.**

**INDICTMENT**

**AT ALL TIME RELELEVANT TO THIS INDICTMENT**

**GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

**The Grand Jury Charges:**

**1.. Defendant Joe Biden is a resident or citizen of Washington D.C. and/or Delaware employed with the United States Government**

with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, and 21 counts of wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343, 2(a), and 2(b). Treason

## THE ENTERPRIZE

### PURPOSE OF ENTERPRIZE

“These defendants engaged in a massive, “international/Global” 27 year continuing scheme to defraud & exploit two witnesses and to fund a massive

18 U.S.C. § 1001 acts of making false statements, falsifying, concealing or covering up when they had a duty to speak the truth about the coronavirus vaccine in that

It is all part of Bill Gates predictitieve policing, master stamp system, to

Vaccine

Treason

A concealment may involve a failure to disclose or partial disclosures of information required on an application form; however, when using such a theory, the government must prove that the defendant had a duty to disclose the facts in question at the time of the alleged concealment of them. *United States v. Irwin*, 654 F.2d 671, 678-79 (10th Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 455 U.S. 1016 (1982).

purpose of impairing, obstructing or defeating the lawful function of any department of government . . . (A)ny conspiracy which is calculated to obstruct or impair its efficiency and destroy the value of its operation and reports as fair, impartial and reasonably accurate, would be to defraud the United States by depriving it of its lawful right and duty of promulgating or diffusing the information so officially acquired in the way and at the time required by law or departmental regulation.

*Hass*, 216 U.S. at 479-480. In *Hammerschmidt*, Chief Justice Taft, defined "defraud" as follows:

To conspire to defraud the United States means primarily to cheat the Government out of property or money, but it also means to interfere with or obstruct one of its lawful governmental functions by deceit, craft or trickery, or at least by means that are dishonest. It is not necessary that the Government shall be subjected to property or pecuniary loss by the fraud, but only that its legitimate official action and purpose shall be defeated by misrepresentation, chicane or the overreaching of those charged with carrying out the governmental intention.

*Hammerschmidt*, 265 U.S. at 188.

The general purpose of this part of the statute is to protect governmental functions from frustration and distortion through deceptive practices. Section 371 reaches "any conspiracy for the purpose of impairing, obstructing or defeating the lawful function of any department of Government." *Tanner v. United States*, 483 U.S. 107, 128 (1987); *see Dennis v. United States*, 384 U.S. 855 (1966). The "defraud part of section 371 criminalizes any willful impairment of a legitimate function of government, whether or not the improper acts or objective are criminal under another statute." *United States v. Tuohey*, 867 F.2d 534, 537 (9th Cir. 1989).

The word "defraud" in Section 371 not only reaches financial or property loss through use of a scheme or artifice to defraud but also is designed and intended to protect the integrity of the United States and its agencies, programs and policies. *United States v. Burgin*, 621 F.2d 1352, 1356 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 1015 (1980); *see United States v. Herron*, 825 F.2d 50, 57-58 (5th Cir.); *United States v. Winkle*, 587 F.2d 705, 708 (5th Cir. 1979), cert. denied, 444 U.S. 827 (1979). Thus, proof that the United States has been defrauded under this statute does not require any showing of monetary or proprietary loss. *United States v. Conover*, 772 F.2d 765 (11th Cir. 1985), aff'd, sub. nom. *Tanner v. United States*, 483 U.S. 107 (1987); *United States v. Del Toro*, 513 F.2d 656 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 423 U.S. 826 (1975); *United States v. Jacobs*, 475 F.2d 270 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 414 U.S. 821 (1973).

Thus, if the defendant and others have engaged in dishonest practices in connection with a program administered by an agency of the Government,

### **COMMON LAW JURISDICTION**

### **THE SUPREMECY OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, ADMIRALTY AND/OR MARITIME LAW/**

### **CRIMINAL AND/OR EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION**

TORTIOUS BREACH OF "INTERNATIONAL MARITIME CONTRACT," HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, TERRORISM, THE TWO WITNESSES, HUMANITY AND/OR OTHER CRIMINAL ACTS COMMITTED BY FOREIGN OFFICIALS(FOREIGN NATIONALS, ONE OR MORE XI JINPING, V. PUTIN, A.MERKEL, EMMANUEL MACRON, BORIS JOHNSON, CONSPIRING WITH U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, JOE BIDEN, K. HARRIS TO DEFRAUD THE TWO WITNESSES TO OBTAIN 125 TRILLION TO "PUSH" THE COV-19 BIO-, IN ADDITION TO THE MONEY LAUNDERING SCHEME VIA THE PUBLIC/HOUSING PARTNERHSHIP AGREEMENT – BREACH OF

INTERNATIONAL CONTRACT – APPLIES CRIMINALLY TO THESE PEOPLE VIA THE RACKETEERING INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATION ACT FOR FOREIGN OFFICIALS ACTS OCCURRING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

ARE SUBJECT TO PROSECUTION IN THE UNITED STATES

**UNIVERSAL JURISDICTION!!**

**RACKETEERING CONSPIRACY, INTERNATIONAL CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY(GENOCIDE, TERRORISM, SLAVERY)**

**That which derives its force and authority from the universal consent and immemorial practice of the people** The basic jurisdiction of the sovereign The 50 States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater private Attorney General and/or Relator include the right to define and punish crimes. Art. I, section 8, col. 10 of the U.S. Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and offenses against the Laws of Nations. Congress may declare criminal under U. S. law, acts that are criminal under international law via legislation(The Racketeered influenced and Corrupt Organization Act and/or Authority:

**HIGH COURT JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 75(V)**

**Section 75(v) and the constitutional limitation**

Section 75(v) of the *Constitution* provides that '[i]n all matters ... in which a writ of Mandamus or prohibition or an injunction is sought against an officer of the Commonwealth ... the High Court shall have original jurisdiction'. It is now established that the existence of s 75(v) gives rise to a constitutionally entrenched minimum provision of judicial review.

**PLAINTIFF(S) AND/OR CLAIMANT INCORPORATE AFFIDIVANT OF PROBABLE,  
CRIMINAL CHARGES AND INFORMATION AS FULLY SET FORTH HEREIN**

The basic jurisdiction of any sovereign state includes the right to define and punish crimes. The U.S. Constitution provides (Art. I, sec. 8, col. 10) that Congress shall have power "to define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Laws of Nations." Under this provision, Congress may identify and declare criminal under U.S. law, acts that are criminal under international law. Normally this is done by legislation. The domestic law of the United States is part of the fabric of international criminal law insofar as that national law provides for the recognition and punishment of international offenses. It has generally been the practice of the United States to recognize and punish international crimes only when they are embodied in U.S. treaties and implemented by federal legislation. <https://law.jrank.org/pages/1392/International-Criminal-Law-Defining-international-crimes.html> Read more: [International Criminal Law - Defining International Crimes - War, Convention, United, and Torture - JRank Articles](#) <https://law.jrank.org/pages/1392/International-Criminal-Law-Defining-international-crimes.html#ixzz7Ddg0VYQX> Read more: [International Criminal Law - Defining International Crimes - War, Convention, United, and Torture - JRank Articles](#) <https://law.jrank.org/pages/1392/International-Criminal-Law-Defining-international-crimes.html#ixzz7DdgODyxr>

**List all u.s. constitutional right and/or human rights claims for relief**

**Illegal monopoly, violation of Sherman acts etc.**

corporation. [name of indi  
13. Defendant parent corporation and een  
the stockholders of defendant subsidiary B in ento

Jacob Rothchild, David rockerferllor, bill gates,

**PLAINTIFF INCORPORATE RELATED CASES – ALL  
DISMISSED –**

**THEFT, MULTIPLE ACTS OF WIRE FRAUD, MAIL FRAUD  
PERJURY, FALSE DECLARATIONS, FALSE ARREST,  
ASSAULT AND BATTERY, TWO ACTS OF EXTORTIONS**

**PLAINTIFF INCORPORATE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT AND  
VERIFICATION AS FULLY SET FORTH HEREIN, WHICH  
OPERATES AS ONE OR MORE CLAIMS OF RELIEF, FIRST  
AMENDED COMPLAINT ETC.**

**PLAINTIFF(S) AND/OR CLAIMANT(S)  
INCORPORATE**

## *The “Core” International Crimes*

International criminal law (ICL) is a quite new and constantly developing branch of public international law, which deals with the criminal responsibility of individuals for the most serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian laws. ICL, identifying a certain number of “international crimes”, wants to expose perpetrators of such serious violations to personal criminal liability and provides for criminal sanctions that apply to all offenders.

The concept of “international crimes” is not defined by a universally accepted formulation, however they are usually referred to as “breaches of international rules entailing the personal criminal liability of the individuals concerned (as opposed to the responsibility of the State of which the individuals may act as organs)”<sup>[1]</sup>, “crimes that involve direct individual criminal responsibility under international law”<sup>[2]</sup> or even “punishable acts or conduct proscribed by international law”<sup>[3]</sup>.

ICL outlines four main categories of international crimes: genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression

IN ADDITION TO crimes such as terrorism and piracy (to just name a few) which are still object of controversy among the members of the international community.

Criminal accountability for those “core crimes” is considered by the international community of fundamental importance with regard to respect for the rule of law, deterrence of future violations, and the provision of redress and justice for victims.

These criminal conducts are considered to affect the international community as a whole and, consequently, all states have an interest to prevent the occurrence of these particularly heinous crimes and in holding the perpetrators accountable. Indeed, perpetrators of international crimes may be convicted on the basis of their own direct acts or omissions, or when ordering and facilitating a crime. This includes those who directly commit the crimes as well as those who, at the highest political and military levels, are involved in the planning and authorization of such acts.

Thus, the individual criminal responsibility for international crimes can be held in parallel with the responsibility of the state.

The international crimes have been defined over time in a range of international conventions and agreements, beginning with the first Hague Conventions, at the end of the 19th century, which established rules for military conduct during wartime, up to the Rome Statute[4] that, in 1998, established the International Criminal Court (ICC) with jurisdiction over the four "core crimes" (genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression).[ACTS OF TERRORISM]

It is on the base of the Rome Statute provisions, which represent the most comprehensive modern codification of international crimes, that the following paragraphs will synthetically explore the features the four "core crimes".

### Genocide

Genocide is defined by the Rome Statute as one of the following acts : (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group, committed with "the intention to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group"[5].

Genocide is essentially considered an attack upon human diversity[6]. The term was crafted with the Holocaust in mind, it is composed of the Greek word 'geno' (tribe or race) and the Latin verb 'caedere' (to kill)[7]. The essence of genocide is the destruction of the cohesion and moral dignity of a group as collective entity, as an element of international society.[8]

In the Nuremberg judgment the Holocaust was punished under the notion of 'crimes against humanity', which includes persecution and extermination. Only one year after the Nuremberg judgment, in 1946, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution in which it 'affirmed' that genocide is a crime under international law[9]. The UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide eventually defined the crime as an independent conduct in 1948[10]. The definition of the Convention was then reproduced in the Statutes of international criminal courts and tribunals, such as the ad hoc tribunals for the former Yugoslavia[11], Rwanda[12] and, lastly, the ICC.

The spirit of the crime of genocide lies in the attack on specific protected groups of victims. It can only be committed against national, ethnic, racial or religious groups[13]. Other groups, such as political or cultural groups, are not recognized as protected groups per se[14]. Genocide does not require the actual destruction of a protected group. However, according to the Convention, the enumerated acts must be committed with the 'intent' of the perpetrator to destroy the group in whole or in part ('specific intent'). Moreover, Genocide is the only crime in which incitement is expressly prohibited[15]. The prohibition takes into account that genocide is often spread through mass mobilization. While drafting the Genocide Convention the delegates of the State parties decided to criminalize public and direct incitement to genocide in order to counter emerging patterns of genocide and take

into account the specific risks of incitement of an indeterminate group of persons (e.g. through speeches, radio, press or other media)[16].

As cultural factors, such as social, historical and linguistic features, are often necessary to explain whether a group qualifies as a racial, ethnic, religious or national group, the definition of the extent to which cultural destruction may amount to genocide has generated a long debate[17]. As a matter of facts, the cultural dimension play an important role in the determination of genocide and, technically, the *actus reus* of genocide is not confined to killing. Physical and biological destruction are then often complemented by the elimination of cultural features, property or symbols.

### Crimes against humanity

Crimes against humanity are identified by the art.7 of the Rome Statute, which contains their most comprehensive modern treaty codification[18], as the following acts: (a) Murder; (b) Extermination; (c) Enslavement; (d) Deportation or forcible transfer of population; (e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of international law; (f) Torture; (g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity; (h) Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender as defined in paragraph 3, or other grounds that are universally recognized as impermissible under international law, in connection with any act referred to in this paragraph or any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court; (i) Enforced disappearance of persons; (j) The crime of apartheid; (k) Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health. Paragraph 1 of art.7 requires the mentioned acts, part of which are also recognized as common crimes by many national legal frameworks, must be committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population.

It appears clear that the concept of crimes against humanity retains some features of genocide, such as the idea of extermination. However, crimes against humanity differ from genocide, as while the latter focuses on the collective nature of the victims as a group, identified by nationality, ethnicity, race or religion, they are inclined to penalize the collective nature of the perpetration of crimes[19]. Crimes against humanity are attacks on civilian populations that are at risk because of their presence in the targeted population.

The basic idea is that, where exists a collective action of an organization that causes harm to the civilian population throughout a widespread or systematic violence, a crime is no longer simply an ordinary crime under domestic law but an international crime. Therefore, the peculiar element that distinguishes crimes against humanity from domestic crimes is the context in which they are committed, as part of a widespread or systematic attack against the civilian population.

Marking a significant development in international law, crimes against humanity were codified, for the first time, in the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal. Indeed, until then, the conduct of a state towards its own citizens was strictly considered a matter of internal affairs.

Nevertheless, in the first codification, the crimes against humanity could not be charged independently of a nexus to other crimes, they had to be linked to war crimes or crimes against peace (aggression). As seen in Statutes of major international criminal courts and, lastly, in the Rome Statute, the concept of crimes against humanity was then unbound from its war-related nexus and was developed more in line with the human rights tradition. Indeed, Crimes against humanity can now be committed in both the context of armed conflict and in peacetime. The reference to the concept of 'civilians' in the definition of the crime is the only reminiscence of the historical linkage to war crimes.

Crimes against humanity could be differentiated in two categories of offences. The first one encompasses the so-called murder-type offences. They include murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation or forcible transfer of population, torture, acts of sexual violence or enforced disappearance of persons. Some but not all of them are criminal offences in national legal systems. They were banned internationally because of their cruelty and barbarity. The second type of offences is 'persecution'-related. They are typically geared at persecution of a specific group of people on racial, religious or political grounds<sup>[20]</sup> and often may not be considered criminal or even prohibited in national legal systems.

The notion of attack against civilian population of the crimes against humanity is understood in an extensive way, including the use of armed force and any form of mistreatment or discriminatory practices. An attack is considered 'widespread' if it is conducted on a large scale and, even if there is no specific numerical threshold, it results in a large number of victims<sup>[21]</sup>. The term 'systematic' used to define the attacks refers to their organized nature, such as the repetition of similar criminal conduct on a regular basis.<sup>[22]</sup> In absence of the repetitive element, the systematic nature of the attacks could be also substantiated by the existence of a plan concerning attacks or other factors such as, for instance, the existence of a particular policy or ideology to destroy or weaken a community, discriminatory measures, measures changing the demography of the population, or the involvement of high-level political and/or military leaders in the establishment of the plan<sup>[23]</sup>.

### War crimes

War crimes are the oldest category of international crimes. They are grounded in international humanitarian law (IHL), traditionally known as *jus in bello* (the law of war), an independent branch of public international law. IHL regulates the conduct of parties engaged in an armed conflict and seeks to minimize suffering and harm. It is based on a balance between military necessities and humanitarian considerations. Indeed, in armed conflict, certain acts of violence, such as attacking enemy's military objectives, are allowed (lawful) and others prohibited (unlawful). International humanitarian law regulates both lawful and unlawful acts of violence reconciling the two different perspectives, on one side, the humanitarian commitment 'to prevent or mitigate suffering', on the other, the pragmatic warfare necessity of overcoming the enemy.

Historically, a turning point in the codification of international humanitarian law has been identified in the battle of Solferino<sup>[24]</sup> and the subsequent issue of the first Geneva Convention<sup>[25]</sup> for the amelioration of the condition of wounded combatants. The body of IHL rules was then complemented by the 'Hague law'<sup>[26]</sup>, on the rights and obligations of

belligerents in the conduct of military, and the 'Geneva law'[\[27\]](#) designed to protect victims of armed conflict and specific categories of persons, such as prisoners of war, detainees, civilians and humanitarian aid workers. Nowadays, nearly every state in the world has agreed to be bound by IHL provisions and the core of them is considered as customary international law.

However, only specific and serious violations of international humanitarian law are criminalized as "war crimes". The initial IHL provisions failed to specify whether a violation entailed criminal responsibility and the "War crimes law" was developed incrementally and through practice in the twentieth century. Even the Geneva Conventions and its Protocols, by qualifying the so-called grave breaches as 'war crimes', created a certain initial confusion from a conceptual point of view, since the idea of "grave breaches" implies a hierarchy, whereby certain violations are considered grave enough to qualify as crimes, whilst others do not. One of the key prerequisites of a war crime is that the crime is connected to the armed conflict. This is a necessary requirement to distinguish war crimes from ordinary offences[\[28\]](#). Upon war crimes is established a universal jurisdiction[\[29\]](#), which entitles a State to prosecute offenders even in the absence of any link between the crime committed and the prosecuting state. In order to make this principle effective, States are required to establish universal jurisdiction for war crimes in their national legislation. The basis for the assertion of universal jurisdiction over war crimes is found in both treaty law and in customary international law.[\[30\]](#) The ICC Statute consider the war crimes in art. 8 providing a comprehensive list of them and containing an additional element that specifies the ICC has jurisdiction 'in particular' when war crimes are 'committed as part of a plan or policy or as part of a large-scale commission of crimes'.

The large majority of war crimes can be traced back to the violation of certain fundamental principles of international humanitarian law grounded in the protection of persons and property[\[31\]](#). A first fundamental principle is the principle of protection of non-combatants that requires parties to an armed conflict to treat civilians, prisoners of war and wounded or sick former combatants humanely. A second key principle is the principle of distinction. It requires parties to a conflict at all times to distinguish between civilians and combatants and direct the attacks only against combatants and military objects. They must not be directed against civilians or civilian objects, such as churches, hospitals or private residences that are not used for military purposes. The ICC Statute also expressly prohibits attacks on humanitarian assistance and peacekeeping missions, as long as they are entitled to civilian protection[\[32\]](#). A third fundamental principle under international humanitarian law is the principle of proportionality. It prohibits an attack on a military objective if such an attack may be expected to cause excessive collateral damage (such as loss of civilian life, injury to civilians and damage to civilian objects) in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated. Lastly, the fourth fundamental principle is the prohibition on employing weapons, ammunition, materials and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury and unnecessary suffering to members of the armed forces and civilians who directly participate in hostilities.

To be held accountable of war crimes the required mental elements may differ in terms of their thresholds. On this matter, the ICC sets a relatively high mens rea standard stating that, unless otherwise provided, intent in relation to consequence exists only if the person 'means to cause that consequence or is aware that it will occur in the ordinary course of events' [33]. Crime of aggression.

Aggression is one of the most controversial crimes in international criminal law[34]. Likewise war crimes, it is essentially connected to armed violence. Still, aggression does not involve a breach of the *jus in bello*, but a criminalization of certain forms of recourse to force (*jus ad bellum*). Aggression is usually defined as the most serious and dangerous form of illegal use of force by a state against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another state[35].

The crime of aggression highlights the trend towards a *jus contra bellum* in the international legal order, characterized by the restriction of the use of armed force in international relations. Despite that, the crime has a troubled past and in most historical cases, it has been prosecuted after the fact.

In the first version of ICC Statute the crime of aggression was just symbolically included in Article 5 but its exercise of jurisdiction remained pending on the formulation of a proper definition. Only after years of debates and negotiations, at the Kampala Review Conference (2010), states reached agreement on a definition of the crime and the conditions under which the Court can exercise jurisdiction. The new definition identifies as "crime of aggression" the planning, preparation, initiation or execution, by a person in a position effectively to exercise control over or to direct the political or military action of a State, of an act of aggression which, by its character, gravity and scale, constitutes a manifest violation of the Charter of the United Nations[36]. The Kampala definition describes aggression as a leadership crime and extends individual criminal responsibility from the traditional concept of 'war of aggression' to 'acts of aggression' according with General Assembly Resolution 3314 definitions[37]. The idea of individual criminal responsibility is closely linked to unlawful state action in international relations. Therefore, an individual cannot incur responsibility in the absence of an act of aggression under international law.[38]

In practice, types of aggression may vary from mere violations of sovereignty (e.g. targeted air strikes) to interventions with on-site presence or other unlawful uses of force. These acts may involve high civilian casualties or loss of life and disturb peace and security. In other cases, they may cause limited human damage, or even be exercised with the intent to protect peace and security or human rights.[39]

However, several are the factors that limit the definition of a conduct as "act of aggression". As stated in art.8 bis of the ICC Statute, the crime of aggression requires an act which 'by its character, gravity and scale' constitutes 'a manifest violation of the Charter'. These factors distinguish the crime of aggression from general violations of the prohibition of the use of force, resulting in the fact that not every illegal use of force entails individual criminal responsibility for aggression.

crimes of aggression committed by non-state parties against them (i.e. on their territory), although they enjoy such protection for other categories of crimes[43].

importance in the advancement of human rights protection. both the 'public' and 'private' sides of violence thus protecting different interests: state interests, the autonomy and dignity of individuals and group rights.

[15] Art.3 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948 : The following acts shall be punishable:

- (a) Genocide; (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide; (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide; (d) Attempt to commit genocide; (e) Complicity in genocide.

Russia made a proposal to cover it in the Genocide Convention as follows: 'In this Convention genocide also means any deliberate act committed with the intent to destroy the language, religion or culture of a national, racial or religious group on grounds of national or religious origin, or religious beliefs such as: (a) Prohibiting the use of the language of the group in daily intercourse or in schools or the printing and circulation of publications in the language of the group; (b) destroying or preventing the use of libraries, museums, schools, historical monuments, places of worship or other cultural institutions and objects of the group.'

crimes committed by certain civilians not taking part in hostilities against other civilians should automatically qualify as war crimes.

Universal jurisdiction over war crimes -(03/2014): "The treaty basis for the assertion of universal jurisdiction was first introduced by the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 for the protection of war victims in relation to those violations of the Conventions defined as grave breaches. Under the relevant article of each Convention (Arts 49, 50, 129 and 146, respectively), States are required to search for alleged offenders "regardless of their nationality," and either bring them before their own courts or hand them over for trial by another State Party which has made out a *prima facie* case. ....While the relevant treaty law provisions are restricted to grave breaches, universal jurisdiction in customary international law may be regarded as extending to all violations of the laws and customs of war which constitute war crimes."

### **BREACH OF "INTERNATIONAL MARITIME CONTRACT"**

### **VIOLATIONS OF THE NUMBERG CODE**

Introduction The judgment by the war crimes tribunal at Nuremberg laid down 10 standards to which physicians must conform when carrying out experiments on human subjects in a new code that is now accepted worldwide. This judgment established a new standard of ethical medical behaviour for the post World War II human rights era. Amongst other requirements, this

document enunciates the requirement of voluntary informed consent of the human subject. The principle of voluntary informed consent protects the right of the individual to control his own body. This code also recognizes that the risk must be weighed against the expected benefit, and that unnecessary pain and suffering must be avoided. This code recognizes that doctors should avoid actions that injure human patients. The principles established by this code for medical practice now have been extended into general codes of medical ethics. The Nuremberg

The judgment by the war crimes tribunal at Nuremberg laid down 10 standards to which physicians must conform when carrying out experiments on human subjects in a new code that is now accepted worldwide. This judgment established a new standard of ethical medical behaviour for the post World War II human rights era. Amongst other requirements, this document enunciates the requirement of voluntary informed consent of the human subject. The principle of voluntary informed consent protects the right of the individual to control his own body. This code also recognizes that the risk must be weighed against the expected benefit, and that unnecessary pain and suffering must be avoided. This code recognizes that doctors should avoid actions that injure human patients. The principles established by this code for medical practice now have been extended into general codes of medical ethics. Code (1947)

- To immediately stop the medical experimentation and administration of vaccines to the Israeli public.
- To ask the government to approve all legislative procedures that do not violate the principle of a person's informed consent to receive the medical treatment described above, which denies legal status in Israel and in Israeli democracy, including avoiding the creation of a vaccination passport , leaving the names of those who have not been vaccinated with the local authorities or any other relevant legislator.
- Taking the strictest measures against any public, business or employment entity that violates state labor laws or other matters required to prevent vaccination coercion or offer, as well as discrimination, against those who choose not to receive the above innovative medical care.
- Please note that a copy of this document will also be **forwarded to the media around the world for violation of the Nuremberg Code**. Relevant in all countries of the free world.
- And as a final note, it should be noted that only recently a decision was made in the Council of Europe on 27/1/21, ordering all authorities not to pressure or request people to take the Corona vaccine in any way. Therefore, what is good for advanced European countries is certainly also good for Israel – and the balance speaks for itself “.

Pursuant to one or more of the:

RICO, Clayton, Sherman Act] bring to bear the pressure of “private attorneys general” on a serious national problem for which public prosecutorial resources are deemed inadequate; *the mechanism chosen to reach the objective in one or more of the Clayton, Sherman, Act and **RICO** is the carrot of treble damages.*[Agency Holding Corp. v. Malley-Duff & Associates][107 S.Ct. 2759, 483 U.S. 143, 151 (1987)]

In rejecting a significantly different focus under RICO, therefore, we are honoring an analogy that Congress itself accepted and relied upon, and one that promotes the objectives of civil RICO as readily as it furthers the objects of the Clayton Act. Both statutes share a common congressional objective of encouraging civil litigation to supplement Government efforts to deter and penalize the respectively prohibited practices. The object of civil RICO is thus not merely to compensate victims but to turn them into prosecutors, “private attorneys general,” dedicated to eliminating racketeering activity.<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, at 187 (citing Malley-Duff, 483 U.S., at 151 ) (civil RICO specifically has a “further purpose [of] encouraging potential private plaintiffs diligently to investigate”). The provision for treble damages is accordingly justified by the expected benefit of suppressing racketeering activity, an object pursued the sooner the better.[Rotella v. Wood et al., 528 U.S. 549 (2000)]

Private Attorney General

ALL PUBLIC OFFICIALS, Member of Congress, Delegates, or Resident Commissioners, either before or after he/she has qualified, or an officer or employee or person acting for or on behalf of the United States, or any department, agency, or branch of Government thereof, including the District of Columbia, in any official function, under or by authority of any such department, agency, or branch of Government, are acting as agents of foreign principals in violation of 18 § 219

**Coronavirus is a Global funded by Bill and Melinda Gates conspiracy between China and unlawfully using violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims, to get to get the vaccine,**

<https://english.elpais.com/science-tech/2021-11-19/why-the-covid-19-vaccines-do-not-stop-the-virus-from-circulating.html>

but is in my opinion biological warfare, which spreads the disease

## FACTS

**U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL ARE GUILTY OF TREASON, AIDING, ABETTING RUSSIA AND CHINA, CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY(COMMIT TWO PREDITATE ACTS AND ARE GUILTY OF VIOLATING THE RACKETEERED INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATION ACT(SEE BELOW)ALL PROPERTY IS SUBJECT TO FORFEITURE AND ALL PUBLIC OFFICIALS REMOVED FROM OFFICE**

- 1) U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE HAVE COMMITTED “acts” of TREASON; AS FOLLOWS:

CLEARLY ACTED WITH “THEN” MERRICK GARLAND CHIEF JUDGE OF U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, DONALD TRUMP, WILLIAM BARR AND OTHER “CO-CONSPIRATORS, CRIMINALS, FRAUDSTERS,” falsies, conceals or covers up by trick, scheme or devise a material fact and/or made and continue to make false, ficititious or fraudulent statements or reprenstations and/or makes and continue to make false writing or documents knowing the same to contain false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entries in case # \_\_\_\_\_ entitled Sharon Bridgewater vs. Donald Trump in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1001

ILLEGALLY USED MY NAME WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION OR CONSENT, CONSPIRED WITH MERRICK GARLAND(SEE BELOW) COMMITTED AT LEAST TWO PREDICATE ACTS OF MAIL FRAUD AND WIRE FRAUD IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §1341 AND/OR 18 U.S.C. § 1343, CONSPIRED WITH MERRICK GARLAND, MANUFACTURED A “FAKE COURT CASE,” IN THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS D.C. CIRCUIT DENIED AND/OR DEPRIVED BRIDGEWATER THE RIGHT TO FILE A WRIT OF CERT. OR A FIRST AMENDMENT COMPLAINT IN A SCHEME TO DEFRAUD BOTH SHARON AND/OR JAMES S. BRIDGEWATER, issued an order without jurisdiction and/or ACTED WITHOUT . ISSUED ONE OR MORE VOID ORDER TO OBTAIN \$125 TRILLION DOLLARS.

The United States Supreme Court has clearly, and repeatedly, held that any judge who acts without jurisdiction is engaged in an act of treason. U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101, S. Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed. 2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L.Ed 257 (1821). Title 5, US Code Sec. 556(d), Sec. 557, Sec.706: Courts lose jurisdiction if they do not follow Due Process. An order that exceeds the jurisdiction of

the court is void, and can be attacked in any proceeding in any court where the validity of the judgment comes into issue. (See *Rose v. Himely* (1808) 4 Cranch 241, 2 L ed 608; *Pennoyer v. Neff* (1877) 95 US 714, 24 L ed 565

China, Russia,

#### **Brain Chip on Soldiers**

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/checkpoint/wp/2014/08/27/new-obama-plan-calls-for-implanted-computer-chips-to-help-u-s-troops-heal/>

**That on September 18, 2014, Obama signed Executive Order 13676: Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria Terrifying New Executive Order give US Gov Power To Force Vaccines and RFID Chips, and his February 15, 2015 Task Force “5-Year National Action Plan(see**  
<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/09/18/executive-order-combating-antibiotic-resistant-bacteria>

is now being implemented on the general public(humanity)

## **FIVE YEARS LATER**

**That on the Chinese New Year(the year of the rat) January 27, 2020 the Coronavirus was announced by co-conspirators China**

2) Have knowingly, intentionally, concealed known facts they are under a duty to disclosure to the American people and/or humanity, secretly, malicious conspired with high tech companies(Bill Gates, Microsoft, et al) and parachuetical companies, to enslave humanity Bill Gates allowed forms of DNA that have been manipulated in the lab in a way that alters their natural state can be patented. (reword)

of voluntary informed consent of the human subject. The principle of voluntary informed consent protects the right of the individual to control his own body. This code also recognizes that the risk

meanwhile China is collecting DNA

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-court-genes/u-s-top-court-bars-patents-on-human-genes-unless-synthetic-idUSBRE95C0PW20130613>

- 3) Called cDNA - the “c” stands for “complementary” - it is essentially an edited form of a to patent Coronavirus vaccine, which means everyone if you received the Cov-19 vaccine, your DNA, mixed with the cDNA(patented)your body now is “someone” else
- 4) **IS SECRETLY WORKING IN JOINT PARTICIPATION WITH THE ENEMY JOE BIDEN, DONALD TRUMP, KAMALA HARRIS, RUSSIA AND/OR CHINA**
- 5) **OUR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS**
- 6) **ARE SECRETLY CONDITIONING SOCIETY TO REMAIN SIX FEET APART, NORM IN TOTAL CONTROL – PREDICTIVE POLIC**
- 7) **LOCK-DOWN IS A WAY OF LIFE NOW, TRANSITIONING SOCIETY FOR PERMANENT LOCK-DOWNS**

**THEY WILL CONTINUE TO PRODUCE DIFFERENT VARIANTS(“MARKET THE FLU, HEPATIC, DIABETES, I.E)AND MORE BOOSTER SHOT, AND SUBSEQUENTLY INTRODUCE THE “INVISIBLE TATTOO VACCINE DELIVERY” WHICH TAKES THE PLACE OF SHOTS – THIS IS “THE OFFICIAL SNAKE BITE” MARK OF THE BEAST SO YOU MAY NOT BUY OR SELL UNLESS YOU HAVE THIS INVISIBLE TATTOO, ONCE A PERSON RECEIVES IT, THEY WILL BE PROGRAM(5G NETWORK)**

# Surveillance and Predictive Policing

## Through AI

the unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims.

**THE DEFENDANTS JOE BIDEN, DONALD TRUMP, BARAK OBAMA, KAMALA HARRIS, ET AL CRIMES CONSTITUTE racketeering conspiracy, treason, extermination, murder, enslavement, torture, imprisonment, rape, forced abortions and other sexual violence, persecution on political, religious, racial and gender grounds, the forcible transfer of populations, the enforced" illegal, unlawful crimes against the two witnesses and humanity, terrorism ARE**

**PURSUANT TO DIPLOCK COURT INTRODUCED UNDER NORTHERN IRELAND(EMERGENCY PROVISIONS)ACT OF 1972, WAS INTRODUCE FOR NON-JURY TRIALS TO DEAL WITH INTIMIDATION OF WITNESSES, AND WAS INTRODUCE**

**1)A CASE WHERE THE TRIAL IS A RETRIAL AND THE JURY IN THE PREVIOUS WAS DISCHARGED BECAUSE JURY TAMPERING WOULD TAKE PLACE**

**2)A CASE WHERE JURY TAMPERING HAS TAKEN PLACE IN PREVIOUS CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS INVOLVING THE DEFENDANTS.**

**3)A CASE WHERE THERE HAS BEEN INTIMIDATION OR ATTEMPTED INTIMIDATION OF ANY PERSON WHO IS LIKELY TO BE WITNESSES IN**

## THE TRIAL.

### § 160 —Against parent corporation and officers and directors of subsidiary corporations—For rescission of patent license agreement and accounting of converted corporate profits and waste of corporate assets—By shareholder of parent corporation—For injury to both parent and subsidiary corporations

[Caption, Introduction, see CAPTIONS, PRAYERS, ETC.]

1. 1 [Name of plaintiff], Plaintiff, is a resident of 2  
[address], City of 3, County of 4, State of 5.

2. 6 [Name of defendant], Defendant parent corporation, is a  
corporation duly organized and existing under the laws under the State of  
7 engaged in the 8 [manufacture of industrial safety devices]

---

There are two criteria which must be satisfied in order to utilise this arrangement under the 2003 Act. The first is that a judge must be satisfied that there is evidence of a 'real and present danger' that jury tampering would take place.<sup>18</sup> Examples of evidence of 'real and present danger' include:

- (a) a case where the trial is a retrial and the jury in the previous trial was discharged because jury tampering had taken place,
- (b) a case where jury tampering has taken place in previous criminal proceedings involving the defendant or any of the defendants,
- (c) a case where there has been intimidation, or attempted intimidation, of any person who is likely to be a witness in the trial.<sup>19</sup>

where he/she is satisfied that there is a risk that the administration of justice will be impaired.<sup>1</sup> Non-jury trials in the context of terrorism came to be known as 'Diplock trials' in this jurisdiction (and are still widely referred to as such) because it was Lord Diplock's report into emergency procedures in Northern Ireland in 1972 that recommended this arrangement.<sup>2</sup> The single-judge 'Diplock courts' were subsequently introduced under the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act 1973 in an attempt by the UK government to deal with the intimidation of witnesses by paramilitary groups and the perceived subversion of jury decisions along sectarian lines. Significant improvements in the security situation in the mid-2000s led the then Secretary of State for Northern Ireland Peter Hain to propose a programme of security normalisation within which the abolition of the Diplock trials was an important part.<sup>3</sup> However, the continuing risk of obstruction

## **JOE BIDEN, DONALD TRUMP, BARAK OBAMA, GEORGE BUSH, WILLIAM CLINTON EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND ILLEGAL, UNLAWFUL SCHEME WITH THE POPE E.U. TO EXPLOIT TWO WITNESSES**

On May 15, 2019, President Donald Trump, invoking his constitutional executive and statutory emergency powers, signed Executive Order 13,873, which prohibits U.S. persons from conducting information and communications technology and services (ICTS) transactions with foreign adversaries. Though the executive branch has refrained from publicly identifying countries or entities as foreign adversaries under the Executive Order, observers agree that the Executive Order's main targets are China and telecommunications companies, namely Huawei, that threaten American national security and competitiveness in the race to provide the lion's share of critical infrastructure to support the world's growing 5G network. Executive Order 13,873 raises several concerns—both broad and specifically related to the Trump Administration. In general, courts have struggled to clearly define the legal status of executive orders or the courts' ability to review executive orders. The quasi-legislative nature of executive orders creates tension with the separation of powers principle and contributes to courts' challenges in addressing