

RULE 39 - URGENT

I need to receive a reply by email before December 26, 2023, at 10:00, China Standard Time.

Person to contact:

LE CORRE Vincent B [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

TAIYUAN [REDACTED],

SHANXI PROVINCE

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Phone number: +86-[REDACTED]

Email addresses:

vincent@ecthrwatch.org (please note that there is the letter T between the EC and HR)

[REDACTED]@gmail.com

[REDACTED]@gmail.com

(If you can, please request a delivery receipt *and* a read receipt when you communicate with me by emails. Please send the decision to these 3 email addresses. The decision to my last request for interim measures (your reference : 50552/22 V.L.C. c. France) was supposedly notified to me by email and regular mail, **but I never received the email**. I would receive the Court's decision by the regular mail almost 3 months later on February 16, 2023. Thank you.)

- (1) Dear Honorable Judges of the European Court of Human Rights,
- (2) On December 15, 2023, I submitted 2 faxes to the Court at +33 (0)3 90 21 43 50 but I couldn't submit, that day, the third fax I was going to submit and which contained my requests for interim measures. Indeed, [REDACTED] account was abruptly suspended.
- (3) **My first request for interim measure is for the European Court of Human Rights to adopt an inquisitorial approach, rather than adversarial, for the establishment of the facts.**
- (4) Indeed, as explained in Karen Reid's book, A Practitioner's Guide to the European Convention on Human Rights, 6th edition, in section 1-016 (*Establishment of the facts*), "*The Court has power to take evidence and hear witnesses [...]. It is rare that the Court is unable sufficiently to determine the factual basis of an application on the documentary material provided by the parties. Where a matter has been adjudicated in a domestic system, at first instance and on appeal, it is likely that the crucial facts have become common ground between the parties or that the differences between them are unlikely to be resolved further. [...]*"

- (5) I accuse the French judicial system, in certain specific cases which are pertinent to my situation, of condoning a recurring pattern of the serious crimes of “*faux et usage de faux en écriture publique*” (the forging/doctoring/altering/falsification of a court/public/legal/official documents/decisions and subsequent criminal use of such documents/decisions).
- (6) To give a simple example which I posted online yesterday on, among other websites, Nicole-Belloubet.com, a non-official website on former Minister of Justice of France, Ms. Nicole Belloubet, on October 23, 2018, at 20:06 +0800, I wrote to the Minister to warn her that this recurring pattern of the serious crimes of “*faux et usage de faux en écriture publique*” (the forging/doctoring/altering/falsification of a court/public/legal/official documents/decisions and subsequent criminal use of such documents/decisions) kept happening! Attached to the email is incontrovertible evidence substantiating my claim.
- (7) This is not an isolated occurrence. The frequency of these incidents is such that I can demonstrate, beyond a reasonable doubt and through rigorous mathematical analysis, the existence of a consistent pattern of these serious crimes. In the second fax I sent to the Court on December 15, 2023, I begin a detailed exposition from paragraph (19) on page 5 of the 36-page document in which I methodically demonstrate how one can mathematically establish, beyond a reasonable doubt, and arguably beyond a shadow of a doubt, that there is intentional manipulation within the legal system. As I conclude in paragraph (35), “This systematic pattern of errors, revealed through statistical analysis, powerfully proves intentional manipulation within the legal system.”
- (8) In addition to these exceptionally serious crimes that France has long tolerated, I further accuse the French judicial system of obstructing the execution of the law, as delineated under Article 432-1 of the French Criminal Code. This obstruction, tacitly endorsed by high-ranking magistrates, ironically turns into a case of obstruction of justice, a situation that is as ironic as it is regrettably true. Allow me to elaborate on what French law professor Yves Strickler once elucidated.
- (9) In 2017, due to the fact that one of my court cases had still not been adjudicated after almost 7 years, I decided to sue the State under Article 141-1 of the Judicial Organization Code, an article directly tied to Article 13 of the Convention, which guarantees the right to an effective remedy. Given the urgency of my situation, an urgency deemed justified by Professor Strickler, I applied for provisional legal aid at the Paris High Court (*Tribunal de Grande Instance de Paris*) to sue the State's legal representative (*l'Agent Judiciaire de l'État*).
- (10) The Legal Aid Office (*Bureau d'Aide Juridictionnelle*) of the court made it clear to me that they do not follow the law, having de facto created their own rules. When I shared with Professor Strickler what I had explained to the court official, namely "that the Legal Aid Office should abide by the laws of the Republic and not create their own," Law Professor Yves Strickler responded: "You are absolutely right. These 'procedural contracts', established by bar associations, jurisdictions, and in your case, I am discovering, by a Legal Aid Office, are truly preposterous! Yet the law is the law, and French institutions are required to respect it."
- (11) Upon encountering the unfamiliar legal concept of 'procedural contracts', I initiated research to comprehend its implications, as I was previously unaware of this term. My findings, which I discussed with Professor Strickler, revealed a critical aspect: these contracts are typically agreements between two consenting parties. I pointed out to him

that I had never consented to the French judicial system creating its own laws, thereby infringing upon my human rights, including the right to an effective remedy as safeguarded by Article 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

- (12) Curious about the applicability of Article 432-1 of the French Criminal Code, which addresses the obstruction of law execution (by inventing their own laws), I sought Professor Strickler's expertise. He referred to a legal text clarifying that Article 432-1 does not apply to subordinate officials unless they possess decision-making authority.
- (13) However, the text also distinctly identified magistrates of the judicial order as individuals within the scope of Article 432-1. This prompted me to re-engage with Professor Strickler, questioning if Article 432-1 could be relevant in my situation, especially since I had alerted high-ranking judicial figures like Jean-Michel Hayat, President of the Court, and Chantal Arens, First President of the Appeal Court, about the ongoing issues, yet no remedial actions were taken.
- (14) Professor Strickler's response validated my reasoning, highlighting the crucial need to demonstrate both decision-making authority and a direct link to the designated authority.
- (15) This leads me to a compelling conclusion: In cases such as mine, the French judicial system is, in fact, impeding the execution of the law. This obstruction manifests through two key actions: firstly, by usurping the legislative authority of the French Parliament via the judicial branch's creation of its own laws, and secondly, by repeatedly disregarding serious crimes of "*faux et usage de faux en écriture publique*" (the forging, doctoring, altering, and falsification of court, public, legal, and official documents, followed by their illegal use). Such actions have effectively marginalized me, infringing upon my fundamental rights as enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights.
- (16) Professor Strickler concurred, stating, "Your reasoning is sound. The critical factors to establish are 1° the presence of decision-making power, and 2° a tangible link with the stipulated authority."
- (17) Hence, I am led to firmly believe that the French judicial system's actions, particularly in my case, constitute an obstruction of the law. By overreaching the powers granted to the French Parliament and allowing a pattern of serious criminal activities like "*faux et usage de faux en écriture publique*" to persist unchallenged, the system has not only shut me out but also blatantly violated my rights guaranteed by the European Convention on Human Rights.
- (18) **With the highest regard for the Honorable Judges of the European Court of Human Rights, I respectfully reiterate my plea for the Court to adopt an inquisitorial rather than adversarial approach in establishing the facts of the case. This request is made with a deep appreciation for the Court's commitment to justice and fairness.**
- (19) My second request for interim measures is for the Court to urge the respondent state, France, to recognize and address its serious and ongoing violations of my human rights and to promptly resolve the case. I firmly believe that an expedient settlement is in the best interest of all parties involved. However, I want to emphatically state that under no circumstances am I prepared to be silenced regarding what I now understand to be a criminal RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act) case in the United States. The offenses committed by McDonald's Corporation and their

accomplices extend beyond France, affecting multiple nations globally. The severity of these crimes is too significant to be overlooked or dismissed.

- (20) Should France, the respondent state, recognize the severe infringement of my human rights and express willingness to settle the case, I am prepared to withdraw my first request for interim measures. Such a resolution may provide an opportunity for my life to return to normalcy.
- (21) In response to any queries from the Court regarding the urgency that justifies my request for interim measures, I refer to the explanation provided in my second fax to the Court dated December 15, 2023. As outlined in paragraph (38), "The cumulative effect of these practices transcends mere procedural implications and delves into severe psychological impacts. For individuals like me, who strive for justice amid such systematic obstruction, the ordeal is tantamount to psychological torture. The deliberate instigation of a state of learned helplessness, in my view, represents a breach of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which categorically prohibits inhuman and degrading treatment.
- (22) I humbly request the Court to contemplate the following situation. In my labor case, where I was unjustly dismissed for participating in a strike 13 years ago due to unpaid wages following a unilateral, illegal modification of my work contract against my consent, there has been a glaring lack of justice. It's been 13 years, and yet the case remains unadjudicated. How is this conceivable?
- (23) Regarding the McDonald's case, the evidence I previously mentioned and which is publicly available on Nicole-Belloubet.com irrefutably demonstrates a clear instance of document alteration. This act effectively stripped me of my right to appeal an already unfair initial judgment, where the judges fraudulently claimed adherence to the adversarial procedure—a claim that is patently false. I was never afforded the opportunity to review McDonald's evidence or to respond to their defense, as detailed in paragraphs (93) and (94) of the second fax I submitted to the Court on December 15, 2023.
- (24) As Law Professor Yves Strickler once underscored: "It is essential to remember that the adversarial procedure is fundamentally the only rule to guarantee. It is only through this procedure that we can hope to see the truth come to light."
- (25) In the McDonald's case, how can the adversarial procedure be considered respected when I was denied access to the evidence presented by McDonald's and the opportunity to counter their defense? It was nothing short of a mock trial. The manipulation of a date in my appeal attempt should be a matter of grave concern for the Court.
- (26) In conclusion, I urge the Court to consider the profound implications of these issues and grant my request for interim measures to address the serious and ongoing violations of my rights.
- (27) Respectfully submitted,
- (28) Vincent B. Le Corre
- (29) Taiyuan, Shanxi, China
- (30) December 20, 2023

SECOND REQUEST FOR INTERIM MEASURES WHICH CANNOT BE PUBLISHED ONLINE FOR OBVIOUS REASONS

RULE 39 - URGENT - URGENCY LEVEL: VERY HIGH

I need to receive a reply by email before December 26, 2023, at 10:00, China Standard Time, which is the day I might try to start my hunger strike in Beijing, whether I get the authorization or not.

I have initiated the publication of vital communications related to my case on en.XiJinping.fr, a non-official website on the President of the People's Republic of China. This measure is a proactive step in the event that I receive a negative response from the European Court of Human Rights to my request for interim measures. Should this occur, my next course of action involves drafting an open letter to President Xi, in which I will seek authorization to stage a public hunger strike protest outside the French Embassy in Beijing. The purpose of this protest is to draw attention to the grave and persistent breaches of my human rights by France. Given the unpredictability of China's stance on my right to protest, this proactive approach is crucial. My resolve to uncover and publicize the truth remains firm and steadfast.

Furthermore, I intend to make sure that this request for interim measures is formally presented to both the French Ambassador and the Consul General at the French Embassy in Beijing.

Person to contact:

LE CORRE Vincent B [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

TAIYUAN [REDACTED],

SHANXI PROVINCE

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

[REDACTED]

Phone number: +86-[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Email addresses:

vincent@ecthrwatch.org (please note that there is the letter T between the EC and HR)

██████████@gmail.com

██████████@gmail.com

(If you can, please request a delivery receipt and a read receipt when you communicate with me by emails. Please send the decision to these 3 email addresses. The decision to my last request for interim measures (your reference : 50552/22 V.L.C. c. France) was supposedly notified to me by email and regular mail, but I never received the email. I would receive the Court's decision by the regular mail almost 3 months later on February 16, 2023. Thank you.)

- (1) Dear Honorable Judges of the European Court of Human Rights,
- (2) Following my initial fax to the Court on December 15, 2023, I am writing to present additional requests for interim measures. While the substance of that first communication of December 15, 2023, remains valid and I do not intend to reiterate its content here, it is necessary to highlight new aspects of my case that warrant the Court's immediate attention.
- (3) Due to technical issues with ██████████ service on December 15 (I was unable to submit a third fax that day due to the unexplained suspension of ██████████), I am consolidating this second set of requests into a single fax submission. While the first request I submitted today, on December 20, 2023, will be publicly available online due to its detailed account of the human rights violations I have faced, this second submission contains sensitive information that I choose not to disclose publicly, even though I am not reiterating what I previously said on December 15, 2023, which, for the record, is true.
- (4) Beyond the initial interim measures requested earlier today, there are further measures that are imperative for my situation, and which I must keep confidential for obvious reasons.
- (5) In 2022, I appealed to the European Court of Human Rights, requesting France to dismiss all charges against me and my family (ECtHR's reference 50552/22 V.L.C. c. France). This request is reiterated given the new evidence presented today, suggesting that former Minister of Justice Ms. Nicole Belloubet may have committed an offense by failing to act on my reports (*non dénonciation d'un crime - Article 434-1 du code pénal*). It is crucial to note that I had informed Ms. Belloubet and her staff multiple times about these issues, and her awareness of my situation is evidenced by her lodging a criminal complaint against me.
- (6) France must immediately rescind all criminal charges against me. I respectfully disagree with the Court's decision of 2022 (50552/22 V.L.C. c. France). The ruling stated, "This request is clearly outside the scope of Article 39, which is why it has not been submitted to a judge for decision." However, I contend that this decision overlooks crucial context.
- (7) In 2020, I was poised to file a request for interim measures to address a recurring pattern of serious crimes involving "*faux et usage de faux en écriture publique*" (the falsification, doctoring, forging, altering of legal, court, public, and official documents/decisions) when I received a summons from the French Police. In my view, this action constitutes an intimidation tactic against an applicant, thereby obstructing my right to submit an individual petition. As detailed in the second fax sent on December 15, 2023,

this incident had a profound chilling effect on me. Additionally, there are aspects of this matter that I am unable to discuss due to the implications of some very specific laws.

- (8) My concerns were further heightened in [REDACTED] based on information I received – which I also referenced in my earlier correspondence with [REDACTED] – I suspected an attempt to [REDACTED], a notion that seemed implausible at the time. The context being McDonald's. This suspicion, which I later shared [REDACTED] only intensified upon realizing, in September 2021, that I was indeed a target of the French judicial system.
- (9) Given these circumstances, I firmly believe that the immediate dismissal of all charges against me is not only justified but necessary to prevent further infringement of my rights and to alleviate the undue pressure and intimidation I am currently experiencing.
- (10) Therefore, my third request for interim measures is for France to immediately drop any and all charges against me and any of my family members, directly or indirectly related to these cases. I am seeking a broad application of this request due to my current lack of trust in the French judicial system.
- (11) My fourth request is for full immunity in [REDACTED] France [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- (12) Under the considerable pressure I am currently facing, I acknowledge that there may be additional demands to consider. However, my immediate priority is to submit these requests for interim measures before the end of today, December 20, 2023.
- (13) I trust the Court will understand the gravity and urgency of these additional requests and will consider them with the utmost seriousness and promptness.
- (14) Respectfully submitted,
- (15) Vincent B. Le Corre
- (16) Taiyuan, Shanxi, China
- (17) December 20, 2023