

Human Rights Council

Complaint Procedure Form

- You are kindly requested to submit your complaint in writing in one of the six official UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish) and to use these languages in any future correspondence;
- Anonymous complaints are not admissible;
- It is recommended that your complaint does not exceed eight pages, excluding enclosures.
- You are kindly requested not to use abusive or insulting language.

I. Information concerning the author (s) of the communication or the alleged victim (s) if other than the author

Individual Group of individuals NGO Other

Last name: Rodriguez

First name(s): Isidoro

Nationality: United States Citizen

Address for correspondence on this complaint: 2678 Avenir Place, Apt. 2227,
Vienna, VA 22180, USA.

Tel and fax: (please indicate country and area code) USA 1.571.477.5350/fax 703.876-5385.

E-mail: business@isidororodriguez.com

Website: <http://www.isidororodriguez.com>

Submitting the complaint:

On the author's own behalf: and,

On behalf of other persons: (Citizens of the United States)

II. Information on the State concerned

Name of the State concerned and, as applicable, name of public authorities responsible for the alleged violation(s): (a) the United States of America; (b) the Hon. Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; (c) the Hon. Judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Eleventh, District of Columbia, and Federal Circuits; (d) the Hon. Judges of the United States Tax Court; (e) United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia; (f) United States District Court for the District of Columbia; (g) Office of the United States Attorney General, United States Department of Justice; (h) Office of the United States Assistant Attorney General for the Eastern District of Virginia; (i) Office of the United States Assistant Attorney General for the District of Columbia; (j) Tax Division of the United States Department of Justice; (k) the Office of Commissioner, United States Internal Revenue Service; (l) the Hon. Justice of the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Virginia; (m) Fairfax County Court of Appeals and Circuit Court of the Commonwealth of Virginia; (n) the attorneys in the Office of Attorney General of the

Commonwealth of Virginia; (o) officers of the Virginia State Bar Association; (p) attorney members of the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board; (q) officers of the Bar Association for the District of Columbia; (r) employees of the Virginia Employment Commission; and, (s) certain agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

III. Facts of the complaint and nature of the alleged violation(s)

The complaint procedure addresses consistent patterns of gross and reliably attested violations of all human rights and all fundamental freedoms occurring in any part of the world and under any circumstances.

Please detail, in chronological order, the facts and circumstances of the alleged violations including dates, places and alleged perpetrators and how you consider that the facts and circumstances described violate your rights or that of the concerned person(s).

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Mr. Isidoro Rodriguez ("Mr. Rodriguez") files this United Nations complaint and related submission of information to the Special Procedures, on behalf of himself and citizens of the United States based on the evidence of the Washington D.C./Virginia Oligarchy of United States ("Federal") and Commonwealth of Virginia ("Virginia") government attorneys, and employees acts outside the scope of authority and judges' *void* orders issued without jurisdiction and/or judicial authority in violation of the *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine*¹(**Exhibit 1, 2, 3b and 3c, 4a thru 4m**). Furthermore, the Complaint and related pleading are filed based upon the surreal unlawful *void* orders (**Exhibit 2a, 2i, and 2iii**), granting "impunity"² and absolute immunity for unlawful acts and *void* orders issued in defiance of the limitation and prohibitions of the Federal and Virginia Constitutions and Statutes, Articles 7, 8, 10, & 12 of the International Bill of Rights, and relevant principals to systematically deny access to an impartial court and trial by jury to secure accountability for malfeasance and the business conspiracy in violation of [Va. Code § 18.2-499](#), 500.³ (*See attached Memorandum of Law in Support of Mr. Isidoro Rodriguez's United Nations Complaint And Submission Of Information To The Special Procedures About His Challenge to The Grant Of "Impunity" For the Violations of The Limitation and Prohibitions of The Constitutions and Statutes of The United States and*

¹ The *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine* mandates that when an entity did not have the constitutional authority, legal power, or jurisdiction to render any order, said order is *void ab initio*--as a complete nullity from its issuance, **that cannot be made valid by either *stare decisis/res judicata***, may be impeached directly or collaterally by all persons, at any time, or in any manner. See *Collins v. Shepherd*, 274 Va. 390, 402 (2007); *Singh v. Mooney*, 261 Va. 48, 51-52(2001); *Barnes v. Am. Fertilizer Co.*, 144 Va. 692, 705 (1925); *Rook v. Rook*, 233 Va. 92, 95(1987).

² Regarding "impunity" and absolute immunity from accountability, President Theodore Roosevelt observed that, "[n]o man is above the law and no man is below it: nor do we ask any man's permission when we ask him to obey it." The United Nations adopted this concept to prohibit the granting of "impunity," which it defines as, "the impossibility, de jure or de facto, of bringing the perpetrators of violations to account - whether in criminal, civil, administrative or disciplinary proceedings - since they are not subject to any inquiry that might lead to their being accused, arrested, tried and, if found guilty, sentenced to appropriate penalties, and to making reparations to their victims." Thus, any grant of "impunity" and/or absolute immunity from accountability for acts outside of scope of employment, jurisdiction and/or judicial authority is a violation of the fundamental right to hold government officials liable for criminal and tortious acts (Updated Set of principles <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G05/109/00/PDF/G0510900.pdf?OpenElement>).

³ **Va Code § 18.2-499.** Combination to injure others in their reputation, trade, business or profession: right of employees: (a) Any two or more persons who shall combine, associate, agree, mutually undertake or concert together for the purpose of wilfully and maliciously injuring another in his reputation, trade, business or profession by any means whatever, . . . , shall be jointly and severally guilty of a Class 3 misdemeanor. Such punishment shall be in addition to any civil relief recoverable under § 18.2-500.

DETAILED FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES EVIDENCING UNLAWFUL ACTS

Mr. Isidoro Rodriguez (hereinafter “Mr. Rodriguez”), is a 71-year-old citizen of the United States of America (“United States”) of Spanish/Puerto Rican descent born in the South Bronx, N.Y., who as a U.S. Ex-Pat established a unique *pro hoc vice*⁴ civil litigation/corporate practice in the Commonwealth of Virginia (“Virginia”) and Barranquilla, Republic of Colombia (“Colombia”),⁵ to serve non-resident United States and Colombian individuals and businesses.⁶

Subsequent evidence confirms that in retaliation for Mr. Rodriguez successfully representing non-resident U.S./Colombian citizens/entities against the U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”) policies of the Clinton Administration under former U.S. Deputy Attorneys General Eric Holder (“Holder”), in 2004 Holder as a Washington D.C. Lobbyist/Attorney,⁷ entered into a business conspiracy in violation of VA Code §§ 18.2-499, 500, with Mr. Jack Harbeston (Managing Partner of Mr. Rodriguez’s client Sea Search Armada and Armada Company (“SSA”)) to injure Mr. Rodriguez’s international law practice, good reputation, profession, right to employment, and statutory Virginia Attorney’s Lien, by entering Virginia to simultaneous file two fraudulent bar complaints with the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board (“VSBDB”), for his:

- (1) litigating pursuant to VA Code § 54.1-3932 and Virginia State Bar Legal Ethics Opinion #1325 issued to Mr. Rodriguez on February 27, 1990 (**Exhibit 3a**), to protect his property interest in his Choate Virginia Attorney’s Lien on the SSA’s claim to sunken treasure

⁴ **“Pro hac vice** ...The phrase usu. refers to a lawyer who has not been admitted to practice in a particular jurisdiction but who is admitted there temporarily for the purpose of conducting a particular case.” 8th Ed Black’s Law Dictionary. In *Supreme Court of New Hampshire v. Piper*, 470 U.S. 274 (1985) (Rehnquist dissenting) (the Court held that the practice of law is a **“fundamental right”** and emphasizing the importance of *pro hoc vice* litigators **“bringing claims that would be too unpopular for resident lawyers to bring,”** based on animus of a judge or court (Emphasis added)

⁵ After serving from 1977 to 1983 as an appointee in the Carter and Reagan Administration (last position as Senior Executive Service Director of Office of Civil Rights, USDA), Mr. Rodriguez went to Colombia as Contracts Administrator/Assistant General Counsel, Morrison Knudsen International, on the \$2 Billion EXXON Cerrejon Coal Mine Project, Guajira, Colombia.

⁶ In 1995 the Clerk of the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed the uniqueness of Mr. Rodriguez’s practice by stating it was “the only instance in recent memory that a lawyer with an address outside the United States has argued a case before the Court.” Tony Mauro, *Legal Times*, “Testing the Limits of Sovereign Immunity” (1995), after Mr. Rodriguez was granted *cert.*, argued and won *Martinez v. Lamagno and DEA*, 515 U.S. 417 (1995) (Chief Justice Rehnquist dissenting) (Court reversed USCA 4th Cir. and then U.S. Att. Gen Eric Holder, to order that a non-resident Hispanic had the right of access to an evidentiary hearing of the DEA agent’s acts outside the scope of employment by DUI while having sex and causing a car accident in Barranquilla, Colombia).

⁷ It is alleged (**Exhibits 2a, 4a, 4j, and 4k**), that Holder and other government attorneys and judges conspired to damage Mr. Rodriguez’s international litigation practice in retaliation for successfully representing non-resident U.S./Colombian citizens against the unlawful policies: see *Katia Gutierrez de Martinez v. Lamagno and Drug Enforcement Administration (“DEA”), supra.* (https://www.oyez.org/advocates/isidoro_rodriguez); See also: *Cooperativa Multiactiva de Empeados de Distribuidores de Drogas (Coopservir Ltda.” v. Newcomb, et al.*, D.C. Cir. No 99-5190, S Ct. No 99-1893 (2000) (challenge to President Clinton’s Executive Order prohibited bill of attainder issued under the War Power Act); *Orqanization JD Ltda. v. Assist U.S. Attorney Arthur P. Hui and DOJ*, 2nd Cir. No. 93-6019 and 96-6145 (1996) (Mr. Rodriguez argued and won the right to hold accountable DOJ’s Assistant U.S. Attorneys accountable for violations of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (1978); and, *Lopez v. First Union*, 129 F3rd. 1186 (11th Cir. 1997) (Mr. Rodriguez argued and won the right to hold DOJ’s Assistant U.S. Attorneys, employees and financial institution accountable for violation of the Right to Financial Privacy Act).

trove aboard the sunken 1707 Galleon San Jose off the coast of Colombia) (See [Report's on Pres. of the Colombia confirming Dec. 2, 2015, of finding treasure trove valued at \\$18 Billion USD](#)), and,

- (2) for litigating to enforce his rights as a father to protect his 13-year-old U.S. citizen son from a “zone of war” pursuant to The Hague Convention, VA Code, and Joint Custody Agreement (**Exhibit 4a, 4ai, and 4aii**) (see also <http://www.liamsdad.org/others/isidoro.shtml>).

In response to the fraudulent VSBDB bar complaints filed for litigating to enforce statutory rights, Mr. Rodriguez filed motions and briefs challenging the jurisdiction of the VSBDB as a “court” and the authority of its members as “judges.” Mr. Rodriguez argued in motions and briefs that the VSBDB was a “kangaroo court” illegally created and appointed by the Supreme Court of Virginia’s abuse of delegated authority from the General Assembly under 54.1-3909. The Supreme Court of Virginia had acted outside their jurisdiction and judicial authority to promulgate unauthorized court rules violating the limitations and prohibitions on the Court under Article VI, §§ 1, 5, and 7 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Virginia (“VA Const.”), and the restrictions on the delegated authority to the Court under VA Code § 54.1-3915, 3935, thereby denying due process and equal protection mandated by the 5th, 7th, and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution (“U.S. Const.”) (See page 15 of the Law Memo).

On November 27, 2006, the VSBDB denied the motions and issued a *Void Ab Initio Order* disbaring Mr. Rodriguez for litigating to enforce his statutory rights (**Exhibits 3b**) (http://www.vsb.org/docs/Final_Order_Rodr_11-28-06.pdf). On June 29, 2007, the Supreme Court of Virginia in an unpublished summary order affirmed the VSBDB *void ab initio* disbarment order (**Exhibit 3c**).

Thereafter in furtherance of the business conspiracy of Holder *et al.*, the Washington D.C./Virginia Oligarchy of government attorneys (**Exhibit 2av and 2avi**), employees of the Internal Revenue Service and the Virginia Employment Commission (**4g and 4h**), and the Honourable Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Honourable Judges of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, District of Columbia, and Federal Circuits, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, and the United States Tax Court, unlawfully used and abused the judicially created doctrine of *stare decises* and *res judicata* (See Law Memo, page 19 of 23), to affirm the VSBDB *void ab initio order* to injure Mr. Rodriguez’s international law practice, business, reputation, profession, statutory property right, and the right to employment in violation of the 1st, 5th, 7th, and 14th Amend. U.S. Const., Art. VI of VA Const., the *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine*, the Internal Revenue Code, and the Social Security Act,⁸ by issuing the following administrative and court orders:

- Ex 1a. *In re Isidoro Rodriguez*, (October 16, 2009) Unnumbered Order of Disbarment by Art III US Tax Court based upon the violation of the *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine* to use *stare decisis* and *res judicata* and give legal effect to other *void* court orders affirming the illegal *void* order of the VSBDB. The court refused to address the violation of limitations and prohibitions under the VA Const. Art. VI, and VA Code VA Code § 54.1-3915 on the General Assembly’s delegation of authority under VA Code

⁸ The evidence confirm a bureaucratic meanness to punish Mr. Rodriguez, by not only unlawfully disbaring him as a member of the bar of the Article III U.S. Tax Court based upon the VSBDB *void ab initio order*, but also to assessing against Mr. Rodriguez and his wife federal taxes grater then allowed by law in violation of 26 U.S.C § 7214, to affirm the striking 2006 business/litigation expenses against the VSBDB *void ab initio order*, deny discovery of IRS employees’ summarily declaring “frivolous” litigation expenses, and denying the right to subpoena to confront hostile witness. Also, after Mr. Rodriuez was terminated as a contract attorney based upon the affirming of the VSBDB *void ab initio order* to deny Virginia unemployment compensation benefits (**Exhibit 4g and 4h**).

§ 54.1-3909 to promulgate court rules to the Supreme Court of Virginia, thus by legal sophistry obfuscate and did not discuss that the VSBDB unlawfully disbarred an attorney for litigating to enforce his statutory rights, was an unlawful “kangaroo” court, and the VSBDB members unlawfully appointed by the Supreme Court of Virginia as “judges.”

- Ex 1b. Summary denial of a motion to vacate in violation of the *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine*.
- Ex 1c. Summary denial of a motion for reconsideration for violation of the *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine*.
- Ex 2a. *Isidoro Rodriguez, Esq., v. Jane/John Does of the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board, et al.*, U.S. Dist. Ct. E.D. VA 12-cv-663-JAB (April 12, 2013), memo and order denying access to impartial ct. and jury trial by granting “impunity” to government attorneys, employees, and judges violation of the limitation and prohibitions of VA Const., VA Code, and *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine*.
- Ex 2ai. Order Denying Motions for Trial by Jury and Grand Jury.
- Ex 2aii. Order granting “impunity” by enjoining and denying future access to court.
- Ex 2aiii. Order 4th Cir USCA No 13-1638, affirming DC order grant of “impunity.” injunction and prior restraint.
- Ex 2aiii. Order 4th Cir USCA No 13-1638, affirming Dist. Ct. violation of the limitation and prohibitions of VA Const., VA Code, and *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine*.
- Ex 3a. 1990 VSB LEO #1325 confirming IR right to enforce statutory attorney lien.
- Ex 3b. 2006 VSBDB Order disbaring IR for litigating to enforce statutory rights issued in violation of the limitation and prohibitions of VA Const., VA Code, and *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine*.
- Ex. 3c. *Isidoro Rodriguez v. Virginia State Bar*, Supreme Court of Virginia, Record No. 070283, summary decision affirming VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4a. *IR v Legal Times et al.*, U.S. Dist. Ct DC NO. 07-0975 (PLF) Memo and Order summary dismissal and denial of action filed in 2003 to enjoin VSBDB as a “kangaroo court.
- Ex 4ai. U.S. Dist. Ct Order denying a motion for reconsideration.
- Ex 4aii. USCA DC No. 07-5234 (Dec. 2007) deny injunction against VSBDB et al. in *IR v. Legal Times et al.*
- Ex 4aiii. USCA DC No. 07-5234 (July. 2008) order aff’d dismissal in *IR v. Legal Times et al.*
- Ex 4bi. *Isidoro Rodriguez v Virginia State Bar*, USSC 07-419 (October 31, 2007) the Hon. Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court John G. Roberts, sitting as Circuit Justice of the USCT Appeals for the 4th and District of Columbia Circuits, denied Mr. Rodriguez’s application for an injunction of the unlawful rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia and *void order* issued in violation of Art. VI of the VA Const., VA Code §§ 54.1-3915, and 3935, and the *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine* (**Exhibit 4bi**).
- Ex 4bii. *Isidoro Rodriguez v Virginia State Bar*, USSC 07-419, Nov. 2007,2007, denial of Petition for Cert., to review and vacate VSBDB *Void Ab Initio* disbarment order.

- Ex 4c & 4ci. *In re Isidoro Rodriguez*, USCA 3rd Cir., No. 08-8037, docket and letter confirming denial of a motion for reconsider of use of *stare decisis* to use the VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4cii. *Isidoro Rodriguez v 3rd Cir. Standing Committee on Attorney Discipline*, USSC No. 08-1121 (March 2009) Motion to USCA 3d Cir Justice Suter to enjoin use of *stare decisis* to affirm the VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4di. *In the Matter of Isidoro Rodriguez*, USCA 4th Cir No. 06-9518 (April 2009) unpublished order of disbarment of IR based upon *stare decisis* to reciprocally use the VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4dii. *In the matter of Isidoro Rodriguez*, USCA 4th Cir N. 06-9518, 3rd Pet for Writ of Mandamus pursuant to 18 USC § 3771 to enjoin grant of immunity for the VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4diii. *In re Isidoro Rodriguez*, USCA 4th Cir No-1444 (April 2008), denial of Writ of Mandamus.
- Ex 4e. *In re Isidoro Rodriguez*, USCA 2nd Cir (July 2009) Order of Disbarment based upon VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4fi. *In re Isidoro Rodriguez*, USCA DC Cir. No. 08-7134, Disbarment based upon VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- EX 4fii. Denial of rehearing on unlawful use of VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4gi. *Isidoro & Irene Rodriguez v Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service*, USTC No. 10691-09, an action challenging IRS for “assessing taxes more than permitted by law” by it simply declaring as “frivolous” and striking the 2006 business/litigation expenses against VSBDB *void ab initio order*, the USTC summarily withdraw Mr. Rodriguez as counsel of record based on its earlier disbarment in violation of the *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine* Ex 1a, b, and c.
- Ex 4gii. *Isidoro & Irene Rodriguez v Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service*, USTC No. 10691-09, Denial of motion to disqualify an opposition to transfer order from D.C. Cir. to 4th Cir., based upon the motion of U.S. DOJ Tax Division motion.
- Ex 4h. *Isidoro Rodriguez v Virginia Unemployment Compensation*, Administrative order denying unemployment compensation benefits to IR based upon VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4hi. *Isidoro Rodriguez v Virginia Unemployment Compensation*, Ct of App. of VA No0291-09-4, Mr. Rodriguez’s petition for en banc hearing of denial of benefits based upon VSBDB *void ab initio order*.
- Ex 4hii. *Isidoro Rodriguez v Virginia Unemployment Compensation*, Ct of App. of VA No0291-09-4, (Nov. 2009), En Banc order aff’d VEC use of VSBDB *void ab initio order* to deprive IR of unemployment comp. benefits.
- Ex 4i. *Isidoro Rodriguez v District of Columbia Court of Appeals Committee on Admissions*, USCA DC No. 08-OA-26 (Sept 2008), Response to IR petition for writ of mandamus in support of the use of VSBDB *void ab initio order*.

- Ex 4j. *Isidoro Rodriguez v Jack Harbeston et al.*, USDCT WA No. C11-1601 (JCC) Order dismissal suit for lack of venue because disbarment occurred in other circuits based on the use of *stare decisis* to aff'd the VSBDB void ab initio order.
- Ex 4k. *In re Isidoro Rodriguez Litigation*, US Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation MDL No. 2307 denial of action for consolidation of Dist. Ct EDVA and WDVA in an effort to obtain consideration of an impartial court.
- Ex 4L. *Sea Search Armada v. the Republic of Colombia*, USCA DC NO. 11-7144 (March 2012), Order denying IR motion to Intervene to protect statutory property rights in Choate Attorneys Lien on treasure trove from the effect of VSBDB *void ab initio* order.
- Ex 4m. *In the Matter of Discipline of Isidoro Rodriguez* USSC No. D-02466, the order of suspension and disbarment of IR without hearing based upon Clerk's use of *stare decisis* of the VSBDB *void ab initio* order.
- Ex 4mi. *In the Matter of Discipline of Isidoro Rodriguez* USSC No. D-02466, IR response to USSCT Show Cause Order based on VSBDB *void ab initio* order.

Due to the above unlawful acts and *void* orders in October 2010, Mr. Rodriguez filed *Isidoro Rodriguez, Esq., v. Jane/John Does of the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board, et al.*, U.S. Dist. Ct. E.D. VA 12-cv-663-JAB, to secure accountability and damages for the: (a) depriving him of his statutory and fundamental rights; (b) injuring his international *pro hoc vice* law practice, profession, reputation, employment; (c) depriving him and his wife of their statutory right under 26 U.S.C. § 7214 to not be assessed taxes greater than permitted by the Internal Revenue Code; (d) depriving him of his statutory right to unemployment compensation benefits under the Social Security Act; (e) depriving him of his property rights in his Choate Virginia Attorneys Lien by business conspiracy in violation of VA Code §§ 18.2-499, 500; (f) usurping and/or permitting the usurping of the exclusive constitutional power of the General Assembly of Virginia to create courts and appoint judges; and, (g) for the systematic denying access to an impartial court and civil trial by jury to secure accountability/damages for acts outside the scope of employment, jurisdiction, and judicial authority.

In response the Hon. U.S. Dist. Judge John A. Gibney, Jr., first, ordered the summary dismissal of *Isidoro Rodriguez, Esq., v. Jane/John Does of the Virginia State Bar Disciplinary Board, et al.*, U.S. Dist. Ct. E.D. VA 12-cv-663-JAB (April 12, 2013), *aff'd* 4th Cir USCA No 13-1638 (Nov. 2013) (**Exhibits 2a, 2aii, 2aiii and 2aiv**), denied Mr. Rodriguez motions for a jury trial to obtain accountability and damages for malfeasance by violation of the *Void Ab Initio Order Doctrine*, and business conspiracy in violation of VA Code § 18.2.499, 550, and, second, granted the Washington D.C./Virginia Oligarchy of Federal/Virginia government attorneys, employees, and judges "impunity" and absolute immunity for their unlawful acts by,

[enjoining of Mr. Rodriguez] from filing any lawsuit in any federal court of the United States involved in any way his disbarment or the allegations leading to his disbarment [by the VSBDB and federal courts]. The Court further enjoins the plaintiff from filing any lawsuit in any federal court of the United States against any of the defendants in this case, against any judge or retired judge, against any United States Attorney or member of a United States Attorney's staff, against the Attorney General of Virginia or any past or present member of the Attorney General's staff, and against the Virginia State Bar or any agents of the Bar. The plaintiff is further enjoined from filing any additional pleadings in the instant case, other than pleadings necessary to perfect and present an appeal. [As well as ordering a prior

restraint by requiring Mr. Rodriguez to file a motion] in the federal court in which he wishes to file [any other type of suit], for leave of Court to file suit. . . .”⁹

Mr. Rodriguez filed petitions with President Barrack Obama (**Exhibit 5a thru 5b**); filed petitions with his representatives from Northern Virginia in the Virginia General Assembly (**Exhibit 6**) (see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VAkEficA5sQ> and, <https://t.co/sLv7pz3zD5>); and, filed petitions with his representatives in the U.S. Congress and Senate (**Exhibit 7**).

IV. Exhaustion of domestic remedies

1- Steps taken by or on behalf of the alleged victim(s) to exhaust domestic remedies– please provide details on the procedures which have been pursued, including recourse to the courts and other public authorities as well as national human rights institutions¹⁰, the claims made, at which times, and what the outcome was:

For purposes of not restating the above, see **pages 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and attach exhibits for detail.**

2- If domestic remedies have not been exhausted on grounds that their application would be ineffective or unreasonably prolonged, please explain the reasons in detail:

All domestic remedies have been exhausted in seek an investigation and reversal of the *void ad initio* order granting “impunity” (**Exhibit 2a, 2ai, 2aii, and 2aiii**)

V. Submission of communication to other human rights bodies

1- Have you already submitted the same matter to a special procedure, a treaty body or other United Nations or similar regional complaint procedures in the field of human rights?

Yes

2- If so, detail which procedure has been, or is being pursued, which claims have been made, at which times, and the current status of the complaint before this body:

First, Mr. Rodriguez filed on May 15, 2016, a Petition (P-926-16) (**Exhibit 9a**) with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), and a Request for Precautionary Measures (MC-367-16) (**Exhibit 9b**, see <http://www.isidororodriguez.com>). Petition (P-926-16), was only provisionally registered and has been under “study” without action for more than 18 months, and the Request for Precautionary Measures (MC-367) was summarily denied without explanation (**Exhibit 10**), despite the evidence of “exceptional circumstances” which are “inextricably tied to the merits of the matter” of the systematic denial of access to an impartial court and trial by jury (**Exhibit 11**).

Second, Mr. Rodriguez in addition to the Instant Complaint, a Submission of Information to Special Procedures has been filed.

⁹ The Hon. Judges Gibney also granted “impunity” to nongovernment bad actors Jack Harbeston and Holder, who entered Virginia in 2003 to undertake the business conspiracy, holding that “the Court will not decide Harbeston’s (sic) jurisdictional claim since the Court dismissed the case.” But, in the related RICO action *Isidoro Rodriguez v Jack Harbeston et al.*, USDCT WA No. C11-1601 (JCC) (**Ex 4j**), the action was dismissed for lack of venue because “the complaint concerns disbarment proceedings in other jurisdictions. The proper venue to review those decision is those jurisdictions.”

¹⁰ National human rights institutions, established and operating under the Principles Relating to the Status of National Institutions (the Paris Principles), in particular in regard to quasi-judicial competence, may serve as effective means of addressing individual human rights violations.

VI. Request for confidentiality

In case the communication complies with the admissibility criteria set forth in Council resolution 5/1, kindly note that it will be transmitted to the State concerned so as to obtain the views of the latter on the allegations of violations.

Please state whether you would like your identity or any specific information contained in the complaint to be kept confidential.

Request for confidentiality (*Please tick as appropriate*): Yes

No

Please indicate which information you would like to be kept confidential. None

Date: September 11, 2017

Signature:

N.B. The blanks under the various sections of this form indicate where your responses are required. You should take as much space as you need to set out your responses. Your complaint should not exceed eight pages.

VII. Checklist of supporting documents

Please provide copies (not original) of supporting documents (kindly note that these documents will not be returned) in one of the six UN official languages.

- Decisions of domestic courts and authorities on the claim made (a copy of the relevant national legislation is also helpful):
- Complaints sent to any other procedure mentioned in section V (and any decisions taken under that procedure):
- Any other evidence or supporting documents deemed necessary:

VIII. Where to send your communications?

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
Human Rights Council Branch-Complaint Procedure Unit
OHCHR- Palais Wilson
United Nations Office at Geneva
CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland
Fax: (+41 22) 917 90 11
E-mail: CP@ohchr.org
Website: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/HRCIndex.aspx>