



WWW.JUSTICE4HUMANITY.ORG

APPENDIX – THE DEFAMATION CAMPAIGN AGAINST PRINCE JUDGE MATTHEW

(A law firm certified package of the relevant documentary evidence will soon be available upon request):

The following verified facts about the state-sponsored campaign of illegal defamation against Prince Matthew are adapted from a certified Barristers Opinion from a licensed UN NGO international law center:

In December 2007, an international law firm for which Matthew was a figurehead “President”, was targeted by a low-level “Business Development Specialist” (here called “Ringleader”), in the US Department of Commerce (DOC) Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA) in New York. Using as an excuse two “potential clients” (who never actually hired the law firm) referred by DOC, in retaliation for the law firm refusing to accept the clients (both rejected for fraud), DOC engaged in aggressive and persistent criminal extortion and racketeering, making illegal demands enforced by a relentless campaign of governmental pressure and threats, especially by false defamation, aggravated by victim and witness intimidation – all federal crimes.

This organized criminal activity from DOC was conducted under false color of official authority, with Ringleader illegally claiming to be a “federal agent”, despite the fact that DOC is merely an administrative agency with no law enforcement authorities. The attacks consisted of continually inventing knowingly false and inflammatory accusations, intended solely for the purpose of sabotage. Despite the fact that the law firm had 40 executives and 6 offices in 5 countries, all accusations and defamation were personally directed at Matthew as its figurehead “President”.

In January 2008, within only two weeks after threats of sabotage by DOC, the website and database servers of the law firm were shut down, blocking all access to client files. This caused interruption of work for all clients, creating discontent among clients of the firm.

On 12 January 2008, Matthew filed an FBI criminal complaint with the Internet Crime Complaint Center (“IC3”) division, which resulted in local police causing the servers to be restored in Florida, and yielded evidence indicating the servers were shut down “at the request of a government agency” such as DOC abusing its authority. Evidence in the case file proves that an online defamation campaign by Ringleader under DOC in 2009 admitted possession of a 2007 internal document which could only have been stolen from those private servers during that event.

On 12 March 2008, Matthew filed a 1st FBI criminal complaint against DOC, with full evidence of all violations. This FBI complaint was joined by two victim-witnesses who signed affidavits, both brokers targeted by DOC extortion and defamation merely for referring clients to the law firm.

On 03 December 2008, Matthew filed a 2nd FBI criminal complaint against DOC, with full evidence of all continuing violations. This FBI complaint was joined by another two victim-witnesses who signed affidavits, both executives of an independent Savings & Loan financial institution targeted by DOC extortion and defamation merely for being a client of the law firm.

Both federal complaints were referred to the FBI Public Corruption Squad “C-14” in New York, which investigated and referred to an Office of Inspector General in Washington DC, but the FBI did nothing to intervene to stop the escalating organized criminal attacks against the law firm, which was fully in good standing.

On 08 December 2008, Matthew also filed a 3rd federal complaint against DOC with the US Department of State, with evidence that the racketeering ring was abusing US Embassy functions to extend the reach of their federal crimes in violation of international law, proving that military methods officially recognized as “information warfare” were being used as illegal persecution.

In February 2009, Ringleader was removed from DOC and transferred to an “information technology” division of USAID (related to “information warfare” capabilities), apparently to deflect pressure and scrutiny away from DOC as the subject of 3 federal criminal investigations.

Without any law enforcement intervention, despite federal investigations, the persecution by DOC accelerated into a prolonged campaign of criminally false defamation on the Internet. All of it was personally directed at Judge Matthew, and all postings were proven to be coordinated among the same group of state-sponsored criminal perpetrators connected to DOC.

On 16 December 2009, in retaliation for his removal from DOC caused by multiple criminal complaints against him, Ringleader created a dedicated blog for false defamation against Matthew and his former law firm, under a branded campaign name (here called “Defamers”).

Beyond false inflammatory disinformation, the campaign included manufacturing forged documents pretending to be third parties, and even fake “lawyer review” websites (listing very few names – probably fictitious except for Matthew’s name, and not allowing any positive comments). False claims about the law firm were apparently used as an excuse for the primary purpose of persecuting Matthew individually as a political dissident.

On 31 January 2010, Matthew filed an FBI complaint against Defamers with the IC3 division of the FBI National White Collar Crime Center (“NW3C”). In retaliation for this criminal complaint, the branded Defamers blog site immediately began illegally using the logos of NW3C itself, and of another FBI government contractor, the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE), to describe the group’s identity.

On 03 February 2010, Matthew filed another FBI complaint against Defamers for fraudulent misuse of the NW3C and ACFE logos, and illegally impersonating federal agents to misrepresent the source of the false

defamation campaign. This caused both FBI contractors to support intervention for removal of the campaign from all legitimate and lawful online sites.

Eight Major Internet Service Providers Agree to Shut Down Criminal Defamation Websites Directed at Judge Matthew

A subsequent audit of Investigations & Enforcement Results verifies that the DOC ring-leader of the criminal defamation campaign was eventually sanctioned and neutralized by federal and even national security agencies. It presents evidence that the legal departments of 8 major corporate internet service providers agreed that the campaign was flagrantly criminal and shut down all accounts and banned the users of the operation.

The law firm had no relations with or obligation to DOC, and DOC has no administrative or regulatory authority over any law firm. The racketeering operated by and through DOC used a modus operandi of referring potential “clients” (the same few fraudulent supporting actors) to a firm, as a pretense for abuse of authority as extortion, enforced by false defamation under exaggerated color of official authority.

The facts that the ring-leader was a career Army counter-intelligence officer, and that counter-intelligence is the primary source of state-sponsored persecution of political dissidents, indicate that DOC was used as a vehicle for special operations against dissidents. DOC is a prominent feature of US Embassies worldwide, and “commerce” is a convenient sphere to attack dissidents globally by depriving them of the basic human right to practice their profession or make a living.

In 2009, Judge Matthew had a political conflict with a State Bar association in the United States. He had held only inactive “Associate Membership” status, which is not a license, and thus never used it, instead practicing law under foreign law licenses and authorizations.

One year after he had left the law firm of which he was the figurehead “President”, two clients breached their commercial transaction contracts with that law firm, by fraudulently misrepresenting their projects and failing to provide their documents for the law firm to work with.

Both clients filed complaints with the local State Bar against Matthew personally, although he was never assigned to their cases and had already left the firm a full year earlier, claiming a license violation for not “refunding” their retainers. However, nothing was owed to them, and by their breach of contract they in fact owed substantial penalties to the law firm.

Documents in the case file indicate that the State Bar did not follow many of its own rules and procedures providing for fair defense against false claims. It disregarded evidence of the foreign law licenses of both Matthew and the law firm, which would prove that the Bar had no jurisdiction. It also ignored extensive documentary evidence proving every point in both complaints to be knowingly false.

The Bar disregarded evidence which had been accepted by the FBI, establishing that both clients were being coordinated by a non-client organized crime group supported by the US Department of Commerce (DOC), which was using their false complaints to perpetrate criminal extortion to demand tens of millions of dollars from the firm, enforced by a campaign of unlawful false defamation online. It also ignored the fact of prior criminal

complaints with the FBI against that same group, and that such complaints had been accepted and referred to a specialized “Public Corruption” division, indicating that they were taken seriously.

Review of the case file by defense lawyers revealed that the State Bar appeared to be politically “persecuting” him, primarily discriminating against his living exclusively in foreign countries and relying on foreign licenses. Such multinational lifestyle was apparently perceived as an insult to their authority and a threat to their relevance with all international lawyers from their local State.

Matthew insisted upon resigning from the local State Bar, since it was not a “license”, was never used, and never needed. Furthermore, he would have had to pay approximately \$100,000 for a “full trial” type litigation, only to defend a non-active non-license of no benefit to him, which he now saw as merely an instrument of sabotage by abuse of authority. The Bar had already demonstrated persistent and escalating violation of his due process rights, and highly politicized persecution. Thus, politically motivated bias and prejudice were evident, and no fairness or lawfulness could be expected.

As the only way to be allowed to resign, he was forced to sign a standardized “Voluntary Revocation” document stating that he “admitted to the charges as stated”. However, in that document, no actual “charges” were stated, as nothing was stated that would be a violation under the Rules of Conduct.

He only “admitted” out of context the isolated fact that the firm did not give a refund, but the document was not permitted to mention the overriding legal fact that by binding enforceable signed contracts breached by both clients, no refund was owed. He did not admit anything that would constitute wrongdoing, and certainly did not admit anything for which any lawyer would be “disbarred”.

The voluntary resignation form also officially stated that it could “not be used for any other purpose”, but yet was aggressively used for every other imaginable illegal purpose, all as an instrument of persecution of a political dissident.

The clients never filed any civil lawsuit against Matthew or the law firm, apparently because they knew the evidence proved their complaints false, and a Court would most likely make them pay the penalties owed to the firm for their breach of contract. In the entire history of the law firm, not one complaint was ever filed against its own foreign international law license, of which all clients had a copy.

Months after Matthew’s resignation in protest, direct documentary evidence emerged, revealing the active and prominent involvement of the DOC in driving and coordinating the entire State Bar process. (The DOC had no standing in the case, had conflict of interest as the subject of 2 prior FBI criminal complaints against it, and has no authorized function or any lawful purpose for interfering in the legal profession.)

The following key pieces of evidence (provided to qualified persons upon request) prove that the State Bar process was politically motivated, criminally corrupted, knowingly violated jurisdictional limits, and was intentionally abused for unlawful persecution as a dissident:

2007 – Membership Cards in State Bar & American Bar, proving that the local State status was merely inactive “Associate” membership, which cannot be considered a “license”, and does not constitute being “at Bar”, such that using the term “disbarred” is a false portrayal intended only to be inflammatory and defamatory. That the

“Associate” card was issued in 2007 proves that this inactive non-license status was held for 2 years before the State Bar “investigated” the false complaints.

2006 – Certification by Panama Bar Association, issued in 2009 by the “National Lawyers Association of Panama”, proving that the law firm was registered with the Bar as a “Professional Association” since 2006, and was thus internationally licensed from the exclusive jurisdiction of Panama. This proves that any personal law license from Matthew was irrelevant, not used and not needed, as the firm had its own license. The 2006 registration date proves that this law firm license was held 3 years before the false complaints to the local State Bar.

All clients of the firm were given copies of the full Panama license before being allowed to hire the firm, proving that the complaints to the local State Bar were intended solely as a direct personal attack against Matthew as an individual, and were not part of any legitimate dispute.

2006 – Notarized Affidavit of Founding Partners of Law Firm, issued in 2009 by one of several managing partners, evidencing that Matthew was only the figurehead “President” (by power of attorney) of the international law firm, and proving that the firm was in fact managed by multiple “founders and partners Lawyers registered at the Panama Bar Association”, a description which does not include Matthew.

2008 – Notification to American Bar & State Bar, entitled “Urgent Request for Support in Defense of Legal Profession”, issued by Matthew in March 2008, notifying the American Bar Association and local State Bar of “a direct attack on the legal profession, and a wrongful deterrent to the provision of necessary legal services”, with a lawyer and law firm in good standing “being persecuted by the DOC”. It requested to “defend the integrity of the legal profession... and to uphold the rule of law”, as “An honest [lawyer] should not be disadvantaged against or subordinated to a corrupt ‘official’ of any agency.”

This proves that both Bar associations were given a copy of the 1st FBI complaint against DOC, highlighting evidence that DOC had “the declared intent of having the firm and all its lawyers disbarred ‘throughout the whole world’”, for corrupt and illegal purposes, a full year before the one-sided State Bar process against Matthew. Both Bar associations did nothing.

2008 – Emails Proving DOC Arranged the State Bar Process, a string of emails between an “Investigator” of the local State Bar and Ringleader of DOC, dated December 2008, obtained by a private investigator. It evidences the aggressive targeting of Matthew as a private person by DOC, prompting the Bar to reply that his “alternate address is personal information and shall not be disclosed”, revealing the political motivations for illegal harassment unrelated to the false complaints.

The emails prove that the Bar had full knowledge of the fact that “Associate” status was inactive and was not a “license” at all, as the Investigator quoted a State Bar statute that “Associate Members... may not practice law”. This proves that the process was advanced with knowledge of lack of jurisdiction, and that the later statements wrongfully describing “voluntary revocation of license” as “disbarred” were knowingly and intentionally false, and thus could only be intended as defamation for persecution.

The emails prove that DOC was actively reaching out to clients of the law firm and referring them to the local State Bar, thus abusing color of authority to encourage anybody to make any possible complaints, admitting “I have passed on your information to our clients”, and volunteering “assistance to identify other involved parties”. (The FBI “C-14” division noted that it is highly illegal for any government official to refer to “our clients” indicating bribe-taking for personal gain by abuse of authority.)

Outrageously, the State Bar Investigator wrote, “I will give Mr. Vertman a call and coordinate with the Assistant Bar Counsel overseeing this matter.” This is a major admission, proving that the DOC Chief Legal Counsel named Vertman was directly coordinating the entire process with the higher level of the Bar, thus flagrantly prejudicially corrupting the process by illegal abuse of authority. This is direct evidence of the federal crime of victim retaliation by DOC, as Vertman was in charge of defending against the 2 FBI criminal complaints filed by Judge Matthew, and was legally responsible for disciplining Ringleader, not aiding and abetting the organized criminal campaign of persecution.

Conclusion

Judge Matthew has been independently verified through informal communications with official channels, with successful confirmation of all claimed credentials, experience and qualifications, and validation that all statements in his curriculum vitae and public biographical profiles are truthful and accurate.

He is genuinely a highly decorated national security veteran, former independent Presidential advisor, and accomplished international lawyer and diplomatic special envoy. He has been entrusted with tens of billions and occasionally trillions of dollars in a trustee and fiduciary capacity, and appears to have been entrusted with national security command decisions affecting potentially millions of lives, as well as entrusted with real military force.

For no serious complaints to have happened, no civil lawsuits, no criminal violations, and no liabilities nor adverse consequences resulting from his highly sensitive activities, over so many years, is statistically surprising. This indicates that he is diligent, loyal, reliable, trustworthy, follows missions to completion, and does not make mistakes under pressure.

The only real “adverse information” touted by his political opponents are two regulatory events, which were pushed forward by American local agencies which lacked jurisdiction, solely by means of unlawful abuse of power in violation of due process of law. Those wrongful accusations are proven by voluminous documentation to be knowingly false, made for the primary purpose of politically motivated and unconstitutional persecution against him.

Justice4Humanity is an independent grass-roots coalition of human rights advocates supporting The Arbitration Court of International Justice (ACIJ), to institute meaningful enforcement of international human rights law.



WWW.JUSTICE4HUMANITY.ORG



WWW.JUSTICE4HUMANITY.ORG

CITATIONS TO SOURCE REFERENCES:

- [1] Allan M. Jalon, *A Break-In to End All Break-Ins: 1971 Stolen FBI Files Exposed Government's Domestic Spying Program*, Los Angeles Times, 08 March 2006.
- [2] Ward Churchill & Jim Vander Wall, *The COINTELPRO Papers: Documents from the FBI's Secret Wars Against Domestic Dissent*, South End Press, Boston (1990), pp.xii, 303.
- [3] Tim Weiner, *Enemies: A History of the FBI*, Random House, New York (2012).
- [4] Bud & Ruth Schultz, *The Price of Dissent: Testimonies to Political Repression in America*, University of California Press (2001).
- [5] Brian Glick, *War at Home: Covert Action Against US Activists and What We Can Do About It*, South End Press, Boston (1989); Ward Churchill, *Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars*, South End Press, Boston (2002).
- [6] UK Prime Minister & Home Secretary, *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism*, HM Government, March 2009, pp.14, 80, 83, p.44.
- [7] Defense Press and Broadcasting Advisory Committee, *Defense Advisory Notice System (DA-Notice System)*, Official Website (www.dnotice.org.uk), "Home" page, as of January 2014.
- [8] UK Prime Minister & Home Secretary, *The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering International Terrorism*, HM Government, March 2009, pp.67, 69.
- [9] European Commission Directorate General for Justice Freedom and Security, *Acquis of the European Union*, Section: "Terrorism", October 2009, pp.34-35.
- [10] Frank La Rue, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression, UN Human Rights Council, A/HRC/17/27 of 16 May 2011, Summary, Articles 26, 34.