

War Crimes Clarification for ICC Review

To: OTP-ICC

From: Todd Glassey, Rights Holder, EP0997808A3 et al

Date: 18-July-2018

Re: War Crimes Definition to support filed petition for relief

Table of Contents

The purpose of this document.....	2
The European Commission and the EU have acted in a manner to convert the EP0997808A3 Property and allow key vendors to resell it there in the European Continent in defiance of treaty and law.....	2
Timely filing, Jurisdiction and Venue are perfected.....	2
The War Crimes under Rome Statute.....	3
8 (2) (a) (iii): the War crime of willfully causing great suffering.....	3
8 (2) (a) (iv): the War crime of destruction and appropriation of property.....	3
8 (2) (b) (ii): the War crime of attacking civilian objects.....	3
8 (2) (b) (ix): the War crime of attacking protected objects.....	4
8 (2) (b) (xii): the War crime of denying quarter.....	4
8 (2) (b) (xiii): the War crime of destroying or seizing the enemy's property.....	4
8 (2) (b) (xxi): the War crime of outrages upon personal dignity.....	5
8 (2) (e) (iv): the War crime of attacking protected objects – Treaties and TEFU Article 7 Protections for property.....	5
8 (2) (a) (iv): the War crime of destruction and appropriation of property.....	5
6 (a): the War crime of Using the stolen Property in Weapons to commit Genocide.....	5
German Appropriation of US6370629 and use under the fraud provisions of EP0997808A3 to commit Genocide.....	6
British Appropriation of US6370629 and use under the fraud provisions of EP0997808A3 to commit Genocide.....	6
French Appropriation of US6370629 and use under the fraud provisions of EP0997808A3 to commit Genocide.....	7
TEFU Article 7 property protections violated.....	7
The TRIPS, Patent Cooperation Treaty, and Paris Accord/Madrid Protocol create Protected Status standing for the EP0997808A3 IP.....	8
Subsidiary immunity for commerce derived from war crime actions.....	8
EC/EU In actions creating trade agreements with Canada, Australia, and Japan, all of which who have illegally filed and abandoned instances of US6370629, the EC is partnering with other Nations in the their War Crimes as well.....	8
In Closing.....	9

The purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to correct the sections of the Rome Statue quoted in the original filing and show the detailed war crimes committed therein. It is as such submitted as an amendment to those documents already on file with the Office of the Prosecutor (filed yesterday).

The European Commission and the EU have acted in a manner to convert the EP0997808A3 Property and allow key vendors to resell it there in the European Continent in defiance of treaty and law.

Both for its own uses, and for public uses the European Commission and its EU Parliament have allowed the conversion of the US6370629 IP to be used in the EU outside the terms and requirements set up in the US6370629 (and US6393126) settlements. This has flowed into Financial and Military Weapon Systems, all used in the commission of Genocide, as well as the appropriation of property. In doing so they have committed murder, mayhem, and crimes against Humanity.

Further, they have allowed it to be used in a manner which causes direct losses and forms an appropriation because of the underlying EP0997808A3 Fraud.

Finally, they use the stolen/appropriated properties in concert with other nations who also have stolen, said same, and who like the European Commission and EU Parliament, refuse to address either the licensing requirements, or the fraud damages their appropriation creates. In all instances these are war crimes as enumerated herein.

We submit this amendment to the ICC for its review of the specific sections of the ROME STATUTE (6, 7, and 8) which constitute war crimes.

Timely filing, Jurisdiction and Venue are perfected.

These complaints all pertain to actions in the EU from 2002-through the current date as well as in Canada, Australia, Japan, South Africa, South Korea, in actions stemming from ongoing intellectual property conversion and appropriation crimes. Ones not fully codified by the US Courts until March of 2014 in USDC 14-CV-03629/WHA, and as such these are filed timely, and with full jurisdiction of the International Crime Court. Additionally, since the deaths and genocides from the uses in Drones and related technologies appropriated as a war crime continue, each new one forms a tolling event also empowering the ICC's review.

The War Crimes under Rome Statute

All nations of the EU are signatories to the Rome Statute as is the EC itself, and so are bound by the War Crimes definitions in Section 6, 7, and 8 of the Rome Statute.

These then are the direct sections of the War Crimes definitions the European Commission and EU itself are in violation of for their unlawful uses of the EP0997808A3 IP's and their allowing others as “privateers” and “counterfeiters” to sell and use those same properties in the EU nations themselves.

8 (2) (a) (iii): the War crime of willfully causing great suffering

By refusing to apply Article 7 payment mandates, the European Commission is causing great suffering to those parties they have both expropriated themselves, and allowed others to expropriate and illegally take use of.

This constitutes a War Crime under Section 8(2)(a)(iii) of the Rome Statute.

8 (2) (a) (iv): the War crime of destruction and appropriation of property

The EU as administered is an active participant in a War Crime under Section 8, 2(a)(iv) – the War crime of destruction and appropriation of property. The EU in blocking any and all fraud claims against the prosecution of the EP0997808A3 Patent Fraud has become a party to the War Crime of the conversion of the US6370629 IP across all nations of the EU.

The actions of the European Commission in blocking the enforcement of the EP0997808a3 patent fraud constitute a destruction and appropriator against a Civilian Object, that being the protected Intellectual Properties which US6370629 formally codified. If US6370629 had not properly issued there would be a claim of relief here, but since it did properly issue, and under US and EU Law is a Civilian Property Object, this claim is fully justified.

It is further supported by the massive number of derivative patents filed in the US and EU itself by parties like Apple, Microsoft, and many others using the US6370629 IP's directly, and in using components of those methods, all of which claim full ownership and re-license them under those new patent numbers. This is a formal appropriation of those properties and a re-titling of them for sale and use offense, which fully meets the requirements of 8(2)(a)(iv) as a war crime.

8 (2) (b) (ii): the War crime of attacking civilian objects

Under the TRIPS and Paris Accord, Intellectual Properties constitute Civilian Objects, and are protected by treaties, and Article 7 of the TEFU itself. As such allowing the conversion of those

War Crimes Clarification for ICC Review

properties constitutes an attack against Civilian Objects as defined in Section 8 (2)(b)(ii) of the Rome Statute.

The actions of the European Commission in blocking the enforcement of the EP0997808a3 patent fraud constitute an Attack against a Civilian Object, that being the protected Intellectual Properties which US6370629 formally codified. If US6370629 had not properly issued there would be a claim of relief here, but since it did properly issue, and under US and EU Law is a Civilian Property Object, this claim is fully justified.

As such any time a Rome Statute Member refuses to enforce a Patent Licensing Fraud Complaint they are a party to the attack against that property under both 8(2)(b)(ii) and 8(2)(a)(iv) as well.

8 (2) (b) (ix): the War crime of attacking protected objects

Under the TRIPS treaty, the Patent Cooperation Treaty, and Paris Accord, as well as Article 7 of the TEFU itself, Intellectual Properties constitute Protected Objects. While originally intended to be physical property intellectual property, with the massive reliance on computers, has taken a stance as real property as well. As such this standard applies to it.

As such allowing the conversion of those properties constitutes an attack against Civilian Objects as defined in Section 8 (2)(b)(ix) of the Rome Statute.

8 (2) (b) (xii): the War crime of denying quarter

The refusal to allow enforcement of TRIPS and TEFU Article 7 protections is a denial of quarter against property. Because the property belongs to people, the refusal to enforce the terms of Article 7 constitutes a denial of quarter against those parties, they being the owners of the property being taken. This is especially true if they derive sustenance and survival from that property, and once seized are made destitute.

8 (2) (b) (xiii): the War crime of destroying or seizing the enemy's property

The Actions of the EC and its EU constitute a war against the owners of the properties in their formally attacking and seizing those properties. In allowing third parties to re-claim and license those properties as their own, the EC and its EU are functionally destroying the properties therein, and in this case, this constitutes a 8 (2)(b)(xiii) violation.

8 (2) (b) (xxi): the War crime of outrages upon personal dignity

The property conversion from treaty protected Intellectual Properties is an Outrage against Personal Dignity when it is used to drive the owner of the property into poverty and flee the nation of their birth as has been done here.

As such this conversion constitutes a war crime under 8(2)(b)(xxi) as well.

8 (2) (e) (iv): the War crime of attacking protected objects – Treaties and TEFU Article 7 Protections for property

The Actions of the EC and its EU constitute “a war against the owners of the properties” in their formally attacking and seizing those protected properties.

In allowing third parties to re-claim and license those properties as their own, the EC and its EU are functionally destroying the properties therein, and in this case, this constitutes a 8 (2)(e)(iv) violation.

8 (2) (a) (iv): the War crime of destruction and appropriation of property

The use of Counterfeit Products in operating the European Commission is a derivative of the War crime of destruction and appropriation of property. When the European Council allows this to occur through its own IT acquisitions process and not stop it, they become party to the Appropriation itself.

The appropriation of the US6370629 IP and its fraudulent publication in the EU Nations under the protection of the European Commission constitutes a War crime of destruction and appropriation of property. Proffering and allowing the mass distribution of those Stolen Properties under the War Crime committed per Section 8 (2) (a) (iv) is yet another extension of the War Crime in re the EP0997808A3 patent fraud itself.

6 (a): the War crime of Using the stolen Property in Weapons to commit Genocide

Using the stolen Property in Weapons to commit Genocide as many EU nations do today, which are used in committing Genocides in the Middle East is a third derivative and distinct War Crime under Rome Statute 6 (a), as derived from the War Crimes of Rome Statute 8 (2) (b) (iv), 8 (2) (c) (i)-1, 8 (2) (e) (i) as well. These also qualify under Rome Statute 7 (1) (a) as Acts of Murder under the War Crimes provisions.

German Appropriation of US6370629 and use under the fraud provisions of EP0997808A3 to commit Genocide

The Nation of Germany for instance sells a 155mm Howitzer round called the AC-90. It is a GPS guided Ballistic Fuzed Munition, and relies on the controls of US6370629 to operate. It is sold outside of the realm of the Settlement for US users of the US6370629 Patent, and is also sold from the EU where the EP0997808A3 Patent Fraud contaminates every sale of any product or software relying on US6370629.

Since this unit is used in direct military action and tens of thousands have been killed by its use, its use constitutes a War Crime in the Commission of a Genocide under the Conversion (appropriation of property) to commit a 6(a) Genocide provisions of the Rome Statute.

British Appropriation of US6370629 and use under the fraud provisions of EP0997808A3 to commit Genocide

The US Government sells the British Government Tomahawk cruise missiles which Britain has used in numerous military events illegally.

The Tomahawk Command and Control Services interfaces, Time on Target Controls, Ordnance Trigger Controls, Security Controls for its Operating Computer Systems, as well as its Bomb-Damage-Assessment facilities and Geotagging from its surveillance applications all infringe on US6370629.

Britain thus cannot use these in any form because of the EP0997808A3 Fraud which they are the core protector of.

Additionally, Britain produces the Shadow Hawk Cruise Missile itself with its partner the French Government, and those like tomahawk utilize the same service controls which infringe on those methods EP0997808A3 would have protected.

The same Property was appropriated for use in the Aircraft Navigation, Autopilot, Fly-By-Wire Controls, Geotagging services, and most all military surveillance systems run by the British Government as well as the file system journaling and other areas of their computer and telecom infrastructure, all done under the protection of the European Commission making both parties members of a class of war crimes committers.

As such the use of those as stolen property, in commission of Genocide is a subsidiary war crime which prevents the EU from doing business with the British Government in any form. Especially using Computers who communicate using the IP the EP0997808A3 services would control and rely on.

Hence, British Banking using the EP0997808a3 protected methods perfected by the US6370629 Patent's issuance prevent the setting up of any post BREXIT Banking or Financial treaties as derivative war crimes under the Appropriations standards previously discussed here as well.

French Appropriation of US6370629 and use under the fraud provisions of EP0997808A3 to commit Genocide

Additionally, like Britain, France produces the Shadow Hawk Cruise Missile itself as the SCALP EW, and like those controls in US tomahawks utilize the same service controls which infringe on those methods EP0997808A3 would have protected.

The same property was appropriated by vendors in France to serve the needs of the French Government for use in the Aircraft Navigation, Autopilot, Fly-By-Wire Controls, Geotagging services, and most all military surveillance systems run by the French Government as well as the file system journaling and other areas of their computer and telecom infrastructure, all done under the protection of the European Commission making both parties members of a class of war crimes committers.

As such the use of those as stolen property, in commission of Genocide is a subsidiary war crime which prevents the EU from doing business with the British Government in any form. Especially using Computers who communicate using the IP the EP0997808A3 services would control and rely on.

Hence, French Banking using the EP0997808a3 protected methods perfected by the US6370629 Patent's issuance prevent the setting up of any post BREXIT Banking agreements with any EU or UK Nation, or Financial treaties as derivative war crimes under the Appropriations standards previously discussed here as well.

TEFU Article 7 property protections violated

The Article 7 property protections force the European Commission and its Parliament of the EU to properly pay for any property converted for the public use in the EU Nations. It has refused to take notice of its frauds therein and is in direct violation of Article 7's protections therein.

Additionally the German, French, and British Governments have refused to implement their own prosecutions against the EP0997808A3 Frauds or implement compliance programs for their uses of US6370629 based products, or those of its derivative 274 patents at this time. Thus, making themselves all parties to the Appropriation of the Property and its redistribution to Microsoft, Apple, Google, Facebook, Oracle, Cisco, Juniper Networks, Netflix, eBay, Paypal, and many others.

In all instances an Article 7 violation as described herein has created a situation where the EC and its EU nations are in direct standing as parties to the conversion of said same properties.

The TRIPS, Patent Cooperation Treaty, and Paris Accord/Madrid Protocol create Protected Status standing for the EP0997808A3 IP

The TRIPS Agreement the Patent Cooperation Treaty, the Paris Accord and its Madrid protocol extensions all form a set of Property Protections and Reliance Agreements between their signatories and those who rely on them.

The Failure to meet those constitutes a war crime when conversion and appropriation happen, or when those properties are used in the commission of Genocide or the appropriation of those properties causes the parties they are stolen from to be driven into poverty or publicly humiliated. In all instances those actions have happened in the context of the US6370629 patent frauds.

Subsidiary immunity for commerce derived from war crime actions

The European Commission may not make any derivative agreements or treaties to set aside war crime related actions by UK or other Nations. Further, it may not make a BREXIT agreement which does not properly resolve Britain's creation of the EP0997808A3 fraud as the original sin act in this matter.

Deriving Commerce from Appropriated properties is a separate war crime in and of itself and constitutes an ongoing act of Pillaging as defined in Rome Statute 8 (2) (b) (xvi).

EC/EU In actions creating trade agreements with Canada, Australia, and Japan, all of which who have illegally filed and abandoned instances of US6370629, the EC is partnering with other Nations in the their War Crimes as well.

Since US6370629 was illegally filed in the following nations, any partnerships or trade agreements which function to set aside these matters constitute a subsidiary act as well, both under War Crimes, and TEFU Article 7 and Article 101(1) and (3).

War Crimes Clarification for ICC Review

US6370629 Foreign Filing Dates

App/Patent Number	Nation	Filing Date	Authorize Date	Status	Publication Date
AU54015/99	Australia	10/14/99	None	Abandoned	
CA2287596	Canada	10/26/99	None	Abandoned	
EU0997808A3	EU	10/27/99	None	Abandoned	04/23/03
BR9904979A	Brazil	10/29/99	None	Abandoned	12/19/00
ZA9906799	South Africa	10/29/99	5/2000 but never paid for	Abandoned	06/21/00
JP2000-163379	Japan	10/29/99	None	Abandoned	06/16/00
KO2000-0035093	South Korea	10/28/99	None	Abandoned	06/26/00

In Closing

The ICC can see that because these are ongoing matters, that whether stemming from frauds happening in 1999 or 2000, any derivative patents filed and issued after 2002, are covered by the courts authority. Additionally any follow-on acts which happened after 2002 are covered as well, hence the ICC is fully empowered to address this appropriation war crime and its effects.

Further, the murders and killings using the appropriated properties have been happening over the last 15 years and the Court has a responsibility to act therein.