

Institute for the Advancement of Justice & Human Rights

1968 S. Coast Hwy #3919, Laguna Beach CA 92651

Contact: info@iaj.institute Website: <https://www.iaj.institute>

15 September 2025

Committee Against Torture (CAT)
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
Palais Wilson
52 Rue des Pâquis
CH-1201 Geneva, Switzerland
Email: cat@ohchr.org

Preliminary Shadow Report by the IAJ regarding the compliance of the United States of America with the UNCAT, and indication of the necessity of an Article 20 Investigation into Systemic Judicial CIDT and Torture in the United States

Dear Members of the Committee Against Torture,

The Institute for the Advancement of Justice and Human Rights (IAJ) respectfully submits its preliminary Shadow Report on the subject of the compliance of the United States of America with the UNCAT, and petitions this Committee, under Article 20 of the Convention Against Torture, to investigate credible and consistent evidence of widespread, systematic, and officially endorsed practices of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and punishment (CIDT), and torture within the United States of America, with particular initial focus on its state and federal judiciaries.

The IAJ is an independent non-government public interest body (NGO) dedicated to monitoring, investigating, documenting, educating and advocating against systemic human rights violations within the United States. The IAJ is organized under the Paris Principles and aims to be the National Human Rights Institution that the United States has refused to bring into being for decades. The IAJ is organized according to the Paris Principles and follows investigation methodology consistent with the Istanbul Protocol, and aims to embody and enhance best practices and the highest standards of independent investigation that may be applied to human rights.

With requests having been made in 2025 on behalf of the People of the United States to the United States Supreme Court Justices and to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals chief judge to cooperate with the establishment of an NHRI, and requests to United States Presidents to issue an executive order for the establishment of an NHRI, and having received no compliance as yet, the IAJ proceeded without further delay to AI-generate its website, and began accepting electronic complaints and human rights violations reports on August 4, 2025.

By mention to a handful of individuals that the IAJ seeks knowledge of human rights violations by government, and by courts in particular, word-of-mouth caused the first complainants to register on August 4, 2025. As of September 13, 2025, the IAJ was overwhelmed with 89 registrants entering their individual complaints, and 27 reports of human rights violations of others made by third parties. Each complainant and each person reporting a violation of a third party consented to their submissions being shared with the Private Attorney General (PAG). We acknowledge the letter by the PAG submitted to the 83rd session of the CAT.

Since August 4, 2025, and as of September 13, 2025, 16 individuals had been subjected to an initial assessment to confirm that substantive grounds exist for independent investigation of prohibited acts, and all 16 successfully passed the initial assessment, graduating them to the list of cases to be fully investigated. This indicated that the IAJ requires more resources as the anticipated initial volume of complaints has been far exceeded. Based on the very short-term statistics, the rate of registration of new complainants extrapolates to an average of approximately 3 complaints and violation reports per day, and a potential annual rate of more than 1,000 cases per year. However, the IAJ is receiving consistent and reliable information from registered complainants that thousands of people are taking individual and collective actions against human rights violations involving the courts, and law enforcement and other officials, and that they would potentially submit their complaints to the IAJ upon being informed by word-of-mouth.

The focus of the IAJ's first Shadow Report is the judicial violation of the UNCAT and other non-derogable rights protected by human rights treaties. The IAJ's first Shadow Report refers the CAT to the systemic prohibited acts which are discussed in the referenced PAG letter. Under Article 20, the Committee may initiate a confidential inquiry where there is "**well-founded indication that torture is being systematically practiced** in the territory of a State party." The nature and gravity of complaints communicated to the IAJ indicate an apparent uniformity of judicial treatment that raises a requirement of a human rights inquiry into judicial practices. The IAJ announces that it will submit information to the CAT to determine if, based on credible information, this threshold has been exceeded based on factors including:

- **Admissions of torture-enabling doctrines** by federal judges;
- **Institutional refusals to prevent or remedy harm** to disabled and pro se individuals under court control;
- **Ethics evasion and immunity practices** that block all domestic oversight;
- **Judicial policies explicitly denying effect to the UNCAT and other human rights treaties.**

A credible independent review of the judicial system in the United States made available to the IAJ indicates that it **lacks any mechanism to address CIDT or torture committed by judges**:

- Judicial ethics complaints are **decided by peers and colleagues of the accused**, who routinely dismiss them.
- The Department of Justice and state prosecutors disclaims jurisdiction over judges.
- Judicial immunity doctrine blocks all civil remedies.
- **No U.S. body exists to independently investigate or prosecute torture committed by judges.**
- The 'court of last resort', the U.S. Supreme Court, has been found to **repeatedly deny or fail to docket** petitions describing judicial torture, CIDT, and denial of medical care. That court has failed to stay proceedings where litigation itself was medically documented to cause trauma and risk of death.

The case of the PAG is particularly illuminating because his torture documentation is founded on repeatable measurements of physical and mental pain and suffering that was enabled by a unique health condition and peer-reviewed science and statistical modeling that enables measurement of the magnitude of pain and suffering, and the correlation of judicial conduct with his pain and suffering. This type and extent of measurement of torture is unprecedented, and where torture is mental and characterized by authorities as lawful sanctions. The public record provided by the PAG documents the consistent and uniform conduct of 40 judges in 10 state and federal courts and the same patterns of prohibited acts over more than seven years of measurements documented chronologically in court records, providing evidence of systemic violations of human rights by judicial policy, and providing a basis for the measurement of non-equivalence of domestic remedies versus UNCAT direct enforcement.

Referring to complainants, without prejudicing the impartial and independent investigation of complaints being filed with the IAJ, there appears to be a large volume of complaints related to the judicial process of the Family Courts throughout the states, and the expression of frustration of no relief, remedy or punishment through the state and the federal courts for the alleged prohibited judicial acts that violate human rights. The complaints often have a law enforcement or institutional involvement and persons acting under color of authority who are outside the courts who are alleged as committing human rights violations.

The IAJ informs the CAT that, based on information being supplied to IAJ by many independent complainants, there are plausibly large numbers of people around the United States who report the absence of human rights in the judicial process, and report severe pain and suffering, and insist that opposition to their treatment by authorities causes further severe pain and suffering, including incarceration. Many identify themselves as parents forcibly separated from their children and the detrimental consequences to children and to society. The complainants interviewed, consistently report that groups of people have organized, and are organizing, around the nation to change the legal and judicial systems. Some of these groups provide information, records, presentations, and content on social media and internet sources which lend credence to the presence of a national and systemic problem. Legislative events indicate that the people are active with regard to complaining to legislators about the judicial process and the treatment of the People by authorities related to the judicial process in the United States, and the IAJ notes no legislation commensurate with the reported harm. The IAJ examines these sources of information and events to confirm the representations made by complainants about the nature of harm, the human rights infringed, the numbers of affected persons, and the systemic character of the complaints.

The U.S. judiciary functions as the final line of defense against torture and ill-treatment—yet when that branch becomes the source of the harm, the obligation to intervene falls to the international community. The Separation of Power under the U.S. Constitution amplifies the need for extra-national intervention. The IAJ respectfully submits that based on evidence in the public record, ill-treatment and torture must be evaluated to determine if they are institutional features of U.S. judicial proceedings. If confirmed, then only international legal pressure and oversight can halt this defect in government compliance with the treaty, because complainants appear to be reporting consistently that no domestic remedy, relief or punishment is possible despite credible efforts. Based on credible information and analysis, the non-self-execution of the UNCAT ensures that individual rights conferred by *jus cogens* and the ratified treaty are, in practice, eliminated and the People of the United States must rely on the CAT and the State parties to the treaty to intervene to secure their non-derogable rights. The PAG reports are consistent with this emerging information from around the country. In more one notable instance, the PAG reports the public record of the Bankruptcy Court of North California, in the federal Ninth Circuit, whose Chief judge insisted that he may torture the PAG with no private to objection or recourse because of the non-self-execution of the treaty. This is verified through the national federal database “PACER”. Credible indications of this institutional character and the inevitable exhaustion of domestic remedies without recourse appear to be present and require independent investigation into systemic human rights violations by the U.S. judiciary.

The IAJ is designed to provide integration with the CAT, and United Nations Human Rights bodies. The technological and electronic access to IAJ information and investigations is feasible for these bodies and the CAT to enable the verification and evaluation of IAJ’s information, and to facilitate contact with complainants. Therefore, the CAT’s investigation of prohibited acts in the United States may be achieved with access to ‘live data’ provided by the IAJ, and with the consent of each complainant and each third party reporter. The IAJ remains sensitive to the privacy of complainants and third party reporters of human rights violations. The IAJ envisages that information in support of UNCAT violations, particularly Article 20 violations, will be made available to the CAT on a continuous and dynamic basis. Therefore, we request that the CAT access and review the most current list of IAJ investigations on each occasion when the CAT investigates Article 20 violations, or the U.S. compliance with the UNCAT.

In addition to investigations of real cases and verified information, the IAJ also conducts academic works, such as design reviews of judicial norms and customs and precedents to determine if CIDD (**Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment**) and **torture are systematically perpetrated by judges** because of the design of laws and procedures, in both state and federal courts, with particularly attention to the impact upon the disadvantaged, including indigent, **disabled** and **pro se litigants**. Based on reasoning and academic review, prohibited acts appear to be structurally compelled by the evolution of jurisprudence according to a foundation rooted in monarchy—they are embedded in court rules, protected by judicial doctrines of immunity, and systemically excluded from ethics accountability. The IAJ tests and normalizes the academic works with real world data. The benefit of an academic approach alongside an independent and concurrent real-world investigation of individual cases, is that it provides a runway to more refined correction of government operations and reform, with integration of human rights as an immutable foundation of judicial ethics, judicial processes, law enforcement and Due Process of law.

The IAJ fills a critical void. We aim to function as an **independent, Paris-Principle-compliant, Istanbul Protocol-aligned investigative and documentation body** within the United States, monitoring and recording previously unconsidered factors such as:

- **Coercive enforcement of structural discrimination and inaccessible court procedures** that deprive pro se and disabled individuals of meaningful participation, including uncorrectable infliction of medical harm and pain and suffering;
- **Denial of medical accommodations** necessary to protect life and bodily integrity, including the refusal to postpone proceedings during medical emergencies;
- **Retaliatory measures** taken against litigants for exercising protected rights (e.g., filing ethics complaints or disqualification motions);
- **Deliberate fact distortion** and procedural abuses that shield misconduct from accountability.
- **Weaponization** of deadlines, records access, and hearings;
- **Retaliation and refoulement** concealed as lawful sanctions;
- **Legal fictions** (such as “discretion” or “non-reviewability”) used to mask torture.

We urge the Committee Against Torture to:

1. **Initiate an active confidential inquiry under Article 20** into systemic judicial torture and CIDT in the U.S. state and federal judiciary, and keep the investigation open and on-going to enable the ‘live-feed’ of information from the IAJ;
2. **Request documents, hearings, and findings from IAJ**, to conduct an Article 20 investigation;
3. **Assess the failure of judicial ethics enforcement as a torture-enabling mechanism;**
4. **Recognize the IAJ as a credible civil society body** for future submissions and collaboration.

The IAJ is dedicated to continuously improving its quality of work and resources and its standards of operation, to serve human rights in the most competent and independent and transparent and truthful manner. The IAJ strives to be an anchor of the baseline of world human rights, and Civil Society Space in the United States. We seek distinguished human rights experts to join our ranks and we will consider your referrals gratefully.

Cordially yours,

The IAJ Directorate

IAJ PRELIMINARY SHADOW REPORT TO THE 83RD SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE AGAINST TORTURE

DATE: September 15, 2025

IAJ Document Version Control Log

Document ID: IAJ-CAT-20250915-001-PUB
Initial Release Date: 2025-09-15

Version History

Version	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
v1.0	2025-09-15	IAJ	Initial release

Classification: CAT (Committee Against Torture)
Access Level: Public Release