

COMMUNICATION TO THE OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Pursuant to Article 15 of the Rome Statute

Submitted by Pierre Deglaire — April 2026

FROM: Pierre Deglaire

7 rue Guillaume Apollinaire, 33700 Mérignac, France
pierre.deglaire@gmail.com | deglaire.aoc@gmail.com
+33 6 63 90 13 01

TO: The Office of the Prosecutor

International Criminal Court
P.O. Box 19519, 2500 CM The Hague, Netherlands
otp.informationdesk@icc-cpi.int

DATE: April 2026

BASIS: Article 15, Rome Statute — Communication by Individuals

SUBJECT: Systematic Persecution, Physical Attacks, and Coordinated
Destruction of Humanitarian Economic Value — France and Multi-State

This communication is submitted to the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court pursuant to Article 15 of the Rome Statute, which allows any individual to provide information about crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court.

It is submitted without legal counsel, under circumstances of documented obstruction of access to justice across four national and international jurisdictions. It is submitted in full transparency and in good faith. The communicant does not assert that all facts described constitute crimes within ICC jurisdiction as currently interpreted. He respectfully invites the Office of the Prosecutor to assess whether they do — and further invites the Court to consider whether a situation of this nature and scale warrants development of the applicable legal framework. This second invitation is developed in the Annex to this communication.

I. IDENTITY OF THE COMMUNICANT

- Name: Pierre Deglaire, French national, born 13 January 1973, Paris, France
- Professional background: thirty years in international finance (Deutsche Bank, UBS, Merrill Lynch) and real estate development across Western Europe

- Current status: in forced international mobility for documented security reasons; currently in Dubai, United Arab Emirates
 - Representation: self-represented in all proceedings, due to documented and systematic obstruction of access to legal counsel in France
-

II. FACTUAL BASIS — SUMMARY

The facts described in this communication span a period of more than ten years (approximately 2014–2026) and involve a documented, coordinated pattern of persecution directed against the communicant and multiple groups of persons associated with his economic projects, by state-linked actors, major French banking institutions, and their institutional enablers across multiple jurisdictions.

A 320-page Global Filing documenting these facts in full has been submitted to the U.S. District Court (Case 1:25-cv-10163-LTS), the High Court of Justice in London (King's Bench Division), and the European Court of Human Rights (Ref. 30346/25). That document is incorporated by reference into this communication and is available upon request.

A. Physical Persecution — Documented Incidents

- 2022 — Serbia: unlawful detention for several days without legal basis or judicial oversight;
- 2022 — France: forced psychiatric internment and sedation without legal basis, following the Plaintiff's attempts to assert his rights;
- Multiple occasions: attempted poisonings, documented;
- Multiple occasions: sabotage of motor vehicles, documented, including one incident of high lethality potential;
- Sustained physical surveillance across multiple countries over several years;
- March 2026 — Georgia: contact-based poisoning resulting in acute pancreatitis, documented through contemporaneous AI consultation logs, insurer correspondence, and signed hospitalization waiver. The Plaintiff was unable to seek hospital treatment due to the documented risk of arbitrary re-institutionalization;
- April 2026 — Turkey: interception of life-critical medications (cardiac, diabetic, psychiatric) by customs authorities, with systematic non-response to formal requests, resulting in two weeks without essential medication. The Plaintiff was required to relocate countries.

B. Systematic Destruction of Economic Projects

- Lucy Bank: a validated EU banking innovation addressing systemic deposit protection and risk allocation, suppressed over more than five years by coordinated action of French state-linked actors and major banking institutions;
- Real estate dismemberment model: validated mechanism for retirement real estate financing, blocked at implementation stage;
- Micro Tiny Houses: alternative housing construction model, destroyed prior to commercial launch;
- Real estate agency group: seven consecutive profitable years, then judicially liquidated in circumstances documented as fundamentally irregular, including the deliberate exclusion of the communicant from effective legal representation through coordinated disinformation by multiple French criminal lawyers.

C. Systemic Denial of Access to Justice

- France: Parquet National Financier — multiple formal complaints over several months, zero responses. Domestic judicial channels effectively closed;
- European Court of Human Rights: urgent petition under Rule 39 returned on procedural grounds inapplicable to emergency procedure;
- United Kingdom: physical attendance before Mr Justice Richard Smith, King's Bench Division, Rolls Building, 26 November 2025 — confirmed in writing by HM Courts & Tribunals Service on 27 March 2026. All documents returned, no case number, no procedural act created;
- United States: case 1:25-cv-10163-LTS opened at SDNY, transfer order to DDC entered by Chief Judge Swain in January 2026 — no DDC case number, no assigned judge, no response to the Plaintiff after 137 days.

III. APPLICABLE ROME STATUTE PROVISIONS

The communicant submits that the following provisions of the Rome Statute are potentially applicable to the facts described. Final qualification rests with the Office of the Prosecutor.

A. Persecution — Article 7(1)(h)

Article 7(1)(h) of the Rome Statute defines persecution as the intentional and severe deprivation of fundamental rights contrary to international law by reason of the identity of a group or collectivity, committed in connection with other acts referred to in Article 7(1).

The communicant submits that the decade-long coordinated campaign — combining physical attacks, forced institutionalization, systematic destruction of economic activity, and orchestrated denial of access to justice across four jurisdictions — constitutes a pattern of persecution directed against the communicant and all persons associated with his economic projects, on account of their challenge to the dominant economic and institutional order. The communicant is the principal bearer of this persecution and its sole documentor, but he does not act or suffer alone. The perpetrators include state agents and state-linked banking actors, and the conduct spans the territory of France and extends across multiple states.

The communicant notes that the persecution documented here was not directed at him alone. At DPP Consulting, 42 collaborators and their families were directly affected by the institutional destruction of the company. The Lucy Bank project involved a team of 10 to 15 persons. Additional collaborators were engaged on the real estate dismemberment model and the Micro Tiny Houses project. The communicant is the sole person capable of documenting and pursuing the totality of these attacks — because only he was present across all fronts and all countries — but he speaks for a collective of identified persons who suffered direct harm. He respectfully invites the Office of the Prosecutor to consider whether the systematic, coordinated, and multi-state character of the conduct, combined with the collective harm visited upon these persons and the intended destruction of economic innovations that would have benefited a broad population, brings this case within the scope of Article 7(1)(h). This question is developed further in the Annex.

B. Other Inhumane Acts — Article 7(1)(k)

Article 7(1)(k) covers 'other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health.' This provision is a residual clause, designed to capture conduct that does not fall neatly within the enumerated categories but is of equivalent gravity.

The communicant submits that the following acts, viewed cumulatively and in context, satisfy this threshold:

- Forced psychiatric internment without legal basis, involving sedation — an act causing serious injury to mental health and to dignity;
- Multiple attempted poisonings over several years;
- Engineered acute illness (pancreatitis) through contact-based substance, in circumstances where the victim could not seek medical care without risk of re-institutionalization;
- Deliberate interception of life-critical medication (cardiac, diabetic, psychiatric) causing two weeks of documented deprivation of medical care.

These acts did not occur in isolation. They were part of a continuous, documented campaign conducted over a decade, with the objective of eliminating a person who posed a challenge to powerful economic actors.

C. Contextual Element — Widespread or Systematic Attack

The Rome Statute requires that acts constituting crimes against humanity be committed 'as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population.' The communicant acknowledges that this threshold, as traditionally interpreted, requires a large-scale or organized attack affecting multiple victims.

He submits, however, that the systematic character of the attack against him — involving coordinated action across state institutions, banking entities, judicial organs, and intelligence or security actors, sustained over more than a decade, across multiple countries, with a documented policy of isolation and elimination — satisfies the requirement of systematicity, even if not of scale in the traditional sense.

The question of whether the destruction of economic innovations designed to benefit populations at scale (described in Section IV) satisfies the 'population' element through its humanitarian consequences is a question of legal development that the communicant respectfully places before the Office of the Prosecutor.

IV. THE HUMANITARIAN DIMENSION — SCALE OF THE DESTROYED VALUE

This section is not submitted as a legal argument under any existing Rome Statute provision. It is submitted as context, to allow the Office of the Prosecutor to understand the full scale of what was destroyed — and why this case may warrant attention beyond its individual dimension.

The three economic innovations destroyed by the documented conduct had, at the time of their suppression, a combined conservative valuation of €124.4 billion. This figure is deliberately understated. The central project — Lucy Bank — was designed to redistribute a significant portion of its economic value to humanitarian causes.

The communicant had established, as a foundational principle of his economic model, that a minimum of 51% of net profits from the YHRK ecosystem — of which Lucy Bank was the primary economic engine — would be redistributed to humanitarian causes, partner NGOs, and documented victims of institutional injustice. This commitment is now inscribed in the Articles of Association of the YHRK Foundation (registered in Georgia, March 2026).

SCALE OF HUMANITARIAN DESTRUCTION: The base economic damage is €124.4 billion (conservative, deliberately understated). Under U.S. federal antitrust law (15 U.S.C. § 15), the documented obstruction and ongoing attacks qualify the claim for treble damages, bringing the total to €375 billion. The

committed redistribution under the YHRK Foundation statutes (51% minimum) applied to this figure represents approximately €191 billion directed toward humanitarian causes. For context: the United Nations estimates the annual cost of eliminating global hunger at approximately USD 40 billion (≈ €37 billion). The destroyed humanitarian redistribution capacity of €191 billion would have been sufficient, by a simple ratio, to fund the complete elimination of world hunger for approximately five years — representing the prevention of approximately 40–45 million deaths from hunger alone, plus incalculable reduction in suffering across hundreds of millions of additional lives.

The communicant does not assert that the perpetrators are directly responsible for the deaths of persons who would otherwise have been saved by this redistribution. The causal chain is indirect and the communicant explicitly acknowledges this. He submits this calculation not as a legal argument, but as a factual illustration of the scale of the harm caused — harm that extends far beyond the individual victim — and as context for the legal development argument presented in the Annex.

V. CURRENT PROCEEDINGS AND CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL CONTEXT

- U.S. District Court, SDNY / DDC: Case 1:25-cv-10163-LTS, active, emergency transfer order issued by Chief Judge Laura Taylor Swain, January 2026;
- European Court of Human Rights: Ref. 30346/25, pending;
- UK High Court, King’s Bench Division: JCIO Refs. 50320/26 and 50341/26, HMCTS Ref. 80122237, active;
- FBI / U.S. Department of Justice: Global Filing delivered December 2025, multiple supplemental submissions transmitted;
- This communication to the ICC constitutes the fifth simultaneous international submission.

The communicant notes that no effective judicial protection has been granted by any of the four existing proceedings, despite their active status. Each has produced documented evidence of obstruction or administrative failure. The ICC communication is submitted in this context, as a parallel track, not a substitute.

VI. REQUEST TO THE OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR

The communicant respectfully requests the following:

- Registration of this communication and issuance of an acknowledgment of receipt;

- Preliminary assessment of whether the facts described fall within the jurisdiction of the Court under Articles 7(1)(h) and/or 7(1)(k) of the Rome Statute;
- Consideration of the legal development argument presented in the Annex to this communication, and assessment of whether the Office of the Prosecutor considers the situation described to be of a nature that warrants a broader legal reflection on the evolution of the applicable framework;
- Identification of any additional information or documentation the Office requires for the purposes of its preliminary examination.

The complete 320-page Global Filing, all supplemental submissions, and all institutional correspondence referenced in this communication are available and will be transmitted upon request through whatever secure channel the Office of the Prosecutor designates.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Deglaire

Communicant – Self-represented

pierre.deglaire@gmail.com | deglaire.aoic@gmail.com

+33 6 63 90 13 01

April 2026 – Dubai, United Arab Emirates

ANNEX — LEGAL DEVELOPMENT SUBMISSION
PROPOSED EMERGING CONCEPT: COORDINATED DESTRUCTION
OF HUMANITARIAN ECONOMIC VALUE AS A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY

Submitted for consideration by the Office of the Prosecutor — April 2026

This Annex is submitted as a legal development document. It does not assert that the proposed concept constitutes current law. It invites the Office of the Prosecutor — and, through it, the Court — to consider whether an important gap in international criminal law exists, and whether the facts presented in the accompanying communication provide an appropriate occasion to begin closing it.

The law does not stand still. The Rome Statute itself represents a development of the law that many considered impossible before 1998. The definition of crimes against humanity has evolved significantly through jurisprudence. The communicant submits that the present case presents a factual situation that is genuinely new, and that the international community would be served by its legal examination.

I. THE EXISTING FRAMEWORK AND ITS GAP

The Rome Statute, as currently interpreted, addresses crimes against humanity in terms of physical violence, deprivation of liberty, and persecution of identifiable groups. It captures massacres, deportations, enslavement, torture, enforced disappearance.

It does not, as currently interpreted, capture the following scenario:

A state and its institutional allies conduct a decade-long coordinated campaign to destroy an individual who has developed economic innovations that, if implemented, would have generated and redistributed tens of billions of euros to humanitarian causes. The individual is physically attacked, institutionally persecuted, and systematically denied access to justice. The innovations are destroyed. The redistribution never occurs. Millions of people who would have benefited from that redistribution do not benefit. None of this constitutes a crime in international criminal law as currently defined.

The communicant submits that this gap is real, significant, and worth examining. It is not a gap born of oversight. It reflects the historical moment in which the Rome Statute was drafted — a moment when the crimes of the twentieth century (genocide, war crimes, mass atrocities) dominated the legal imagination. The twenty-first century has introduced a new category of harm:

the coordinated, institutional destruction of economic value at a scale that produces humanitarian consequences equivalent in magnitude to those of the crimes the Statute does address.

II. THE PROPOSED CONCEPT

Proposed Definition

The communicant proposes, for consideration by the Office of the Prosecutor, the following emerging concept:

COORDINATED DESTRUCTION OF HUMANITARIAN ECONOMIC VALUE: The systematic and deliberate suppression, by state actors or state-linked entities acting in concert, of economic innovations or projects demonstrably designed to generate and redistribute economic value at a scale producing measurable humanitarian benefit, where such suppression is accompanied by physical persecution of the individuals responsible for those projects, systematic denial of access to justice, and where the foreseeable humanitarian consequences of the destruction are of a magnitude comparable to those of recognized crimes against humanity.

This concept does not require that the perpetrators intended to cause humanitarian harm. It requires only that:

- The destroyed project had a documented, credible capacity to produce humanitarian benefit at scale;
- The destruction was deliberate and coordinated, not the result of market failure or legitimate regulatory action;
- The perpetrators were aware, or should reasonably have been aware, of the humanitarian dimension of what they were destroying;
- The destruction was accompanied by persecution of the individual architect of the project, making the harm both individual and collective in its effects.

III. THE LEGAL PATHWAY

The communicant is aware that this concept does not correspond to any enumerated act in Article 7(1)(a)–(j) of the Rome Statute. He submits that it may be accommodated within the framework in two ways:

Path 1 — Article 7(1)(k): Other Inhumane Acts

Article 7(1)(k) is a residual provision, deliberately open-textured. The drafters of the Rome Statute included it precisely to avoid closing the definition of crimes against humanity against future developments. The Elements of Crimes specify that the act must be 'of a similar character' to the enumerated acts, and must intentionally cause 'great suffering, or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health.'

The communicant submits that the deliberate destruction of a project designed to save lives — where the causal chain between destruction and preventable death is calculable, even if indirect — is of a character similar to the other inhumane acts enumerated. The suffering caused is not visited on a single identifiable victim. It is distributed across the population that would have benefited from the project. This distributed harm may be greater in aggregate than the harm of many recognized crimes.

Path 2 — Jurisprudential Development

The history of international criminal law is a history of jurisprudential development. The concept of joint criminal enterprise was not in the Statute; the Appeals Chamber of the ICTY developed it. The concept of command responsibility for civilian superiors was developed through interpretation. The concept of persecution has been extended in ways not anticipated by the drafters.

The communicant does not suggest that the Court should exceed its mandate. He suggests that the facts presented here are sufficiently grave, sufficiently documented, and sufficiently novel to warrant a considered legal examination of whether the existing framework, properly interpreted, can accommodate them — and if not, whether the Assembly of States Parties might be invited to consider whether it should.

IV. THE FACTUAL ILLUSTRATION

To make the scale concrete, the communicant offers the following factual illustration — not as legal argument, but as illustration of the human reality that the proposed concept is designed to address.

Parameter	Figure
Conservative valuation of destroyed projects	€124.4 billion
Redistribution on trebled base: €375Bn × 51% (YHRK Foundation statutes)	≈ €191 billion
UN estimated annual cost of eliminating global hunger	USD 40 billion (≈€37 billion)

Equivalent years of complete global hunger elimination	≈ 5.2 years of full funding
Number of people dying from hunger annually (UN estimate)	approximately 8–9 million per year
Deaths attributable to total foregone redistribution (ratio, 5 years)	approximately 40–45 million — preventable
Additional persons living in extreme poverty affected	hundreds of millions

The communicant repeats: he does not assert that the defendants caused these deaths. The causal chain is indirect. He submits this table to illustrate the scale of the harm in terms that allow comparison with harms that international criminal law already recognizes as among the gravest.

V. THE SYSTEMIC DIMENSION — WHAT HAPPENS IF THE LAW DOES NOT ACT

The communicant has, throughout this submission, described what has been done to him. He now invites the Office of the Prosecutor to consider the systemic dimension — not what has been done to one person, but what the documented apparatus, if left unchecked, will continue to do, to others, in the years ahead.

A. The Asymmetry of Force

On one side of this case stands one person. He has no institution, no legal counsel, no financial resources. He travels alone, under documented physical threat, funding his own international legal proceedings from whatever means he can access. He has survived four poisoning attempts in eighteen months, two vehicle sabotages, forced institutionalization, unlawful detention, acute pancreatitis in isolation, and two weeks without life-critical medication. He documents every incident, files every submission, and pursues every institutional channel — alone.

On the other side stands the following apparatus, documented in the Global Filing of December 2025:

- A head of state and approximately fifteen ministers with direct or indirect involvement in the documented institutional decisions;
- Approximately fifteen major French banking institutions;
- Approximately sixty private companies and their networks;
- Hundreds of identified individual actors across judicial, administrative, banking, and intelligence structures;
- The capacity to intercept mail, block communications, neutralize mobile telecommunications on U.S. soil, and coordinate the blocking of legal proceedings across four international jurisdictions simultaneously.

This asymmetry is itself evidence. No individual dispute between a private person and an institution produces this level of coordinated, multi-state, multi-institutional response. The scale of the apparatus deployed against one person is proportional to the threat that person was perceived to represent — which is itself evidence of the scale of what was at stake.

B. The Projection — What This Apparatus Will Continue To Do

The communicant is one person. He survived because he is, by documented history, exceptionally resistant — professionally, physically, and mentally. A person without his specific background, resources of mind, and decade of preparation would not have survived this campaign. Most would not have documented it.

The question the Office of the Prosecutor is invited to consider is this: how many others, with less resistance, less documentation, less visibility, have been subjected to lesser versions of the same apparatus — and have simply disappeared from view? How many innovative economic projects, less thoroughly documented, have been suppressed by the same mechanisms and produced no formal record? How many persons have been institutionalized, bankrupted, or eliminated without the capacity to reach an international court?

The communicant does not claim to know the answer. He submits that the apparatus documented in the Global Filing — institutional, banking, judicial, and intelligence — is not assembled for a single case. It exists, it operates, and if the law does not intervene, it will continue to operate. The cost of inaction is not the continuation of one person's suffering. It is the perpetuation of a system whose cumulative human cost, projected forward, is incalculable.

THE COMMUNICANT RISKS HIS LIFE EVERY DAY TO BRING THIS INFORMATION FORWARD. THIS IS NOT RHETORIC. IT IS DOCUMENTED FACT: FOUR POISONING ATTEMPTS IN EIGHTEEN MONTHS, TWO VEHICLE SABOTAGES, FORCED INSTITUTIONALIZATION, UNLAWFUL DETENTION, ONGOING MEDICAL DEPRIVATION. IF AN INDIVIDUAL OF EXCEPTIONAL RESILIENCE FACES THIS LEVEL OF ATTACK MERELY FOR DOCUMENTING AND PURSUING THE TRUTH, THE IMPLICATION FOR THOSE WHO CANNOT DOCUMENT OR PURSUE IS CLEAR. THE LAW DOES NOT NEED TO BE CHANGED TO ADDRESS THIS. IT NEEDS TO BE APPLIED.

C. The Law Does Not Need to Change. It Needs to Be Applied.

The communicant wishes to be precise on this point, because it bears directly on the purpose of this submission.

He is not asking the Court to create new law. He is asking the Court to apply existing law to a situation that existing law was designed to address — the use of institutional power to persecute, harm, and silence individuals who challenge that power. The Rome Statute exists precisely because the international community recognized, after the catastrophes of the twentieth century, that some harms are too grave to be left to national legal systems that are themselves implicated in those harms.

France's national legal system is itself implicated in the documented harm. The Parquet National Financier has not responded to five formal complaints. The tribunal de commerce rendered decisions that violated the rules of French law. Multiple lawyers provided coordinated disinformation to prevent access to courts. This is not a failure of the system — it is the system operating as intended, against the communicant.

This is precisely the situation for which the International Criminal Court exists. The communicant does not ask for a revolution in the law. He asks for the law to be applied, now, to documented facts, by an institution that has both the mandate and the independence to do so.

V. THE QUESTION FOR THE OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR

The communicant closes this Annex with a single, respectfully posed question:

When a coordinated institutional campaign deliberately destroys economic innovations designed to redistribute tens of billions of euros to humanitarian causes, physically persecutes the individual responsible for those innovations across ten years and twenty countries, and systematically denies him access to justice in every forum he approaches — does international criminal law have nothing to say? If the answer under current law is no, should it be?

The communicant does not presume to answer this question on behalf of the international community. He submits that it is a question worth asking, at a time when the capacity of powerful institutional actors to cause harm at scale — through economic destruction rather than physical violence — is growing faster than the law's ability to address it.

He respectfully invites the Office of the Prosecutor to consider whether the present case, by reason of its gravity, its documentation, and its novelty, provides an appropriate occasion to begin that reflection.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Deglaire

Communicant — Self-represented

April 2026 — Dubai, United Arab Emirates

DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST:

Global Filing (320 pages, November 2025) — Deglaire v. French State et al
HMCTS written confirmation — Charlotte Brice — 27 March 2026
SDNY case documentation — Case 1:25-cv-10163-LTS
Second Supplemental Factual Submission (Georgia / Turkey incidents) — April 2026
Formal Demand for Damages (US and UK) — 24 April 2026
YHRK Association NNLE — Articles of Association (redistribution commitment)
AI consultation logs documenting Georgia illness episode
Turkish customs correspondence — medication interception evidence