

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>

18 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

Introduction to the IAJ and narrative request for engagement under Article 20

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 (attached). The IAJ petitions this Committee, under Article 20 of the Convention Against Torture¹, to confidentially investigate credible and consistent evidence of widespread, systematic, and officially endorsed practices of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and punishment (“ill-treatment”), and torture within the United States of America², with particular focus on its state and federal judiciaries. The preliminary Shadow Report outlines patterns of prohibited conduct, methodological rigor, and the urgent need for international oversight.

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 functions as a de facto NHRI in the absence of a U.S.-recognized body, and offers a secure, trauma-informed intake and investigation system. The IAJ follows investigation methodology per the standard of the Istanbul Protocol (2022), and aims to embody and enhance best practices and the highest standards of independent investigation that may be applied to human rights.

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 human rights violations and previously unconsidered recurring factors such as:

¹ Article 20 applies to the U.S. because it did not opt out under Article 28(1). The request is grounded in Article 20(1) (well-founded indications of systematic practice), General Comment No. 2 (obligations extend to judicial measures, prompt and impartial examination, and exclusion of torture-tainted evidence), and General Comment No. 3 (redress and rehabilitation duties).

² The United States ratified the Convention against Torture and did not lodge an Article 28(1) declaration excluding Article 20; accordingly, the Committee’s Article 20 competence applies. Article 20(1) authorizes a confidential inquiry upon “well-founded indications” of systematic torture; the Committee’s official procedure contemplates receipt of credible information, State observations, and possible country measures.

- Policy-based exclusion of human-rights principles and human-rights-treaty compliance within the judicial process, law enforcement and child-welfare-related processes;
- Policy-based coercive parent–child separations without Due-Process, psycho-social safeguards, or human rights constraints; failure to protect and assist the family, including protection of children and parents from economic and social exploitation;
- Policy-based denial of urgent medical accommodations during proceedings, including deprivation of life-saving medical treatment, deprivation necessary healthcare, deprivation of opportunity for recovery and rehabilitation, through control of bodily autonomy by public officials and by virtue of jurisdictional or physical custody; unlicensed practice of medicine by public officials; human or medical experimentation; deprivation of the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health;
- Policy-based cruel, unusual, inhuman and degrading punishment and retaliation for non-conformity with the expectations of public officials and authority figures, which are unsupported by the Constitution and human rights treaties; including proliferation of prohibited acts by or against third parties; excessive penalties and punishment;
- Policy-based reckless disregard under color of authority;
- Policy-based knowing and willful infliction of extreme emotional distress, including punishment that is calculated or likely to induce severe pain and suffering;
- Policy-based coercion and intimidation to produce information at the expense of injury, and to accede to deprivation of non-derogable rights;
- Policy-based structural accessibility failures modifying protected rights and impeding effective participation by persons with disabilities and pro se litigants; systemic deprivation of discrimination safeguards and right to redress; systemic absence of equality and access to justice;
- Policy-based deprecation, redefinition and withholding of constitutional Due-Process;
- Retaliatory measures for protected petitioning (e.g., recusal/ethics motions);
- Policy-based refolement to repeat offenders without possibility of protection, relief or remedy; practical absence of effective mechanisms to disqualify perpetrators, or prevent or punish prohibited acts by identified individuals;
- Policy-based deliberate judicial, case-management and investigation practices that frustrate review, including fact distortion;
- Misuse of judicial discretion and doctrines (e.g., immunities, non-reviewability) in ways plausibly facilitating ill-treatment and torture;
- Weaponization of court rules, deadlines, records access, procedures and hearings, calculated to cause injury and to require laborious and lengthy action by the victim to obtain redress while holding the victim under the psychological pain of finality; systemic absence of redress; unconstitutional and inhuman restraints on speech and expression;
- Concealment of torture and ill-treatment as lawful sanctions;
- Legal fictions (such as “discretion” or “non-reviewability”) used to mask torture;
- Delegation and evasion of official duties, calculated to require laborious and lengthy action by the victim to obtain redress while holding the victim under the psychological pain of finality;
- Policy-based absence of protection from torture and ill-treatment, and unavailability of relief, remedy and punishment of perpetrators;
- Systemic immunization of perpetrators by public officials and courts; including immunization for attempts and complicity; concerted, harmonious and aggravating conduct evidencing collusion in prohibited acts;
- Absence of education and training on human rights treaties and treaty-prohibited conduct;
- Policy-based suppression, and failure-to-implement treaty-compliant independent and impartial investigation of prohibited acts; failure to investigate;

- Policy-based absence of prevention mechanisms, including protection of the integrity of the person; facilitating prohibited acts;
- Systemic policies fostering and rewarding exploitation, violence, abuse, deprivation of liberty and security of the person;
- Policy-based failure to prosecute torture and ill-treatment as a hate crime, or as any recognized criminal offense.

The issues raised by these factors affect other domains of international compliance with detrimental social impact. When evaluated, these other domains of compliance evidence the importance of eradicating the non-equivalence of UNCAT domestic mechanisms and treaty-direct enforcement. The prohibited consequences of not correcting the U.S.-UNCAT non-compliance extend to:

- The United States' enforcement of a RUD-modified UNCAT framework—implemented across 50 states—fails to meet its treaty obligations and systematically denies victims of torture meaningful access to remedies. This structural exclusion violates the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the 14th Amendment and undermines the privileges of national citizenship, including access to justice and protection under international law.
- The United States' failure to recognize and enforce protections against torture—despite its obligations under UNCAT—constitutes a deprivation of fundamental liberty interests that, while unenumerated, are retained by the people and protected under substantive due process. The Ninth Amendment affirms the existence of such rights, and UNCAT provides a normative framework for their identification. The absence of effective domestic remedies renders this deprivation constitutionally and internationally unlawful
- Continuous violation of the U.N Charter Articles 55 and 56:
 - Reduction in the standard of living and conditions of social progress by introduction of (generational) societal trauma and distrust of courts and the system of Justice³;
 - Absence of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all;
 - Evasion by the United States of the obligation under pledge to take action with the United Nations for the achievement of higher standards of living and social progress, and the universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

Article 103 of the U.N. Charter provides an opportunity to examine the U.S.-UNCAT compliance in the light of its commitments under the U.N. Charter. Therefore the 2014 Concluding Observations of the CAT may be enhanced in their accuracy by considering previously unconsidered factors, and prohibited consequences. The IAJ requests that the CAT consider these factors and their prohibited consequences. It is very important to remember that the systemic violations documented herein do not reflect the values of the American people, but rather the institutional failures of their government.

The IAJ is informed that threshold and dispositive evidence is available, and considerably more is highly likely to become quickly available indicating widespread occurrence of these prohibited factors. Each factor is capable of an Article 1 violation by its potential to produce severe pain and suffering for prohibited purposes when inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. Each factor could be demonstrated not to constitute a lawful sanction. Each factor is capable of an Article 16 violation by virtue of its inherent cruelty when committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity, inhumanity and degradation, particularly in conjunction with the total measurement of its consequences.

³ By an August 2023 letter, the President of the American Bar Association, the largest voluntary national association of lawyers, judges and law students in the United States (and the world), reported to the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court their lowest judicial legitimacy in history. Founded in 1878, the ABA has approximately 375,000 members and is headquartered in Chicago, Illinois. The ABA President's letter strongly criticized the absence of a code of ethics for the Justices. In response, in November 2023, the Court enacted its first code of ethics in history. The PAG subsequently demonstrated that the pundits are correct, and the code of ethics has no force or benefit, and is ineffective.

The United States has resisted the creation of an NHRI. 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 on behalf of the People. On August 4, 2025, the IAJ began methodologically documented electronic intake and screening of cases that preliminarily indicate recurrent patterns consistent with Article 20 concerns.

Since August 4, 2025, IAJ has operated a secure, trauma-informed intake system with written informed consent and robust confidentiality safeguards. We apply a two-stage screening process: (i) a credibility and arguability threshold based on psychological and medical indicators consistent with the Istanbul Protocol (2022), and (ii) case-building for independent verification through corroborating documentation, clinical review, and legal relevance under UNCAT standards. All findings are prepared for external audit and treaty-based submission.

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 the end of September 17, 2025, the IAJ was ‘inundated’ with 114 registrants⁴ entering their individual complaints, and 25 individuals reported by third parties as being victims of human rights violations. Each complainant and each person reporting a violation of a third party consented to their submissions being shared with the Private Attorney General (PAG) and United Nations Human Rights bodies. We acknowledge the letter by the PAG to the 83rd session of the CAT with case information to initiate an Article 20 investigation by the CAT.

Without prejudicing the impartial and independent investigation of complaints being filed with the IAJ, the first impression about the nature and gravity of complaints communicated to the IAJ indicate an apparent uniformity of judicial treatment within the cases of complainants that raises a requirement of a human rights inquiry into systemic judicial prohibited practices that violate human rights.

This area of human rights inquiry has been neglected in the past. The form of torture and ill-treatment do not fit the stereotypical and unconscionable acts which the public reflexively associate with torture, and which receive the greatest focus and action involving international interest. The matters reported by the IAJ to the 83rd session are distinctly stealthy but meet the definition of torture and ill-treatment under Articles 1 and 16 of the UNCAT.

It is inherently understood that the judiciary control what constitutes “lawful sanctions” and that government respects and delegates that privilege to the judicial branch, except in circumstances where it is established that excess or failures require the setting of a bright line in guidance by law. The design of American government is to ensure the independence of the three branches of government. Thus the legislature does not speak on the internal operation of the judicial branch, and the 1934 Rules Enabling Act conferred the limited influence that Congress could have on the procedural rules of the legislated federal courts to the U.S. Supreme Court. Thus, the judicial branch ‘runs its own house’. Even when the judicial branch deviates radically from the intent of our laws, or the national morality, Congress cannot influence it. An example is the Amendment to the Americans with Disabilities Act which ‘scolded’ the U.S. Supreme Court for continuing its order to all courts in the United States to discriminate based on disability, despite the clear requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act that ignited the world to follow, and to pass their own national laws to follow the leadership in human rights by the United States. In 2017, a distinguished federal judge resigned in protest and admitted that judges treat litigants cruelly, inhumanely and by degradation⁵. An appearance of the extreme

⁴ Since August 4, 2025, and as of the close of September 19, 2025, 17 individuals had been subjected to an initial assessment to confirm that substantive grounds exist for independent investigation of prohibited acts, and all 17 successfully passed the initial assessment, graduating them to the list of cases to be fully investigated. The volume of complainants 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 more than 3 complaints and violation reports per day. 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.

⁵ Debra Cassens Weiss, Posner: Most judges regard pro se litigants as ‘kind of trash not worth the time’, ABA Journal September 11, 2017

reluctance of the American judiciary to embrace human rights is an observation that requires added diligence by the IAJ for truth-finding. The negative implication is that investigations may be lengthy.

When an issue of prohibited acts within the judicial process is identified, the difficulty of the investigation is greater than in other areas of investigation. While an Article 16 investigation may be less burdensome, a torture investigation is extremely difficult even if the ordinary reasonable person would insist that judicial torture has occurred, and even if any assessment of the facts offered and the public record would “shock the conscience”. Because the defense of torture is “lawful sanctions” and the judiciary control what may be considered a lawful sanction, the legal burden on the IAJ of investigating judicial torture is to examine and exhaust each theory, each pathway of legal argument, each derivation or fair construction under which the prohibited act in public view could legitimately be justified as a “lawful sanction”, including exploring the design limitations of court rules and procedure and how they may systemically lead to judicial conduct that is prohibited by force of its dominance and the trust of the judiciary in its correctness. This requires careful and precise legal scrutiny, and integration with de novo review of facts and evidence, with its own challenges. However, the investigation of torture is not optional, and the IAJ is established to ensure that even the most complex investigation shall be performed at the highest standard and thereby to provide a determination of the truth of each alleged prohibited act. Therefore the IAJ takes on this elevated burden of investigation without compromise.

The IAJ is not a mechanism that should be used as a ‘second chance’ at adjudicating a matter that is lawfully determined according to the supreme Law of the Land as defined in the U.S. Constitution, and under the respect that the U.S. Constitution holds for the law of nations. The legal due diligence required by the IAJ therefore creates a selection bias in this respect for the purpose of filtering cases for investigation, while providing opportunity for appeal.

As part of complainants’ offer of proof and identification of public records and evidence, the IAJ is provided with references to multiple organizations and websites throughout the county. Exploration of these information sources has provided compelling information to the IAJ that a nationwide and systemic human rights issue has persisted for at least more than a decade, and not yet considered by the CAT, and must be investigated under the UNCAT. This confronts the IAJ with entry into a massive body of historically recorded allegations of prohibited acts within the judicial process. For practical reasons, the IAJ begins its life with a requirement of registration and formal complaint-based request for investigation, and treats the large amount of information for both their corroborative or contradictory effect.

The IAJ informs the CAT that, based on information being supplied to IAJ by plausibly large numbers of independent complainants, human rights are deficient or absent in the judicial process, causing severe pain and suffering by design and lack of judicial restraints and relief. Large numbers indicate that opposition to their ill-treatment by authorities causes further severe pain and suffering, including incarceration and torture. In each case, the lawfulness of “the sanction” is disputed. Many identify themselves as parents forcibly separated from their children and report the detrimental consequences to themselves, their children and to society.

Referring to complainants, there appears to be a large volume of complaints related to the judicial process of the Family Courts throughout many states. A common feature of submissions is the expression of frustration of no relief, remedy or punishment through the state and the federal courts for the alleged ill-treatment and torture. The complaints often indicate a law enforcement or institutional involvement and identify alleged perpetrators acting under color of authority who are outside the courts but whose ill-treatment and torture is facilitated by the judicial process.

Of concern is the recurring pattern of relocation by litigants under duress, including to another county, to escape alleged ill-treatment and torture.

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. The IAJ examines these sources of information and events for witness identification and corroboration, and also to confirm the representations made by

complainants about the nature and source of harm, the human rights infringed, the numbers of affected persons, and the systemic character of the complaints.

Reports of 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 report no resulting relief or remedy. The IAJ notes no legislation commensurate with the reported harm. The IAJ notes the extreme reluctance of the judiciary to acknowledge and address the problems reported, and observes the incommensurate speed of development of the law through precedents and litigation, which is incompatible with human rights treaties and freedom from torture and ill-treatment.

The focus of the IAJ's first Shadow Report is the judicial violation of the UNCAT. The IAJ's first Shadow Report refers the CAT to the systemic prohibited acts which are discussed in the referenced PAG letter, corroborated by victims Eva Danilak, Julia Minkowski and others. These persons have provided the IAJ with access to their court-sealed chronologically filed medical records for confirmation of injuries. The PAG has filed complaints in 2024 with multiple Special Procedures, and submitted reports of systemic UNCAT violations to the CAT in 2025. A pattern of systemic ill-treatment and torture is revealed by these cases.

The IAJ requests the opportunity to supplement its Preliminary Shadow Report with a continuous 'live feed' of completed independent investigation reports of complainants.

The IAJ invites the CAT to access its website directly for updates of research and investigations, and for the purpose of performing its own independent assessments and verifications. The IAJ will, with the consent provided by complainants, provide secure and confidential access to the CAT and U.N. Special Procedures to access the information directly submitted by complainants and the work of the IAJ.

The IAJ asks the CAT to note that a mechanism is provided on the IAJ website for third parties (such as court observers, investigators, experts, attorneys and judges) to provide reports of human rights violations committed by public officials and authority figures against others. The IAJ will also provide the CAT with access to the third party reports, and indicate which have been investigated.

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, victims must resort to recognized human rights bodies and the international community. The Separation of Power under the U.S. Constitution amplifies the need for extra-national legal competence under Article 20 and subsidiarity when domestic remedies are ineffective.

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 documented by court records.

Based on credible information and analysis, the non-self-execution of the UNCAT and the absence of implementing statutes ensures that individual rights conferred by *jus cogens* and the ratified treaty are, in practice, undermined by domestic gaps in implementation. The judicial process is significantly deficient with respect to CAT GC No. 2/3 duties for judicial remedies, investigation, exclusion (Art. 15), redress (Art. 14). There is no provision, or indication of any Article 12 or 13 compliance. Therefore the People of the United States must rely on the CAT and the State parties to the treaty to speak in order 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 one Bankruptcy Court whose Chief judge insisted that he may torture the PAG with no private right to recourse because of the non-self-execution of the treaty. When all of the elements of torture were present and presented to this

chief federal judge, his position characteristically representative of every member of the state and federal judiciaries, namely that that no such elements and no such prohibition are recognized under the laws that the federal courts follow. This is verified through the national federal database “PACER”. The importance of the PAG’s work is that he has been able to measure and document the ‘intent’ element of Article 1.

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 UNCAT violations by the U.S. judiciary.

Of interest, and of great consequence, is the fact that ultimately, reports of ill-treatment and torture must be addressed by a court. Since one of the pillars of safety of the victim is the security of information related to investigation and reporting so that corrective action may be undertaken while minimizing retaliation and progression of prohibited acts, we find a significant deadlock in the process of abating torture and ill-treatment. Since the prohibited acts must be reported to the perpetrators of the prohibited acts for abatement, and then for remedy, relief and punishment, then by virtue of design, the process of implementing UNCAT cannot be implemented through U.S. jurisprudence and through reliance on the existing judiciary and its norms.

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 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 and state judges;
- **Institutional refusals to prevent or remedy harm** to litigants under court jurisdictional 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 ill-treatment or torture committed by judges:**

- Judicial ethics complaints are **decided by peers and colleagues of the accused**, who routinely dismiss them.
- Complainants report 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 facilitated or 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 and ill-treatment. 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 and physical and mental injuries. This type and extent of measurement of torture is unprecedented, and particularly informative 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.

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 effective, direct and confidential contact with complainants. The communication

system also permits group communications with the CAT. 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, as well as a remote 'conference' mechanism that can permit individual or group investigations and verification by the CAT.

The IAJ remains sensitive to the privacy of complainants and third party reporters of human rights violations. The IAJ performs investigations and records results, provides academic and educational content, and model rulings. The IAJ does not issue reports to law enforcement authorities or to public officials, and is attentive to the trauma and repercussions that may affect the complainant by virtue of an IAJ investigation. The IAJ does not restrict the freedom of complainants to use information available from the IAJ website.

Since the IAJ is designed to provide information in support of UNCAT violations, particularly Article 20 violations, to the CAT and to U.N. Special Procedures on a continuous and dynamic basis, we request that the designated U.N. personnel access and review the most current list of complainants and results of IAJ investigations when investigating Article 20 violations, and the U.S. compliance with the UNCAT, with close attention to document control information stamped on each document to ensure reliance on the most current and correct version of each document.

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 ill-treatment and torture are systematically perpetrated by judges because of the design of laws and procedures, in both state and federal courts. The IAJ examines judicial systems under stress and at boundaries of their operations, by analytical approaches, by use of surveying historical cases, and by using edge cases such as litigation by disadvantaged persons, including indigent, disabled and pro se litigants.

Based on reasoning and academic and historical review, prohibited judicial 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. This approach is beneficial to all nations.

In light of well-founded indications of recurrent patterns consistent with systematic practice, we urge the Committee Against Torture to:

1. **Initiate an active confidential inquiry under Article 20** into systemic judicial torture and ill-treatment 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, information, and findings from IAJ, to conduct an on-going Article 20 investigation;
3. Invite U.S. Government observations, and authorize appropriate in-camera engagement with IAJ's protected materials and witnesses (with safety protocols);
4. Authorize protective measures for complainants and witnesses and request the U.S. to ensure non-retaliation guarantees
5. Encourage the U.S. judiciary and court administrators to adopt Istanbul Protocol-consistent training, intake screening, and Article 15 evidentiary safeguards as interim measures pending the outcome of the inquiry;
6. Invite periodic updates from IAJ (quarterly) with aggregated, de-identified metrics and forensic summaries, preserving confidentiality.

We acknowledge the opening dialogue initiated by the PAG with the State Department (copy attached).

We respectfully request that the Committee recognize IAJ in the following capacities:

1. As a **formal shadow report contributor** for U.S. periodic reviews;
2. As a **de facto NHRI-aligned entity** operating under the Paris Principles;
3. As a **source of verified information** for potential Article 20 inquiry;
4. As a **follow-up monitor** of U.S. compliance with the Committee's 2014 Concluding Observations;
5. As a **liaison to Special Rapporteurs** for coordinated treaty enforcement and systemic reform;
6. As a **credible civil society body** for future submissions and collaboration.

We believe this recognition will strengthen the Committee's ability to assess and respond to credible evidence of structural misconduct and treaty non-compliance within the United States. We welcome any guidance on formal procedures or documentation required to support this request.

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 contributor to 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 INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO THE COMMITTEE AGAINST TORTURE

DATE: September 19, 2025

IAJ Document Version Control Log

Document ID: IAJ-CAT-20250919-001-PUB
Initial Release Date: 2025-09-19

Version History

Version	Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
v1.0	2025-09-19	IAJ	Initial release

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