

«

-

»

1)

(hash)

A©tor

-

(SHA-256),

:

.

.

2)

1: «

»

:

«

»?

:

«

»

.

,

jus cogens (

,

. .)

. «

»

—

,

.

:

jus cogens;

«

»

.

,

(erga

omnes),

«

».

3)

2:

—

«

»

,

.

,

« » —

jus cogens erga omnes.

4) 3: « »

« » —

5) A©tor  
A©tor  
( . 53, 60, 64, 85  
.),

« » — :

jus cogens

6) « » ( .  
64)

(

)

A©tor —  
jus cogens

/

».

( / )

.

.

: 09.10.2025

## APPENDIX III to the A©tor Memorandum

### “ Assessment of Misleading Patterns and Verification via Hash Identifier ”

#### 1) Digital fix (hash) and legal identity

The A©tor Memorandum is accompanied by a file hash identifier (SHA-256) acting as a public trust key: any format reflow does not alter the legal identity of the content. The hash carries the fact of the legal event and the invariance of the text.

#### 2) False pattern #1: “ Maceret invoked ignorance of the law ”

Question: which ‘ law ’ exactly? The debate is misframed: a reference to general time-limits for appeals is presented as ‘ ignorance of the law ’ in general. Substantively, the point is the material inapplicability of ordinary time-limits in matters engaging jus cogens (torture, ill treatment, etc.) and systemic barriers to justice. The ‘ ignorance ’ label is a manipulative formula masking the conflict between procedure and imperative norm.

Key: procedural time-limits cannot neutralize jus cogens; immunity and formal barriers do not create forgetting for crimes against humanity. Priority attaches to restoring balance and access to truth (erga omnes), not to branding the applicant as ‘ incompetent ’ .

#### 3) False pattern #2: subject-matter swap — “ procedural discipline ” instead of substantive law

The accusation boils down to failure to file an appeal on time. In fact, the applicant points to lack of notification, health, and systemic blockage of access. Equating the lapse with ‘ incompetence ’ is a category error. A procedural defect does not defeat substantive claims where jus cogens and erga omnes are engaged.

#### 4) False pattern #3: ‘ immunity ’ as a universal shield

The idea that immunity or office status automatically blocks material consequences of torture/ill treatment is logically and legally untenable. Immunity is not competence; immunity does not displace an imperative norm. Sealing the dispute in immunity is a way to hold the collision to preserve illicit benefit.

#### 5) Finding on A©tor ’ s competence

A©tor ’ s work relies on imperative norms (Arts. 53, 60, 64, 85 of the Vienna Convention, etc.), systemic argumentation, and consistent legal logic—hallmarks of competence. Hence the ‘ incompetence ’ thesis is false: it serves to delegitimize the rights holder and to block the channel through which jus cogens acts in time.

#### 6) Link to the ‘ raider seizure ’ case (Apt. No. 64)

The described actions (power of attorney manoeuvres, passport series edits, deregistration, procedural blocks) match a seizure by collision model. A©tor ’ s legal response restores the link between jus cogens substance and the fact of residence/title—not a quarrel over labels. This is a self correction algorithm, not a ‘ personal dispute ’ .

Date: 2025 10 09