

M.P. Dillon
Office of the Prosecutor
International Criminal Court
The Hague, Netherlands.

11 April, 2016

Dear Sir, Madam

Thank you for your letter of 29 March 2016 in response to my document submission to your office. I highly value the moral purpose of the ICC in its potential contribution to justice and peace.

Your statement in your second paragraph, of the three jurisdiction limits, still leaves President Vladimir Putin fully open to direct Court action, for in your point **one** - the United Kingdom **is** both a signatory to the Rome Statute and the territory **on** which the two assassinations which I had raised with you (*A Litvinenko* and *B Berezovsky*) were directly carried out by FSB agents of the Russian State (*AK Lugovoi* and *DV Kovtun*) under the control of Russian President Vladimir Putin. Concerning the *litvinenko* killing, the British Judicial Enquiry (under Sir Robert Owen), after hearing evidence in both open and closed court, actually described this as a **“state-sponsored” assassination**, as was contained in the documentation which I supplied directly to your office on Monday 22 February 2016 (which had been presented to UK Parliament and released 21 January 2016; and is also available at litvinenkoinquiry.org). This Judicial Enquiry report pointing to Putin’s complicity was in addition to the direct accusation against President Putin made before witnesses by his first murder victim listed, as that victim lay dying. Further, during the UK judicial investigation President Putin blocked their requested extradition of *Andrei Lugovoi* and instead awarded him a medal for his service (concerning whom the evidence of complicity was described as incontrovertible).

Your recommendation of working through national or international jurisdictions is not applicable in either of these as (1) at a national level President Vladimir Putin has effect control, and (2) at the international level Russia holds a veto on the United Nations Security Council. And it should be noted that in the 1998 Rome Statute of the Court that, if the relationship between Articles 27 and 98(1) be read correctly, there is no immunity applicable. For those interested, there is evidence of more than ten other **assassinations** of Putin’s critics in various territories which deserve action, but none has been taken, for this illusion of his impunity continues.

A **third** victim that should be taken into consideration in this regard is Russian whistle-blower *Alexander Perepilichny*, whose unique 2012 poisoning death **in the UK** has direct parallels with the *Litvinenko* assassination (as also with the background circumstances of the *Sergei Magnitsky* murder in Moscow, concerning which, in April 2014, the European Parliament passed a **unanimous** resolution to deny visas and freeze the EU assets of the Putin’s 32 government officials involved).

I’m sure it is not the intention of the International Criminal Court to create safe-havens in non-state-signatories for those who arrange assassinations in the state-signatories to the Rome Statute of the Court, even if the relevant action of the Court is unrecognised by the harbouring state (such as Sudan concerning *al-Bashir*).

Taking the above **three United Kingdom killings** into careful consideration, I trust you shall find a way to give effect to what needs to be done.

Sincerely in expectation,

Rev. Lloyd Emslie Thomas
emslie-thomas@hotmail.co.uk
UK passport holder: 531185300