

# CLASS ACTION INTERROGATORY DOCUMENT (Mock)

**Prepared by:** Susan Ndinga Wright

**Jurisdiction:** Universal Tribunal

**Date:** 12/01/2026

**Subject:** Systemic Accountability, Consent, and Legitimacy of Authority

---

## I. Preamble

The plaintiff(s) submit this document to expose systemic violations, structural harm, and the absence of legitimate authority where institutions, courts, and officials fail to observe principles of consent, equality, accountability, and natural justice.

**Key Principle:** *"Unconsciousness does not excuse harm."*

Silence implies knowledge, dismissal implies intent, ridicule implies defense, and containment implies admission.

The interrogatories herein are directed toward all authorities, officials, institutions, and courts whose actions, omissions, or systemic roles impact the collective rights, safety, and consciousness of the people.

---

## II. Interrogatories

### 1. Duty of Care and Bystanding

Under what legal, moral, or metaphysical principle is it permissible for any authority, institution, or individual to observe harm without intervention, and what mechanisms exist to justify such inaction?

### 2. Defense vs Harm

Can the principle that "everyone deserves a defense" override the systemic harm caused by defending one individual at the expense of many? Who grants legitimacy to this hierarchy of protection?

### **3. Judicial Responsibility**

When societal order deteriorates under a judge's or institution's nominal supervision, does adherence to procedure absolve them of accountability for the consequences of inaction or neglect?

### **4. Immunity and Sovereignty**

If no individual or organization is inherently above the law, what legal basis supports sovereign, diplomatic, or institutional immunity, and how does it reconcile with equality before the law?

### **5. Equality Before the Law**

How can "equality before the law" be claimed when circumstances, coercion, and refusal to recognize dissenting authority materially alter legal outcomes? Are penalties applied consistently for contesting projected authority?

### **6. Legal Certainty**

If legal certainty were foundational, why does law employ inaccessible jargon, specialist interpretation, and obfuscation that prevents comprehension by its subjects? Does opacity equate to control rather than clarity, predictability, or public accountability?

### **7. Accountability**

Why has the law repeatedly failed to hold itself accountable in light of advances across scientific, philosophical, and metaphysical knowledge, and how can recitation of centuries-old statutes satisfy claims of justice in 2026?

### **8. Judicial Independence**

If judicial independence is required to avoid coercion, does this implicitly acknowledge that courts themselves are untrustworthy? How does separation from executive and legislative branches ensure integrity when systemic coercion persists?

### **9. Bias and Narrative Influence**

How can judges claim impartiality when outcomes demonstrably track narrative skill, emotional leverage, and resource access rather than truth or law? Does narrative supremacy constitute a breach of procedural fairness?

### **10. Integrity and Complicity**

Can judges claim integrity while knowingly participating in a system that perpetuates structural injustice, systemic harm, and recurring patterns of self-preservation?

## **11. Conflict Resolution**

Do courts resolve causes or merely symptoms of societal conflict? If structural harm persists under their supervision, is their continued authority a conflict of interest?

## **12. Source of Judicial Authority**

What is the basis for recognizing courts as ultimate arbiters when consciousness, morality, and universal principles extend beyond human institutional design? Who grants consent to their authority?

## **13. Social Stability and Order**

Is the justification of “maintaining social stability” valid when courts and authorities lack capacity to elevate collective consciousness or implement systemic remedies? Can order be imposed without addressing root causes?

## **14. Trust in Justice and Fairness**

How can judgments claiming to ensure “justice is seen to be done” be trusted if those rendering them do not internalize or comprehend the broader state of human consciousness?

## **15. Conflict of Interest (Judging Own Cause)**

If no one should be a judge in their own cause, why are judges permitted to adjudicate matters of systemic consequence without contributing to resolution or remediation of the harm they oversee?

## **16. Reasoned Decisions**

If judges are required to provide logical, transparent reasons, how can distorted perception, misaligned frameworks, or institutional bias render reasoning valid? Who verifies the coherence of “logical truth” applied?

## **17. Audi Alteram Partem (Fair Hearing)**

What is the justification for procedural complexity, obstruction, or finickity in ensuring that all parties' rights to be heard are genuinely equal and effective?

## **18. Natural Justice**

If law is not inherently natural, what law governs the law itself? Who adjudicates when the legal framework fails to recognize its own unlawfulness or structural contradictions?

## 19. Overarching Principle

How can any system claim legitimacy if it cannot withstand evaluation by the principles it imposes on others — including consent, equality, accountability, and transparency?

---

## III. Evidence and Submission

1. All prior case law, statutes, and administrative precedents are treated as **behavioral evidence** rather than binding authority.
  2. Class action includes **all persons impacted by systemic coercion**, creating automatic standing without opt-in.
  3. Silence, inaction, or refusal to respond constitutes **admissible evidence** of coercion, complicity, or negligence.
- 

## IV. Conclusion

This interrogatory document seeks to establish that:

- The system cannot claim legitimacy where its own standards are not applied upward.
- Authority that overrides consent, obscures law, or evades accountability is **systemically invalid**.
- Remedies must address the **structural and metaphysical origin of harm**, not merely procedural or symptomatic outcomes.