

SUBJECT-SPECIFIC EVIDENTIARY REPORT

MR. LEE OF BLUE PANGO MOTEL

Alleged vehicle-case framing, retaliatory pursuit, psychological antagonism, and possible coordinated activity

Source: combinedLee.txt

Prepared: June 28, 2026

Scope: Mr. Lee only; unrelated allegations are excluded except where needed to explain his alleged conduct

Status: Investigative submission; allegations are not findings of fact or guilt

Conditional evidentiary posture. If the events occurred as described, the following report identifies conduct attributed to Mr. Lee that warrants independent verification. The claimant's observations are presented as allegations. Direct recollections, later interpretations, relay-based inferences, legal conclusions, and matters requiring third-party proof are kept separate. No paragraph should be read as a judicial finding or a substitute for admissible evidence.

Executive Summary

The source material repeatedly identifies one principal allegation against Mr. Lee: that he presented, or continued to present, the claimant as involved in a vehicle theft or vehicle dispute even though the claimant says his role was limited to translating another person's account and documents. The claimant says he did not own, take, direct, conceal, sell, or benefit from the vehicles; did not know the underlying affairs beyond what he was asked to translate; and received, at most, a meal rather than proceeds. He further says the person treated as the opposing party or victim later forgave the translation assistance and invited him to take the person's daughter on a date. The claimant alleges that Mr. Lee knew or concealed this exculpatory context and persisted anyway. [Source Blocks B05, B28, B29, B35, B50, B52.]

A second cluster concerns Mr. Lee's response to the claimant's admitted mistreatment of puppies while in Vanuatu. The claimant accepts responsibility, says he apologized, offered monetary compensation, and was severely psychologically unwell following his mother's death. He alleges that Mr. Lee knew this context but continued to antagonize him or pursue harm beyond a legitimate complaint or remedy. That allegation must be divided carefully: truthful reporting, seeking lawful accountability, or requesting compensation would not become wrongful merely because an apology was offered. Legal relevance arises only if Mr. Lee knowingly added false allegations, concealed material exculpatory information, used the incident to support unrelated accusations, or joined extra-judicial efforts to cause disproportionate harm. [B05, B07, B21, B28, B29, B35, B50.]

A third, narrower allegation is a recalled religiously framed statement: Mr. Lee allegedly told the claimant to pray for his mother to be revived while the claimant was acutely grieving and psychologically destabilized. The source characterizes this as deliberate emotional cruelty. Standing alone, the remark is not shown to be a federal offense. Its potential relevance is contextual: knowledge of vulnerability,

hostility, and possible motive if connected by reliable evidence to later false reporting or harassment. [B05, B28.]

The source also asserts that Mr. Lee joined an unspecified later "channel" conspiracy and records that the claimant's sister communicated with him from Pango while allegedly attempting to monitor the claimant. Those propositions are currently inference-heavy. The file supplies no message content, date range, account identifier, overt act, or authenticated platform record proving Mr. Lee's agreement or participation. They should be investigated through records rather than repeated as established fact. [B29, B30.]

Because the material locates the vehicle dispute, the motel relationship, and most direct interactions in Vanuatu, Vanuatu law supplies the most natural legal screening framework. U.S. statutes are included only as conditional comparators and require a defined U.S. governmental matter, official proceeding, federally protected right, state action, or other statutory nexus. The present source does not itself establish those predicates.

1. Scope, Method, and Attribution Rules

This report reviewed all 52 complete observation blocks in combinedLee.txt, not isolated keyword hits. The blocks were screened for actual conduct attributed to Mr. Lee of Blue Pango Motel. References to Stan Lee and Bruce Lee were excluded as unrelated relay or popular-culture references. Incidents attributed to the claimant's sister, Choi, Steve, Elon Musk, courts, governments, or other persons were also excluded except where the source expressly connects them to an act allegedly taken by Mr. Lee.

Repeated statements were consolidated into issue-based sections. Repetition is recorded as consistency within the claimant's account, not as independent corroboration. The report uses four attribution levels:

- Direct recollection: an interaction the claimant says he personally experienced, such as the religious remark or his translation work.
- Document-dependent allegation: a proposition that should be testable through court files, translated documents, payment records, or communications.
- Inference: a conclusion about motive, concealment, conspiracy, or intent drawn by the claimant from surrounding events.
- Unspecified relay or channel attribution: a perceived communication or coordinated signal for which the source provides no authenticated message, speaker, platform record, or chain of custody.

The source contains forceful language and broad allegations against many people. This report does not reproduce that language except where needed to explain the claimant's position. It does not convert intensity into proof, and it does not use allegations against others to incriminate Mr. Lee by association.

2. Subject Identification and Relationship Context

The named subject is identified consistently as Mr. Lee associated with Blue Pango Motel in Pango, Vanuatu. The claimant places himself in Vanuatu from approximately 2010 to 2013 and describes Mr. Lee as a person with whom he had both adverse and helpful interactions. The source says Mr. Lee had an interest in obtaining a metal-casting furnace and visited or researched local ventures. It also says that, when the claimant was stranded, Mr. Lee took him to a religious gathering and helped introduce him to a local family that provided accommodation. [B37, B42, B43, B47.]

These neutral or helpful acts do not disprove later misconduct. They are included because a credible investigative statement should disclose material that cuts against a one-dimensional account. They also establish that Mr. Lee and the claimant knew one another and that Mr. Lee may have had personal knowledge of the claimant's circumstances in Vanuatu. The source does not provide Mr. Lee's full legal name, citizenship, business ownership records, or current contact details. Those identifiers must be confirmed before any formal service, accusation, or records request.

3. Principal Allegation: Knowingly Recasting a Translator as a Vehicle-Theft Participant

3.1 Claimant's repeated account

Across six separate observation blocks, the claimant says he was asked by another person to translate a Korean account and related documents concerning a dispute over vehicles. He describes the underlying parties as the sources of their own quarrel. According to him, he translated what he was given word for word, relied on the requesting person's description, had no independent knowledge of the vehicle dealings, and did not participate in taking or controlling any vehicle. He variously describes the compensation as no payment or a meal. [B05, B28, B29, B35, B50, B52.]

The claimant alleges that Mr. Lee nevertheless blamed him for the cars, characterized the matter as vehicle theft, or persisted in a presentation that treated translation assistance as complicity. One passage describes the asserted pursuit as continuing for approximately eight years, although the file does not supply the start date, end date, or a dated sequence of statements. The source repeatedly uses the word "framing" to describe this alleged conversion of a limited linguistic role into criminal participation. Repetition alone does not prove the accusation, but the account is specific enough to generate concrete verification tasks: identify the underlying case, obtain the original and translated documents, determine who authored each factual assertion, and locate every statement actually made by Mr. Lee.

3.2 Alleged concealment of exculpatory context

The claimant further alleges that Mr. Lee hid or disregarded facts inconsistent with guilt. The principal asserted facts are:

- The claimant performed translation at another person's request rather than originating the vehicle allegations.
- The underlying plaintiff and defendant supplied the factual content and were responsible for their own dispute.
- The claimant says he received no criminal proceeds and no meaningful fee, describing only a meal.
- The claimant says the person treated as the victim or opposing party later forgave his translation assistance and invited him to take that person's daughter on a date.
- The claimant denies any act of stealing, directing, possessing, transferring, or concealing the vehicles.

If Mr. Lee knew these facts, understood the difference between translation and participation, and nevertheless supplied a materially false account to police, a court, or another decision-maker, the conduct would be more probative than mere disagreement. If instead Mr. Lee accurately reported

observed facts, reasonably misunderstood the claimant's role, or never made the statements attributed to him, the central allegation would weaken substantially.

3.3 Why the alleged conduct matters if established

A false accusation can expose a person to investigation, arrest, immigration consequences, reputational injury, loss of property, and impaired access to lawful process. The seriousness depends on the communication actually made, its falsity, the speaker's knowledge, its materiality, the recipient, and the resulting action. The present source supports investigation of those elements but does not supply the alleged complaint, affidavit, testimony, or recording itself.

The strongest incriminating theory is therefore narrow: Mr. Lee allegedly knew that the claimant was acting as a translator, knew or had reason to know that the claimant did not participate in taking vehicles, and persisted in presenting him as a thief or accomplice while withholding facts that distinguished translation from participation. That theory is capable of proof or disproof and should not be diluted by broader claims for which the source presently lacks particulars.

4. Continued Pursuit After the Puppy Incident

4.1 Admitted underlying event and proposed remedy

The claimant does not deny wrongdoing toward puppies in Vanuatu. He describes the act as occurring during a severely disturbed period after his mother's death, accepts moral responsibility, says he apologized to Mr. Lee, and repeatedly offers monetary compensation. He also cites later conduct in which he tried to protect another puppy as inconsistent with generalized malice toward animals. [B05, B07, B21, B28, B29, B50.]

These admissions are not included to put the claimant on trial. They define the factual boundary of the allegation against Mr. Lee. Mr. Lee was entitled to report a genuine event, seek protection of animals, request compensation, and participate truthfully in lawful proceedings. An apology or mental-health explanation would not erase the event or compel forgiveness.

4.2 Alleged excess beyond lawful accountability

The claimant alleges that Mr. Lee went beyond a legitimate response by "constantly" antagonizing him, pursuing his destruction, or using the puppy incident to justify unrelated harm. The source further alleges that Mr. Lee knew the claimant was psychologically unwell and knew the claimant had offered apology and compensation. [B05, B21, B28, B35.]

This allegation becomes legally meaningful only if evidence identifies an act beyond truthful reporting. Examples that would matter include a knowingly false enlargement of the incident; pressure on witnesses to adopt false facts; use of fabricated documents; a coordinated false accusation; threats or coercion designed to obstruct lawful defense; or communications urging unauthorized harm. The current file does not quote a complaint by Mr. Lee, identify a recipient, or provide dates and messages. Investigators should therefore obtain the primary records before characterizing continued pursuit as criminal.

5. Alleged Psychological and Religious Antagonism

The claimant directly recalls that Mr. Lee told him to pray for his mother to be revived. He places the remark during profound grief, says Mr. Lee was aware of his mental deterioration, and interprets the statement as abuse rather than consolation. [B05, B28.]

The meaning of the remark depends heavily on language, tone, translation, cultural context, timing, and surrounding words. A literal or pastoral statement might be understood differently from a taunt. The report therefore treats the recalled words as a direct recollection but the intent to inflict distress as an inference requiring corroboration. Standing alone, the statement is not identified as a distinct offense under the U.S. provisions screened below. Its evidentiary value would lie in proving knowledge of vulnerability, hostility, or motive if connected to later knowingly false conduct.

6. Alleged Connection to Monitoring or Coordinated "Channel" Activity

6.1 Communication with the claimant's sister

One block states that the claimant's sister spoke with Mr. Lee from Pango and introduced the claimant as a "lost brother who only knew mom in his life." The claimant attributes to the sister an intent to keep close tabs on him and affect or destroy his life. [B30.] The source does not quote Mr. Lee's response or identify any action he took. Receipt of a call, without agreement or an overt act, is not proof that he adopted the caller's alleged purpose.

6.2 Assertion that Mr. Lee joined a conspiracy

Another block states broadly that Mr. Lee joined whatever transpired in an online "channel" conspiracy. [B29.] No platform, account, message, date, participant list, or overt act is supplied. A later block says his prior opinions may have been "contracted," but again provides no contract, payment, instruction, or communication. [B35.] These are leads, not presently charge-ready allegations.

The proper investigative approach is to preserve accounts and communications first, then ask whether authenticated records show: identity of the sender; knowing agreement with another person; a defined unlawful objective; an act taken to advance it; and a causal link to harm. Without those facts, the report should not equate perceived relays, name associations, or later media content with a communication by Mr. Lee.

7. Cumulative Intent Analysis

The claimant's cumulative theory is that Mr. Lee used two different events asymmetrically: he allegedly treated the admitted puppy incident as a basis for continuing hostility while also transforming an innocent translation role into participation in vehicle theft. The alleged combination, if proven, could support an inference that the objective was not accurate accountability but the broader discrediting or destruction of the claimant.

Intent should be inferred from verifiable conduct rather than labels. The most useful indicators would be consistency between Mr. Lee's private and official accounts; whether he corrected known errors;

whether he omitted the translation-only explanation after receiving proof; whether he coordinated wording with another person; whether he sought a lawful remedy or unauthorized retaliation; and whether the alleged false account caused an identifiable official or private action. A hostile remark may add context, but it cannot substitute for proof that a material accusation was knowingly false.

Cumulative assessment. The report supports a focused inquiry into knowingly false accusation and possible obstruction. It does not presently support treating every later hardship, media relay, or action by another person as caused by Mr. Lee.

8. Anticipated Explanations and What Would Test Them

Potential explanation	Evidence that would test it
Mr. Lee accurately reported a vehicle event he personally observed.	Obtain his original words, identify the observed act, compare them with ownership and possession records, and separate observations from conclusions.
Mr. Lee reasonably believed translation assistance showed complicity.	Determine what he knew about authorship, compensation, intent, and control of the vehicles; establish whether he received corrections and persisted afterward.
He never accused the claimant of theft.	Locate complaints, affidavits, testimony, emails, messages, and witnesses; avoid relying on second-hand paraphrase.
His puppy-related actions were lawful reporting or a compensation request.	Identify each communication and requested remedy; distinguish animal welfare reporting from threats, fabricated additions, or unrelated retaliation.
He had no role in later channel activity.	Preserve account, device, subscriber, payment, and message metadata using lawful process; test identity and agreement rather than name coincidence.
The religious statement was consolation or culturally misunderstood.	Interview witnesses, determine language and translation, and obtain the full surrounding conversation.

9. Legal Screening

Not a charging conclusion. The provisions below identify elements for investigators and counsel to test. Applicability depends on dates, forum, territorial nexus, the exact statement or act, the subject's knowledge and intent, and admissible evidence.

9.1 Vanuatu law: primary screening framework

The alleged vehicle dispute and relevant interactions occurred in Vanuatu. The Republic of Vanuatu Penal Code [CAP. 135] is therefore the most direct criminal-law reference identified in this review. The following provisions are potentially relevant only if their elements are proved:

- Sections 74-75 define and prohibit perjury: a knowingly false assertion by a witness in a judicial proceeding, made on oath and intended to mislead the tribunal.
- Section 76 prohibits a false statement or declaration required or authorized by law that would amount to perjury if made in a judicial proceeding.
- Section 77 prohibits fabricating evidence with intent to mislead a tribunal.

- Section 78 prohibits willfully removing, destroying, or impairing potential evidence with intent to prevent its use.
- Section 79(a) prohibits conspiring with another person to accuse a person falsely of an offense or to obstruct, prevent, pervert, or defeat the course of justice. The text requires an agreement involving at least two persons; a false accusation by one person, without proof of conspiracy, does not satisfy that clause.
- Section 81 prohibits fraud, deceit, or a knowingly false statement directed to a witness with intent to affect that witness's testimony.

In *Public Prosecutor v. Natuman*, the Supreme Court of Vanuatu treated conspiracy with at least one other person as an essential element of section 79(a) and distinguished motive from the intent required by the provision. That distinction matters here. General hostility or a desire for accountability does not itself prove a conspiracy to accuse falsely. Investigators would need evidence of agreement, falsity, knowledge, and the object of the agreement.

Article 5(1) of the Vanuatu Constitution recognizes liberty, security of the person, protection of the law, and equal treatment under law or administrative action. Article 6 provides a route to the Supreme Court to enforce guaranteed rights. These constitutional provisions are especially relevant if public officials adopted a knowingly false account or denied lawful protections; the present file does not establish state participation by Mr. Lee or identify a specific administrative decision.

9.2 U.S. law: conditional comparator and jurisdiction limits

The source itself states that the United States lacks jurisdiction over the underlying Vanuatu incidents. That is a legally important limitation. U.S. statutes cannot be applied merely because later communications allegedly reached U.S. persons or because the claimant associates the dispute with a broader U.S. process. A prosecutor would need the jurisdictional facts required by the particular statute.

- 18 U.S.C. 1001 reaches knowing and willful material falsification, concealment, or false documents only in a matter within the jurisdiction of the U.S. executive, legislative, or judicial branch. A statement solely to Vanuatu authorities is not enough.
- 18 U.S.C. 1621 concerns willfully false material statements under an oath authorized by U.S. law or a declaration under 28 U.S.C. 1746. The source does not identify such an oath or declaration by Mr. Lee.
- 18 U.S.C. 1512 addresses witness tampering, corrupt destruction or concealment of evidence, obstruction of an official proceeding, and certain harassment intended to prevent reporting or testimony. Section 1512(h) provides extraterritorial federal jurisdiction, but the alleged conduct must still satisfy the statute's connection to an official proceeding or communication concerning a possible federal offense. No such act by Mr. Lee is established in the source.
- 18 U.S.C. 241 requires an agreement by two or more persons to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate a person in the exercise of a right secured by the U.S. Constitution or federal law. The source has not yet identified a specific secured right, agreement, or overt conduct attributable to Mr. Lee within the statute's territorial terms.
- 18 U.S.C. 242 requires willful action under color of law. 42 U.S.C. 1983 likewise requires action under color of state or territorial law for civil liability. The source identifies Mr. Lee as a private motel-associated person and does not establish that he exercised governmental authority or jointly acted with a U.S. state official.

Accordingly, the U.S. provisions are useful as element-based comparators for false statements, obstruction, civil-rights conspiracy, and state action. They are not a basis, on the current record, to label the alleged Vanuatu conduct a completed U.S. federal offense.

10. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests

10.1 Vehicle dispute and translation record

- Identify the Vanuatu civil or criminal case, police file, parties, vehicles, dates, and disposition. Obtain a certified docket and complete record.
- Collect the original Korean-language documents and every translation attributed to the claimant. Preserve file metadata, drafts, email headers, device copies, and printing records.
- Identify who authored each factual assertion, who requested translation, who filed or delivered it, and whether the claimant signed as translator, witness, party, advocate, or declarant.
- Obtain every statement made by Mr. Lee about the vehicles or the claimant, preserving exact wording, language, interpreter, date, recipient, and whether the statement was sworn.
- Obtain vehicle ownership, registration, possession, transfer, sale, repair, and recovery records. Determine whether the claimant ever exercised control or received proceeds.
- Interview the underlying plaintiff, defendant, vehicle owner, requesting party, interpreter witnesses, and the person who allegedly forgave the claimant and invited him to date a daughter.
- Determine when Mr. Lee learned of the translator-only explanation and whether he corrected, repeated, expanded, or concealed any earlier assertion afterward.

10.2 Puppy incident and subsequent pursuit

- Collect contemporaneous animal-welfare, police, veterinary, motel, and witness records concerning the incident.
- Preserve the claimant's apology, compensation offers, and any response from Mr. Lee, including delivery and read metadata where available.
- List each later act the claimant characterizes as antagonism or pursuit. Record the date, speaker, recipient, exact words, requested action, and resulting consequence.
- Separate truthful reporting and lawful remedy requests from any alleged false enlargement, threat, witness pressure, or unrelated retaliatory demand.

10.3 Communications and alleged coordination

- Preserve communications between Mr. Lee and the claimant's sister for the relevant period, subject to lawful process and applicable privacy law.
- Identify the platform meant by "channel," the accounts allegedly used, and the specific message or overt act attributed to Mr. Lee.
- Preserve subscriber data, login history, device identifiers, message headers, attachments, payment records, and deletion logs before seeking content conclusions.
- Require independent authentication. A name, image, media reference, or perceived relay should not be treated as proof that Mr. Lee authored or endorsed a communication.

10.4 Chain of custody and fairness safeguards

- Create forensic copies using documented hashes; retain originals; record every transfer and transformation.
- Use qualified Korean, Bislama, French, and English interpreters as needed. Preserve both source text and translated text.
- Disclose exculpatory and contradictory material together with inculpatory material.
- Give Mr. Lee an opportunity to identify the precise statement he made, its basis, and any correction, while avoiding compound accusations based on unverified relays.
- Do not infer guilt from silence, prior assistance, ethnicity, nationality, religion, business affiliation, or association with other named persons.

11. Questions for Mr. Lee

1. What is your full legal identity and your role at Blue Pango Motel during the claimant's stay?
2. What vehicle dispute do you associate with the claimant, and what did you personally observe?
3. Did you tell any police officer, court, immigration authority, private person, or online participant that the claimant stole vehicles or assisted a theft? If so, provide the exact words and basis.
4. Were you aware that the claimant said he was only translating another person's documents? When did you learn that, and what did you do to verify it?
5. Did the vehicle owner or opposing party communicate forgiveness or invite continued social contact with the claimant? Were you aware of that information?
6. Did you receive an apology or compensation offer concerning the puppies? What lawful remedy did you seek afterward?
7. Did you tell the claimant to pray for his mother to be revived? What were the surrounding words, language, tone, and purpose?
8. What communications did you have with the claimant's sister concerning him, and did you agree to monitor, report on, or influence him?
9. Did you use or participate in any online channel concerning the claimant? Identify every account and communication.
10. Did any person offer money, business benefit, protection, or instruction in exchange for a statement or action concerning the claimant?

12. Requested Determinations

The claimant asks that competent investigators and, where appropriate, the Vanuatu authorities determine the following without presuming either guilt or innocence:

- Whether Mr. Lee actually accused the claimant of vehicle theft, complicity, or another offense, and whether the accusation was materially false.
- Whether Mr. Lee knew the claimant's role was limited to translation and nevertheless concealed or contradicted that fact.
- Whether any false account was sworn, submitted in a legally authorized declaration, used to fabricate evidence, or made as part of an agreement with another person to accuse falsely.
- Whether later conduct concerning the puppy incident remained within lawful reporting and remedy-seeking or became knowingly false, coercive, obstructive, or retaliatory.

- Whether authenticated communications establish that Mr. Lee agreed to or participated in monitoring, online coordination, witness influence, or any other unlawful objective.
- Whether any public authority adopted materially false information without providing the claimant the protection and equal treatment required by Vanuatu law.

The report does not request a predetermined punishment. Charging, civil relief, and any sanction should follow only from verified facts, applicable territorial law, procedural fairness, and proof meeting the required legal standard.

13. Compact Source Map

This map identifies where the consolidated allegations appear. It is an audit aid, not a block-by-block appendix.

Block	Material concerning Mr. Lee	Attribution level
B05	Religious remark; mental-health knowledge; apology and compensation; vehicle translator role; alleged framing and persistence.	Direct recollection plus inference
B07	Claimant accepts puppy wrongdoing and states intent to compensate Mr. Lee.	Claimant admission
B21	Apology, compensation, severe distress, and allegation of continuing antagonism.	Admission plus inference
B28	Vehicle framing and persistence; distinction between lawful process and using law to frame; claimant admits puppy wrongdoing.	Repeated allegation
B29	Unpaid translation; alleged forgiveness by opposing party; assertion that Mr. Lee joined channel activity.	Document-dependent plus unspecified inference
B30	Claimant's sister communicated with Mr. Lee from Pango; motive attributed primarily to sister.	Direct fact asserted; Lee's participation unproved
B35	Alleged pursuit of destruction, vehicle framing, and possible contracted opinions.	Inference; records required
B37/B47	Mr. Lee helped the stranded claimant find local accommodation.	Neutral/adverse material
B42/B43	Mr. Lee's interest in a casting furnace and local ventures.	Neutral relationship context
B50	Translation-only role; meal as payment; alleged forgiveness and concealment; continued vehicle framing.	Specific repeated allegation
B52	Denial of car theft; translation for parties; alleged forgiveness; request for investigation of Mr. Lee.	Specific repeated allegation

14. Conclusion

The source material supports one concentrated, testable allegation against Mr. Lee: that he knowingly recast a translator as a participant in vehicle theft or a vehicle dispute and persisted after facts distinguishing translation from participation were available. The alleged concealment of authorship, compensation, control, and later forgiveness is central. If primary records confirm knowing falsity and a legally consequential communication, the conduct could warrant investigation under Vanuatu provisions governing false statements, perjury, fabricated evidence, and conspiracy to accuse falsely.

The other allegations are materially less developed. The puppy-related claim requires proof of conduct beyond truthful reporting or lawful remedy-seeking. The religious remark may show knowledge and hostility but is not, by itself, shown to constitute an offense. The alleged channel conspiracy cannot

responsibly be advanced without authenticated communications, an identified agreement, and an overt act attributable to Mr. Lee.

The recommended next step is therefore evidence-first: secure the vehicle-case record, original translations, every statement by Mr. Lee, the alleged exculpatory communications, and any relevant platform records. Those materials can establish whether the claimant is describing a knowing false accusation, a misunderstanding, a truthful complaint, or no accusation by Mr. Lee at all. The determination belongs to competent investigators and the lawful tribunal, not to this report.

Legal Authorities

1. [Republic of Vanuatu Penal Code \[CAP. 135\], ss. 74-81](#). Official Vanuatu government PDF; perjury, false statements, fabricated or destroyed evidence, conspiracy to accuse falsely, and witness deception.
2. [Public Prosecutor v. Natuman, Supreme Court of Vanuatu \(2017\)](#). Explains section 79, including the two-person requirement for section 79(a) and the distinction between motive and intent.
3. [Constitution of the Republic of Vanuatu, arts. 5-6](#). Official Parliament source for fundamental rights and enforcement.
4. [Siri v. Government of the Republic of Vanuatu \(2024\)](#). Official judicial decision quoting Article 5(1) protections.
5. [18 U.S.C. 1001](#). Material false statements or concealment in matters within U.S. governmental jurisdiction.
6. [18 U.S.C. 1512](#). Witness tampering and obstruction; includes specified extraterritorial jurisdiction but retains statutory nexus requirements.
7. [18 U.S.C. 1621](#). Perjury under an oath authorized by U.S. law or a qualifying declaration.
8. [18 U.S.C. 241](#). Conspiracy against rights secured by the U.S. Constitution or federal law.
9. [18 U.S.C. 242](#). Criminal deprivation of rights under color of law.
10. [42 U.S.C. 1983](#). Civil action requiring conduct under color of state or territorial law.

End of report.