

Interactive Sovereign Society

INTER-SOVEREIGN RELATIONS

The Chief of Justice of the Interactive Sovereign Society is Jeff Bodner.

This document outlines the responsibilities of the Chief of Justice of the Interactive Sovereign Society. The Chief of Justice is the official responsible for oversight of the assurance that the society's members are adhering to [principles of law](#), as required by the fifth paragraph of the [Constitution](#), to the satisfaction of the overall membership, and also that the society as a whole is adhering to its [Charter](#).

PANEL CHAIRS

The Chief of Justice shall appoint panel chairs for the purpose of conducting hearings where members are believed to have failed to adhere to ISS [principles](#), or representatives or officials acting on behalf of the society are believed to have failed to adhere to the ISS [Charter](#). Panel chairs will be appointed so that there is at least one for each community. This requires that, when a trial is called, at least 20 members are within reasonable vicinity such that a panel may be found and coordinated for an agreed upon date where enough of those members may attend to form a panel, within 21 days.

Panel chairs shall be chosen based on ability to perform three functions, in the interest of seeing that hearings into alleged unlawful conduct are conducted appropriately:

- directing the members of a panel, in a judicial hearing, to focus on comparing the conduct described in the hearing with ISS laws as in the [Summation of Principles](#) or [Charter](#) maintained by the Prime Representative, rather than adjudicating that conduct based upon their own personal discretion,
- remaining impartial through the course of a hearing, so as best to allow the members of the panel to agree on a verdict without the chair having given a personal stance on the matter, and
- presiding impartially over the selection of the members for a panel in a hearing of alleged unlawful conduct, as prescribed in the following sections on Hearings.

CALLING HEARINGS

A panel chair may call a hearing in three types of situations:

- **civil hearing** - when a member or group of members, who shall be called the complainant, alleges that another member or group of members, who shall be called the defendant, has or have acted in a way which is prima facie (on first observation) a violation of another member's personal sovereignty, or a failure to adhere to the principles laid out in the [Summation of Principles](#) maintained by the prime representative, or
- **societal hearing** - when a member or group of members, who shall be called the complainant, allege that a representative or official or a group thereof acting on behalf of the society, who shall be called the respondent, has failed to adhere to the [Charter](#). If the prime representative deems there to be a more suitable choice of respondent than the member or members named by the complainant, then the prime representative may designate a different respondent for the society. The respondent should be chosen as the most appropriate

representatives of the society for the purpose of the particular allegations being made. If there is no designated representative more appropriate for a particular hearing, then the prime representative must act as respondent for the society.

- **external legislation hearing** - when a member or group of members, who shall be called the dissenter, disagrees with a decision of the External Legislation Committee (ELC) with regard to the inconsistency of a law of an external government with ISS principles for placement in the [External Legislation Registry](#) (ELR) as defined in the ISS Charter. The chair of the ELC shall act as respondent on behalf of the ELC.

If a panel chair calls a hearing at the request of a member, then the Chief of Justice may select a different panel chair to preside over the hearing, in particular as a recusal or for administrative or organizational reasons, but may not prevent the hearing from occurring.

If a panel chair calls a hearing that any member finds to be vexatious, scandalous, frivolous, or an abuse of court process, then a societal hearing may be called by any other panel chair with that panel chair named as respondent. The panel in this hearing may, as it sees fit, put a conditional injunction on the hearing in dispute, disallow it altogether, and/or remove the respondent from the judiciary. Any such panel chair removed from the judiciary in this fashion may not be re-instated by the Chief of Justice without agreement from this panel upon review.

A vexatious hearing is one in which part of the motivation for the complaint or dissent is to cause anger or frustration for the defendant or respondent.

A scandalous hearing is one in which part of the motivation for the complaint or dissent is to prejudice others toward the defendant or respondent.

A frivolous hearing is one in which part of the motivation for the complaint or dissent is to cause needless imposition upon the defendant's or respondent's time.

A hearing that abuses court process is one in which any specified or implied purposes for the existence of this Inter-sovereign Relations policy are undermined.

CONDUCT OF HEARINGS

The chair designated to preside over a hearing sets out the exact particulars of the allegation of cause, and then assembles a panel of members of the society, consisting of at least 5 members, as follows:

- (1) the chair
- (2) 2 members selected by the complainant or dissenter
- (3) 2 members selected by the defendant or respondent
- (4) if either party wishes to select more members for the panel, then both parties select the same number of additional members, subject to any limits specified in the [Justice Rules](#)
- (5) after all members for the panel have been selected by both parties, then both parties can veto [a number](#) of the other's nominees, equal to the number of panel members selected by either party, plus one, divided by three, rounded down: in the event of vetoes, the chair selects alternate members as specified in the [Justice Rules](#) unless the parties themselves agree on selected alternate members
- (6) a complainant, defendant, respondent, dissenter, or witness to the disputed event cannot be a member.

A hearing shall then commence, which can be in writing as to both facts and submissions. If there is a clear dispute on the facts, the panel will hear from witnesses directly.

The panel has broad discretionary powers to:

- (1) dismiss the charges as unfounded
- (2) suspend a defendant's membership for a period of time
- (3) terminate a defendant's membership
- (4) specify any other non-monetary and non-custodial penalty
- (5) order restitution of damaged property
- (6) order either complainant or defendant or both to have no contact with each other for a specified time
- (7) review and revise any order made other than to dismiss the charges
- (8) enforce its orders through the same process

All decisions of the panel must receive at least a 2/3 vote in favour (meaning at least 4 out of 5 for a panel of 5), and must be rendered within 7 days of hearing. Hearings must be done within 21 days of the allegation.

Hearings shall follow general rules of natural justice. The chair possesses the discretionary authority to convene the process, but is not the prosecutor.

Complainant and defendant can represent themselves, or appoint a member of their choice who agrees to be their advocate, but any evidence in written or oral form must be from their own hand or mouth.

The Chief of Justice has the prerogative to be privy to all deliberations of the judicial panel with the sole purpose of evaluating the abilities of the panel chair as specified in Inter-sovereign Relations. No influence over, or interference in, the course of proceedings by the Chief of Justice may be allowed. Observations made by the Chief of Justice during a hearing may only be used by the Chief of Justice in a subsequent hearing to remove the panel chair from the judiciary, or else overturn the results of the present hearing, due to conduct of the panel chair that is inconsistent with the specifications in Inter-sovereign Relations.

If the Chief of Justice is not available to observe deliberations of a judicial panel, then the Deputy Chief of Justice retains the prerogative to be privy to deliberations and must then share all such observations with the Chief of Justice.

If the Chief of Justice has a conflict of interest with the matters in a judicial hearing, then the Chief may be disallowed by the panel from being privy to their deliberations. The Deputy Chief then retains this prerogative, and may avoid sharing observations of the hearing with the Chief that are relevant to the conflict of interest. If the Deputy Chief also has a conflict of interest, then the Justice Committee may elect a new Deputy Chief to observe panel deliberations.

REVIEW

1. The Panel has the authority to set a period where a review is prohibited, which shall not exceed 3 months, except in the case of termination, where the review prohibition cannot exceed 6 months. A review request which amounts to a request to merely modify a term of a previous order and not to lessen a sanction is not subject to any order prohibiting review, and the chair has authority for determining whether a review request fits this exception.

2. If either party wishes to add members to the panel for the review, then both parties add the same number of additional members as allowed by the [Justice Rules](#), and the according number of vetoes may be made, but only newly added members may be vetoed.
3. Reinstatement of membership after termination can only be achieved by a review of the panel, and not under the general authority of the prime representative;
4. Complainant, accused, or any panel member may initiate a review request: a complainant's review request can only be to modify or lessen a sanction, and any request by the complainant to increase a sanction is deemed to be a fresh complaint and will result in the chair's consideration of whether to initiate a new disciplinary procedure.
5. In the event the review request is not initiated by the complainant, the complainant shall be consulted with in the course of the review;
6. The Panel may consult with other society members who may reasonably be impacted by the original order or the terms sought by the review
7. Where both complainant and accused agree on a change or a new term for review, that change shall be granted unless, with written reasons, the panel finds that the changes or terms requested or the circumstances of the accused are likely to risk interference with other society members' rights or freedoms;
8. The Panel, on review, may deny the review, grant the terms requested, or grant any other terms the Panel feels warranted in the circumstances, but in no circumstances shall a review result in any sanction which is a greater interference with the personal liberty of the accused than the original order, either in length or severity of sanction. It is the responsibility and authority of the chair to ascertain whether new terms considered by the Panel violate the limits under this section.

PRINCIPLES

The following principles apply in all judicial hearings.

A panel in a civil hearing shall determine an appropriate sanction which will least interfere with the personal sovereignty of the defendant, weighing the need to protect the complainant and the society at large, providing restitution of anything lost to the complainant arising from the defendant's actions and the prospects and likely course of rehabilitation of the defendant, and must never be punitive in intent or result unless there is no other appropriate sanction or remedy available in the circumstances.

A decision of a panel in a societal hearing has superior force in ISS law over a decision of a panel in a civil hearing, and also over a decision of a panel in an external legislation hearing.

For an external legislation hearing, the decision shall be made as follows:

- If the panel agrees in a 2/3 decision to define a law to be inconsistent to some specified extent with ISS principles in the [ELR](#), then no member may subsequently be brought to hearing for not following that law. The panel may, upon review, alter the decision as to what is written in the [ELR](#) about that law.
- If the panel agrees in a 2/3 decision that a law is consistent with ISS principles, then the [ELR](#) should reflect this, and any member failing to follow this law should receive a sanction as per the discretionary powers of the panel.
- If either of the above is not achieved, then the panel must either choose to declare a mistrial and allow a new hearing to be asked or agree to a review at a later time. Any member not following the law may then be called to hearing at the discretion of a panel chair, but the panel assembled for that hearing should then use its own discretion without consulting the [ELR](#) for its decision.

CHIEF OF JUSTICE DUTIES

Upon being informed that a member is willing to act as an ISS panel chair, the Chief of Justice is responsible to establish a rapport with that member, or to see that at least one present panel chair does. One purpose of such a rapport must be to candidly and respectfully express the nature of any concerns that the judiciary has about the potential chair's impartiality, personal emotional control, or versatility with ISS laws and procedures, and to hear the potential chair's responses to any such concerns. If, of the judiciary that have opened a rapport with the potential chair, at least 75% agree that the potential chair is suitable, then the Chief of Justice shall accept the chair. The Chief of Justice retains the discretion to accept a chair if less than 75% of the total involved judiciary agree on suitability, but will not refuse if the 75% threshold is reached.

The Chief of Justice is required to make a complete report available to the ISS membership regarding all considerations made by the judiciary in a decision to appoint a new panel chair. This report must be available to the membership for a period of time that allows Them to make any responses known before the appointment of a new panel chair is finalized.

JUSTICE COMMITTEE

The ISS Justice Committee is mandated with hearing and deciding all matters concerning the legislation of ISS justice, subject to this Inter-sovereign Relations policy.

Any proposed changes to the Inter-sovereign Relations policy should be brought before the Justice Committee first. If this committee carries those changes, then the committee's Chair will move these changes on Public Record for ratification by the membership.

Any rules agreed upon by the Justice Committee that specify details about the conduct of justice, while remaining within the confines of the Inter-sovereign Relations policy, shall be entered in a document entitled ISS [Justice Rules](#). This document shall be maintained by the Chief of Justice and made available to members upon request. No ratification by the membership is necessary for the Justice Committee to change the rules in this document.

Rules may be determined by the Justice Committee without ratification by the membership regarding:

- conditions on limiting number of members in a judicial panel,
- a panel chair's selection of members for a panel to replace vetoed choices, and
- whether panel chairs may accept votes toward any elected positions in the ISS.

Decisions made by the Justice Committee, as well as conduct during working toward those decisions, shall follow the guidelines for the Rules of Order for ISS Public Record.

Membership in the Justice Committee shall be offered to any member explicitly expressing willingness to adhere to the above mentioned Rules of Order.

The Chair of the Justice Committee shall be elected interactively by the committee's members. The Chair is responsible for assuring that the Rules of Order are adhered to, and assuring that decisions are recorded to be made available to ISS members as requested.

DEPUTY CHIEF OF JUSTICE

The Chair of the Justice Committee shall also be known as the Deputy Chief of Justice, and may in general act on behalf of the Chief of Justice when the Chief is absent or unable to act, with the exception that the Deputy may not appoint a Panel Chair when more than 25% of present judiciary do not believe that the potential chair is suitable.

When the Chief of Justice is a party in a hearing, the Deputy Chief of Justice may select which panel chair presides over the hearing.

This outline of Inter-sovereign Relations is prepared in accordance with the Interactive Sovereign Society Summation of Principles and Charter, as maintained by Prime Representative Psam Frank.