

The Role of Attorney Generals (AG)?¹

Serious question (*text of initial post*):

We can see clearly how the US AG defrauds the public & protects the criminals of both financial fraud & sex trafficking.

How many other country AGs (Ireland, UK, etc) over the past few decades have inserted themselves into investigations & litigation to protect the guilty?

- If I were a betting woman I would say...MANY!

Our founding father's would be sick to see this clear abuse of power & breach of separation of powers.

How to stop the politically appointed & corrupt judges who are paid to play?

- EXPOSE THE GUILTY & CALL FOR INVESTIGATIONS & DO NOT STOP.

Is it possible the Epstein file reveal of a global-elite sex trafficking ring could provide the evidence for the systemic abuse, corruption & fraud?

- IT ALREADY IS!

Keep posting your evidence. I will gladly repost!

Sample Reply (*text*)

It has been over ten years since events arose - a sham defence & **false affidavit of verification** was filed. Affidavit was concealed from me to hide perjury of top civil servant.

Collusive representation (aka Boies inserting himself into Epstein's victims litigation).

And then ten years later - AG's office refuses a data subject access request (filed on a hunch) stating;

"It is a function of the Attorney General, as legal adviser to the Government, to direct the defence of proceedings brought against the State or any Minister. This function is carried out by the Office of the Attorney General on the instructions of the relevant line Department or Departments."

However, my litigation is against the Houses of the Oireachtas Commission, the statutory governing body responsible for the administration and operations of Ireland's Parliament (Dáil Éireann and Seanad Éireann).

- Not one Irish Government Minister nor one Government Department is being sued.
- Neither are they a notice party.

It seems to me that an AG cannot assert legal advice privilege when his involvement in litigation is ultra vires.

- The entire scenario presented lacks the foundational elements of a valid lawyer-client relationship - understood to be required for privilege.

¹ Reply copied from a post on X on Feb 13, 2026 w permission.

The formats on these pages has been modified by www.irldefrauded.com for ease of reading

The AG acts not as a legitimate advisor, but as an overreaching official.

- He is exceeding his constitutional remit under Article 30 of the Irish Constitution.
- Many of his predecessors may have engaged in similar conduct in this litigation - covertly - certainly unbeknownst to me.

Why did the Chief Parliamentary Legal Adviser **acquiesce to or fail to challenge** the AG's unauthorised involvement in advising on litigation where **no executive entity was sued or named as notice party**?

Did the **Clerk of Dáil Éireann**, responsible for procedural integrity **authorise, facilitate or fail to object** to the AG's involvement in advising on these proceedings absent any executive party/notice party status, contrary to Article 30's executive remit?

Granted the stakes are high, but when a **banking lawyer raises significant concerns** about a sham Banking Inquiry, the matters in dispute should not fall into the remit of a person acting ultra vires & coincidentally an individual who has acted repeatedly for almost all Irish banks.

Conflicts of interest?

- To my knowledge, AGs in Ireland are not exempt from disclosing conflicts of interest and face mandatory ethics obligations under the Ethics in Public Office Acts 1995 and 2001.
- Surely, Ireland's rule of law demands strict adherence to constitutional roles, and mandates ethical disclosures?
- And what about an AG interfering in litigation firmly outside the executive sphere?

An Irish constitutional crisis has erupted

- the credibility of our State is impaired, but please take note of the deafening silence of our mainstream media.

Commentary added by Ireland defrauded (www.irldefrauded.com)

- When the Attorney General advised the Irish Government on the bank Guarantee scheme in 2008 **was, he informed the Bank's involved were insolvent?**
- Many experts argue that the banks were insolvent, not just illiquid, making an equity injection (effectively nationalization) more appropriate than loans. As reported all references to **solvency** were removed from the final bank inquiry report. **The Committee on Finance Public Expenditures and Reform and Taoiseach, 28 May 2019** is a must watch especially this extracted portion: "*Bank Insolvency Masterclass*" (also on our Video page)
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WeVXDwMvN60>

An equity approach in our opinion would have forced losses onto unsecured senior bondholders rather than Irish taxpayers and might have allowed for the creation of "good" and "bad" banks (as the USA did in the early 1990s), **potentially saving billions** in bailout costs.