

Evaluation of the Lawyer

Jacques BARILLON

Lawyer active in Geneva / Vaud

Business address:

Rue du Rhone 29, 1204 Genève

Place de la Gare 9, 1260 Nyon

Professional telephone: 022 818 46 60 – 022 300 61 61



Jacques BARILLON

Profile

Lawyer of the Scientologists. BARILLON is a loyal follower of the ethics of its founder, L. Ron HUBBARD, according to which the end justifies the means.

Exaggerated advance fees.

He is eagerly looking to pick up mandates of largely publicized cases.

According to the press article published in *Le Matin* on April 27, 2005, he is a profiteer. The former mistress of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs Roland DUMAS, related to the Elf case, Christine DEVIERS-JONCOUR accused BARILLON in a book for having defrauded her (Patrick BOVY, *Tribune de Genève*, February 21st, 2006).

In short, he is one of those lawyers who harshly seek money. A boaster, he is able to snub the adverse party severely to whom he addresses brutal criticism, not through his brilliant debates interventions or dazzling pleas at court, which are rather poor, but by sneaky and cowardly prepared actions out of court, partnering for example with the scribbler Arnaud BÉDAT for *L'illustré*.

Below is Mr. BARILLON's propaganda on how he boasts about being a multidisciplinary all-rounder:

«I thought it was not necessarily prohibited to do a little psychology alongside my law studies (...) I studied humanities, some medicine, and the I got contaminated by two years of psychology (...) of worldwide quality». (I, p. 199)

One must still complete the picture in specifying that BARILLON has an exceptional gift for shaking an audience – and this also happens for good causes.

Is consuming drugs.

Reference list (observations collected since 2000):

Negative references: 10

Positive references: 2

Role assumed in the affair SÉGALAT

Laurent SÉGALAT has been condemned by the Vaudois in 2010 without evidence and without avoal for murder of his step mother to 14 years in prison.

The following books were published concerning this case:

Le procès Ségalat – Un acquittement contesté. Jacques SECRETAN, Editor Mon Village, 2012 (I)

L'affaire Ségalat ou la présomption de la culpabilité. Ian HAMEL, éditions du Belvédère, 2013 (II)

Les nuits blanches d'une robe noire. Gilles-Jean PORTEJOIE, Editions du Moment, 2015 (IV)

Une condamnation bâtie sur du sable. Jacques SECRETAN. Editor Mon Village. 2015 (VI)

The unmasked «Constitutional State» – The scandalous condemnation of Laurent Ségalat. Gerhard ULRICH, Editor Samizdat, 2016

BARILLON has been the defending Lawyer of the civil party. Extract of the last mentioned book:

3.1. The strategy cooked up by BARILLON

The scribbler Arnaud BÉDAT («L'illustré» a weekly newspaper specialized on sensations) is the one who put the lawyer Jacques BARILLON in contact with Roger-Jean SÉGALAT, who was looking for a star among the lawyers to defend his son (II, p. 140). He was a civil party, together with the brother and the sisters of his deceased wife. However, after giving an interview to BÉDAT, the father, seriously ill, was shocked by the publication of an article by him in «L'illustré» on February 10, 2010.

After Roger-Jean SÉGALAT's death, BARILLON executed a brutal turn, changing sides, and dividing the brother and sisters of Catherine from Laurent

SÉGALAT and his family, who until that time had maintained few but friendly contacts. From that moment BARILLON became Mr. SÉGALAT's sworn enemy (II, p. 141).

It is established by Pauline SÉGALAT (daughter of Laurent) that BARILLON had suggested Roger-Jean SÉGALAT that he wanted to accept the defense of his son (I, p. 156). If one can doubt the impartiality of a girl attached to her father, such a doubt is not allowed following the statements by a close friend of the couple, Catherine and Roger-Jean SÉGALAT. This is J., the psychiatrist from Lausanne.

Called as a witness, he made the following startling statement, notwithstanding BARILLON's interruptions: «The first time at Aubonne (hospital for palliative care where Roger-Jean SÉGALAT was staying at some point) he (Roger-Jean) was flabbergasted, without suspicion (about his son), outraged by a first article in the *L'illustré*. He said that Mr. BARILLON, lawyer, had come to see him, that he was defending Laurent. He was convinced of his innocence and wanted be a civil party in order to get access to the file. (...) And there Roger had faith in Mr. BARILLON, lawyer, to defend him. »

BARILLON: « You are making the dead speak...»

Dr. J.: « I am not making the dead speak. I honor their memory! Please Mr. President, do so that Mr. BARILLON does not interrupt me.»

Mrs. MOINAT, lawyer: « You are very upset? »

Dr. J.: « Yes. I manifested myself to the investigating judge who became meanwhile prosecutor, concerning Mr. BARILLON's change of position. I had to react in relation to Catherine and Roger's memory. I say ... in relation to Mr. BARILLON that in some situations one must recuse oneself. » (I, p. 128)

The essential of his contribution in this procedure as lawyer for the civil party, which became under his instigation very hostile vis-à-vis the accused, was

accomplished outside the courtroom. He did not restrain himself to foment animosity on the part of his clients, but formed a fishy duo with the scribbler BÉDAT. The latter was the only one who had access to his clients. All other journalists were kept away (II, p. 144). In the *L'illustré* on October 4, 2011, he published the scoop: «He must now confess». And to serve his teammate, BARILLON, he looked down upon and bamboozled LECOMTE in writing the subtitle: «The expertise of the strange Professor LECOMTE» BÉDAT did not refrain from dirtying the lady scientist in adding in his pamphlet the libelous gossip according to which unidentified English media would have «accused Professor LECOMTE for having performed the embalming of the princess (Diana) by order of the ambassador of the United Kingdom to mask a supposed pregnancy.» Given the failing quality of our mass media, it is not surprising that the publisher RINGIER continues to employ that fellow.

In acting behind the scene, the main job of BARILLON was therefore already done at the opening of the trial proceedings. Laurent SÉGALAT and Professor LECOMTE were slandered in public at a large scale. Before the tables of **LADOR's** court, the performance produced by BARILLON during the debates was rather deficient. One notices few productive interventions. One would have expected that this lawyer, specialized in criminal affaires, who is famous in la Romandie may stuck the accused with his questions to draw a clear chronology of the incident leading to the death of Catherine SÉGALAT. No question in this context!

Among his rare interventions, we note the following examples:

- On May 24, 2012, BARILLON resumes the gossip of the «investigators» according to which «at one time the victim would have stood up because there are her footsteps in a standing position!» (I, p. 67) Pure lye. Even the inspectors CRUCHON and FLÜCKIGER did not go that far.
- When the defender PORTEJOIE shows himself to be indignant that the inspector FLÜCKIGER deared to do the disrespectful remark towards

Laurent SÉGALAT «I love putting down bullshit», BARILLON counters cold bloodedly: «What's wrong about that?» (I, p. 69 – 70)

- He stops Professor LECOMTE in her application of giving evidence by lodging the displaced objection: «This has nothing to do with this case.» (I, p. 113)
- He stops **COTTIER** to avoid him from committing yet another auto-goal. Provoked by one of **COTTIER**'s questions, left unanswered by VIEIRA, **LADOR** let out: «The professor MANGIN may specify this point». Sensing the danger, **COTTIER** lodged: «No. No need» and BARILLON concluded: «It's pretty clear.» (I, p. 151)

Admittedly BARILLON certainly saw how **COTTIER** ridiculed himself by his auto-goals in largely questioning the scientists. Without exposing himself, BARILLON gave free course to the «Attorney General» who enjoys an authority without any tolerance for criticism in this country of Vaud.

Those who expected from BARILLON that he may get lost in an administration of clues for the accusation, for lack of evidence, will remain unsatisfied. Not one attempt in this direction, except brief and peremptory accusations.

His finale at the trial of first instance may be qualified as a bogus advocacy, starting with the false allegation addressed to Laurent SÉGALAT: «I am not your enemy», and his macabre philosophy «I cannot imagine that we can be indifferent to the fact that the victim is actually the one who died. And if one is wrongly condemned, one is a victim, but an alive one!» (I, p. 195)

Then BARILLON returned to the snitch Akron, this Albanian drug trafficker who had shared a cell with Mr. SÉGALAT at a given time and who tried to negotiate a penalty discount in exchange of an accusing «testimony» against his cellmate. Here's how BARILLON validated this «testimony»:

«We know that the accused was in the same cell as the nominee Akron. Who has just said: ‘I know a lot of things... Could it be to my advantage?’ **No, not here. Maybe in France, but not in our country.**»

According to our laws, it seems okay. But in the head of a gangster from the Balkan, such expectations exist. And not only in such brains, as the author of this publication has had the experience of it himself. The maniac murderer with sexual obsession Claude DUBOIS, his cell neighbor at Bochuz had managed to obtain his transfer to half-liberty after rendering «balance» services to the authorities (as balances were designated the snitches at Bochuz).

The rest of the speech was a psychological warfare of which the accused was being burdened with remarks, for example: «You have played and lost» or is being overwhelmed in having pictures of the corpse be put before him. DISCH is also being entangled: «(...) you are going to exhaust yourself, Mr. DISCH, keep your energy for other cases (...) As a remarkable lawyer, you know this very well ... that the game is lost.» (I, p. 201) Neither does he forget to launch flowers to «judge» **LADOR**, congratulating him for having violated the principle of the presumption of innocence before having opened the debate (I, p. 197).

BARILLON is always hunting for on highly mediated cases and he also took advantage this time of the massive presence of journalists to sell himself as a multidisciplinary all-rounder:

«(...) I thought it was not necessarily prohibited to do a little psychology alongside my law studies (...) I studied humanities, some medicine, and then I was contaminated by two years of psychology (...) of worldwide quality» (I, p. 199)

This was the brightest part of his plea.