Statements by Dr. Reiner Füllmich on the status of the Criminal proceedings at the Göttingen Regional Court

I am now publishing four statements in writing that deal with the four central issues of these proceedings against me. I have already orally summarized each of these statements briefly commenting each one of them. I decided to publish these so that anyone who wants to know the details of the vexatious claims against me can follow the trajectory of the case in detail. This will aid in the process of discernment and help to dispel any wrong accusations based on false narratives in the matter. If anyone is interested in keeping the record straight simply show this document to the parties who are either being ill informed or interested in maliciously dishonouring my name and standing.

Statement 1 - The abduction disguised as a mock deportation

The Mexican Migration Act states in § 144 that the **sole** basis for deportation from Mexico states six conditions for deportation and lists some as follows with regard to the status of my wife and myself:
1) My wife and I did not enter the country with forged documents,
2) nor did we enter the country illegally after having been previously deported,
3) nor have we been convicted of any crime that endangers national security,
4) nor were we under investigation for any such crime.
These statements were contained in the deportation order of the Mexican migration authorities as they were noted in the file but never translated into German. This constitutes a violation of the legal procedure. Therefore, my wife and I had entered Mexico legally with no violations of any Mexican laws. Nor did we commit any crimes whilst in the country. The remainder of the file conclusively proves the **dossiers'** statements: Namely, that the German services, in particular the BKA (Federal Criminal Office) and the Lower Saxony LKA (State Criminal Office), in collaboration with the Göttingen public prosecutor's office, had colluded to ask the migration authorities of Mexico to fake a deportation so that an abduction from Mexico and my subsequent arrested at Frankfurt airport were made possible. The services and the public prosecutor's office were obliged to have requested a normal extradition process in order to be able to legally enact an arrest of myself in Mexico, as they themselves had confirmed by email. But since I was charged with just one offence, because it was obviously impossible to "piece together" more, it is deeply questionable whether this is safe to furnish sufficient evidence for this bizarre construct.

But above all, my lawyers and I would have had to have been heard by the Mexican authorities as part of the extradition proceedings. The facts of the matter could have been plainly revealed at the time in Mexico before my abduction. These facts are now coming to light during the proceedings in Germany too. However, the court is straining to conceal the fact, that the accusations made by the public prosecutor's office against me are all false, fabricated and without substance. In particular, it would have brought to light the fact that the entire operation was controlled by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution, as has become plainly evident from the file.

Extradition procedures against me should have never been enacted. Now the German services and authorities stand to be internationally disgraced through this public statement.

Statement 2 - A timely and comprehensive hearing is the central prerequisite for any fair trial

Here I explain that for more than a year and three months the public prosecutor's office, on the instructions of the services, deliberately denied the granting of any legal hearing, but rather pointedly refused to do so, while at the same time it maintaiend constant written and verbal (telephone) contact with the complainants.

I was only given a legal hearing one month after the indictment was written and three months after my abduction from Mexico and incarceration in Germany – obviously far too late! To this day, in further violation of normal proceedings, my legal team has no proper and comprehensive access to the investigation files. Thus, I have no ability to properly comment on the accusations to date. The entire collection of notes from at least 80 telephone conversations and various documents relevant to the decision are being withheld by the other side.

The public prosecutor's office is deliberatly withholding significant, decisive information, just as it did in the criminal proceedings against the US actor Alec Baldwin, which led to the immediate and final dismissal of the charges against Alec Baldwin in the state of New Mexico/USA. In view of the dossier and the overall conduct of the public prosecutor's office as well as the extremely close cooperation with the complainants, there is ground to assume that the instructions of the services and the theft of the money from the sale of my property, which was intended for repayment to the Corona Committee, were discussed and that the whole body of evidence did not find its way into the relevant court files.

Statement 3 - Infringement of the law through the arbitrary exchange of facts and the denial of the right to be heard

In my opinion, the conduct of the presiding judge and public prosecutor John (as well as the other public prosecutors involved, Recha and Dr. Kutzner) constitutes the criminal offence of obstruction of justice pursuant to § 339 of the German Criminal Code. Because based on the facts it is proven that the complainant's claims are based on lies. Therefore, the proceedings against me should have been dropped with an acquittal and immediate release of myself from custody. Instead, in May 2024 the presiding judge replaced the original charges with new charges that were, as before, just as false. This time presiding judge had fabricated these himself. He then went on to refuse to hear the key witnesses named by us to refute the invented facts. This constitutes a further violation of the law. In addition, the presiding judge just stated in an order dated July 12, 2024, that he is aware that the public prosecutor's office had me kidnapped in Mexico and faked a deportation, as we carefully explained in detail during the hearing. He also knew that I had been denied my right to be heard and that crucial evidence had been and was being withheld by the public prosecutor's office. If, in the light of this, he continues to pursue the case and the other members of the court go along with trying to put me behind bars for a fabricated offence, they all stand to be guilty (especially the public prosecutor, of course) of obstruction of justice. According to the penal code a crime punishable by at least one year's imprisonment.

Statement 4 - Freedom of opinion, expression and information in the "fight for justice"

With this statement, I make it clear that, on the basis of established case law of the highest courts of the land, it is wrong that the Chairman asserted that we were not allowed to defend ourselves with ‘harsh words’ regarding our lawful accusations against the court and the public prosecutor's office.

For it is precisely when the state and the courts themselves have created an atmosphere charged with distress (re: kidnapping, denial of a legal hearing, withholding evidence, faking a crime, exchanging facts in order to reach a verdict against me without a hearing on the new facts), it must be possible for the defendant and his lawyers to also defend themselves with clear, unambiguous words. For this case law, I refer to our own mass proceedings against fraudulent banks and corrupt judges that have been running in the German courts for 26 years and have been aided and abetted by the mainstream media. This is because these legal disputes form the basis for the very extensive defence options in the constitutionally protected ***"fight for justice".*** This is granted by the highest courts to the parties involved in a trial, but specifically to a defendant in a criminal trial.

As a case in point: It came to light years later and was reported on at the time, not only by the media but also by the most important German legal journal NJW, that the highest judges of the Federal Court of Justice had secretly had entered into ‘agreements’ with bank representatives to the detriment of our clients in return for payment.

Introduction

On 17.05.2024, the presiding judge Schindler of the 5th Grand Criminal Chamber of the Göttingen Regional Court, consisting of five judges (three professional judges and two lay judges or lay assessors), announced a so-called procedural order. This was his first open but unconstitutional attempt to undermine our defence work. This was done with a mixture of barely concealed attempts of intimidation, deliberately false allegations and condescending statements to the defence and the public, whom he considers unable to understand what is happening in these proceedings.

He further claimed, without providing any evidence, that the defence was influencing the public by receiving phone calls and e-mails in an attempt to influence the court's decision making.

It seems impossible for calls from outsiders to be put through to the Chairman at all. If there have been any such emails or, as the Chairman claims, even anonymous threats, it must be determined who sent them. Similar such behaviour has since been reported by the complainants.

Obviously, the court and the public prosecutor's office, which is bound by instructions, are now doing everything they can to prevent the true facts of the case to come out. This culminated on July 31, 2024, when the presiding judge, in violation of the constitutionally guaranteed principle of orality and the principle of publicity, ordered that the proceedings should essentially be conducted in writing, i.e. without the public in attendance witnessing and hearing more than the mere exchange of court documents. And, more to the point, without the defendant himself being able to monitor which motions are made by his own lawyers. Thus, the defendant is only informed of this afterwards. In particular, the judge did not allow Viviane Fischer's lawyer Großenbach to speak, nor did he allow the lawyers for the defence to read out the motions and their grounds that lawyer Großenbach had submitted for Viviane Fischer. In my opinion, the judge and the court thus crossed the line into legal malpractice.

In my opinion, the sole aim of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution seemed to have been the utter destruction of the Citizens Corona Committee and the theft of the Corona Committee's donations. Viviane Fischer may also have realized this in the meantime.

Since we never agreed otherwise, I expect that Viviane Fischer would testify as a witness that, contrary to the court's "fabriaction", there was no agreement between her and the defendant to the

effect that the loan agreements should be a mere ‘sham’ transactions without binding effect in order to conceal trust agreements allegedly concluded to hold the donations in another account. Because the company for which the complainants Antonia Fischer and Justus Hoffmann claim to be acting never existed and never held any assets, the complainants Antonia Fischer and Justus Hoffmann could not have suffered any financial loss at any time, and therefore the defendant should be acquitted, as Viviane Fischer and her lawyer Großenbach correctly argued.

At the end of this introduction, I will make a summarizing oral statement on the four central points that corroborate the suspicion and justify a claim of obstruction of justice point by point and in its entirety.

In order not to appear to long winded, but still to furnish anyone interested with sufficient robust details to be able to counter any claims based on false or fraudulent information being circulated by the services. Therefore, we are publishing all relevant details in writing in German and in English. As for the English translation we have to solely rely on the help of our volunteer supporters since I have to use all my time to concentrate on my defence in court.

Before I give the verbal summaries of the statements, please allow me to make one more comment:

Of course, some of the parties to the trial have studied law, as the presiding judge remarked condescendingly and scornfully. This is abundantly apparent in the case of some of the parties to the proceedings. But I am no longer sure to whom this actually applies. In any case, I can rightfully lay claim to the fact that I have studied law not only in Germany, but also in the USA. Further, I have also taught law at various universities in Germany and abroad. I have a genuine - i.e. not plagiarized - doctorate in Germany and an LL.M., i.e. a Master of Laws, in the USA. I also passed the three-day bar exam in California in 1993.

I count over 30 years of experience as a litigator in both, Germany and the United States, working almost exclusively in the area of consumer protection and the protection of small and medium sized businesses against invariably fraudulent multinational corporations. As part of this work, I was involved in two class actions. Most recently, this involved a class action case pending in Southern California against Deutsche Bank in 2017 worth 85 billion dollars. I worked pro-bono, that is, without asking for or receiving money, by informing the court through an amicus-curiae brief that Deutsche Bank repeatedly not only **negligently** violated applicable law, but did so **intentionally.** For example, it committed systematic litigation fraud in German courts in order to win lawsuits through fabricated statements (i.e. lying). Two or three weeks after my brief and after I had reported it in front of the entire Management Board at a Deutsche Bank's Annual General Meeting, with the entire Supervisory Board and thousands of shareholders in attendance, Deutsche Bank suddenly settled on terms that have not yet been disclosed to the public. One wonder why?

In addition, I have published a number of legal articels in German legal and foreign publications. In my non-legal capacity I have experience as a soldier and a banker to boot minding the corporate business clients of Deutsche Bank from their Tokyo office. All of this is evident from my Curriculum Vitae (**attached**), but also, as far as my work as a lawyer is concerned, from numerous TV and press reports. The Curriculum Vitae is attached to this document.

In short: Against this background, there should at least be a factual presumption that I have more than just "***amateur***" legal knowledge. However, it remains questionable to what extent such a presumption also applies to other parties in ongoing proceedings.

To conclude this introductory passage, I would like to take the liberty of referring to Chairman Schindler's reference to the offence of ‘obstruction of justice’ - which I will discuss in more detail later. This offence can also be committed by public prosecutors and lay assessors. And a punishable attempt to obstruct justice can also exist ‘if’ - and I quote para. 21 of the Beck Online Commentary on the Criminal Code by Heintschel-Heinegg, Kudlich, 60th edition, as of 01.02.2024 - ‘a member of a collegiate court’ (namely Mr. Schindler) ‘unsuccessfully attempts to persuade other members of the collegiate court to commit an act of obstruction of justice. However, if they join in, then the attempt becomes a complete violation of the law for the instigating judge and all participating judges are guilty of complete violation of the law.’ (end quote)

One more thing, or "one more question", as Columbo and Steve Jobs used to say: the blatantly obvious violation of the law here bears international significance in regard of several aspects.
Firstly: This staged action is about preventing my international work.
Secondly: I was kidnapped from Mexico, i.e. from abroad, as I will explain in a moment.
In view of the fact that the abduction was irrefutably documented in the files, an international court, namely the **Common Law Courts in England**, intervened on my behalf and ordered my immediate release due to the lack of jurisdiction of the German court resulting from the abduction. It also also awarded damages in my favour. This is proof that justice, should it be perverted by the legal courts, is and perhaps can only be made possible outside a perverted system of justice under common law, that is by trial by jury of the people. It is not surprising that Chairman Schindler refers to the court as a "self-appointed court". However, this court is a genuine common law court, which applies the genuine, original common law, i.e. natural law. This is exactly the same law that was applied to the perpetrators during the Nuremberg trials after the collapse of the Third Reich. Was that also a ‘self-appointed court’? Justice will prevail simply on the basis of the true facts brought to light, and without legalese gobbledygook obscuring the view of right and wrong and good and evil, and also without procedural rules being abused to simply obscure the true facts.

Everyone will have to pay a price for what they have done. How high the price will be depends solely on what the perpetrators have done and what they continue to do until the day of reckoning comes. Because justice is what the people recognize - not that which a corrupt system fabricates.

I. The abduction ordered by the German authorities under the supervision of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution and the concealment of the abduction by means of a mock deportation

The chairman's assertion that there was no abduction at all, but simply a deportation, is an assertion against his better judgment, i.e. a deliberate lie. An inadvertent false assertion or mis-interpretation can safely be ruled out here because this connection between the abduction and the deportation is clear from the court documents itself.

If the Mexican police had wanted to arrest me in Mexico, I would have had to either commit a criminal offence in said country or violated Mexican immigration law, which indisputably has never been the case. Because the BKA, working together with the German Office for the Protection of the Constitution, acting through officer Götz Knobloch in Mexico, and the BKA officer Monica Vazquez, exchanged an e-mail on August 24, 2023, according to sheet 131 of the main document, volume 3:

> "The arrest of the wanted person in Mexico is only possible on the basis of a national (Mexican) arrest warrant."

But there was no such thing, and there couldn't have been because I hadn't committed any crimes in Mexico or against a Mexican citizen and because I hadn't violated Mexican immigration law.

However, it would **theoretically** have been possible to apply for my **extradition** via the Mexican judiciary on the basis of the German arrest warrant. This is exactly what the BKA operative Knobloch had in mind since he goes on in the next sentence of the same e-mail:

> "If necessary, it makes sense to already prepare the necessary **extradition documents** in Germany."

But that would have backfired on the German secret services and the German judiciary immediately, as well as in Mexico, i.e. at international level. Because firstly, its baseless context would have come to light at the time. This in the context of my statement on the extradition request, that the arrest warrant had no legal foundation, since its supporting cornerstone was the - false - assertion that I, as managing director of the company, was not authorized to manage the company alone. In truth, I was - just like all the other shareholders and contrary to the allegations of the complainants - indeed authorized to manage the company alone. It would therefore have turned out during the extradition proceedings in Mexico that the complainants had sated a falsehood in their criminal complaint.

Secondly, it would have come to light that public prosecutor John, who had applied for the unlawful arrest warrant, had not carried out any proper due diligence in his investigation, but blindly and willingly cooperated with the complainants. On top of that he expressly refused to inquire with my team of three trusted lawyers in he matter. It would also have turned out that the complainants had in all likelihood fraudulently appropriated the purchase price for my Göttingen property, which among other things was meant to repay the loan to the Corona Committee.
Above all, it would have been clear at the time that Public Prosecutor John knew about these strategems from the beginning and was continuously informed by the complainants, but did nothing to stop it. The fact that to this day he even remained completely inactive in response to our criminal complaint of December 2023 suggests an obstruction of justice in office.

None of this was allowed to come to light, because otherwise the behaviour of public prosecutor John and the Federal Criminal Police Office and the Lower Saxony State Criminal Police Office, which were almost certainly working for the Office for the Protection of the Constitution, would have already been clearly exposed during the extradition proceedings in Mexico.

Where do we get the certainty that the Office for the Protection of the Constitution (VS) is controlling everything in these proceedings against me? Just from the dossier? Not alone, the file itself proves it. It contains the letter from the FIU (Financial Intelligence Unit), which is part of the Customs Directorate General, dated February 15, 2022, with which the Office for the Protection of the Constitution tried to take action against me, but then failed due to the upright and law-abiding senior public prosecutor Reinicke, who due to a lack of criminal evidence had the files put away in June 2022. This letter was prepared by a Mr. Schmelter from the FIU, which is part of the Directorate General of Customs, and sent to the Lower Saxony State Criminal Police Office. It is headed **"Relevance to state security".** And Mr. Schmelter explicitly identifies himself as an employee of the "State Security" department, which is linked to the Office for the Protection of the Constitution. On page 17 he writes to the LKA Lower Saxony:

> "For your information, I am informing you that the analysis report (this letter) (...) has been forwarded to the **Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution**."

The next sentence shows that this was kept secret, even from other German authorities:

"Other domestic public bodies (...) have not yet been informed."

However, as noted, this first attempt by the Office for the Protection of the Constitution to initiate criminal proceedings against me was unsuccessful thanks to Senior Public Prosecutor Reinicke. So two and a half months later, the three Berlin complainants known to another asset of services (whose name I will not mention at this point) began their action by filing their version of a criminal complaint on September 2, 2022. Subsequently public prosecutor John was transferred from Hanover to Göttingen so that senior public prosecutor Reinicke would not be able to stop their (the three Berlin lawyers') "nonsense".

The Göttingen judiciary attempts for extradition, with freshly appointed public prosecutor John in tandem, (as a compliant, Stasi-like puppet specifically transferred to Göttingen from Hanover), would have abjectly failed since all of their fabrications would have been plainly revealed during my hearing in any extradition proceedings. Additionally, this could have no longer been ignored by the mainstream media outlets. Remember that Göttingen is described in a New York Times article as the "heart of darkness" when it comes to freedom of expression. Because in Göttingen there was and is a special police unit that operates undercover on the internet as if they were right-wing radicals or ‘Reichsbürger’ (i.e patriots) to get others to speak out in similar fashion so that it generates a virtual fake enemy with real people falling for it to attract surveillance and possible prosecution. I reported on this in the ICIC video on the psychology and psychopathy of the "p(l)andemic".

This is precisely why the assets carried out an abduction and tried to disguise it by faking a ‘legal’ deportation; of course, there was no real deportation. This is also clearly documented in the court document . Because on page 141 of the main file, the State Criminal Police Office of Lower Saxony, controlled by the Office for the Protection of the Constitution, writes the following to public prosecutor John on 01.09.2023 - signed by Lars Roggatz,- cc’d to the BKA -

> "The current plan is to **lure** Reiner Füllmich to the consulate under the **pretext that** he still has to correct/provide a signature on his passport and then have him arrested by the immigration authorities."

The words "pretext" and "lure" prove beyond any doubt that we - my wife and I - were to be deliberately deceived and trapped because of alleged passport/visa/immigration problems, which in reality did not exist. This furnished an order to be provisionally arrested and subsequently to be deported to Germany bypassing any extradition proceedings (as mentioned: everything would have already come out during my hearing). All this was planned by Götz Knobloch, as Lars Roggatz, LKA Lower Saxony, informed public prosecutor John in an e-mail dated October 4, 2023 (page 152 of the file):

"Mr. Knobloch has planned everything and I am confident that everything will work out."

Knobloch announced on the same day that the accused would be arrested at Tijuana airport *"in consultation with the immigration authorities"*.

A few days earlier, Knobloch had persuaded the Mexican immigration authorities to fake a deportation with the help of Mexican BKA official Monica Vazquez. On 21.09.2023 (page 149) Knobloch wrote:

> "So the immigration authority is not a problem."

In other words, my wife and I were lured to Tijuana by the honorary consul there, who in turn had been put under pressure by the German embassy in Mexico City, this without any legal basis. In fact, there were no visa or immigration problems. That is exactly why only I, and not my wife, was flown out to Germany by two immigration officials. This bogus deportation was, by the way, not paid for by the Mexican side, but by the 'client', namely Germany. Bearing in mind that we **both** had alleged passport problems and thus should have been deported **together**. However, my wife was able to fly back to finally tend to our dogs the next day.

I was even able to phone the consul Carlos Enkerlin in Tijuana because the whole thing seemed completely strange to the head immigration officer. And he explained to me and then apparently also to the officials (in Spanish) that there was foul play going on here, but that he couldn't get out of it. The head of the authority then told me with downcast eyes that he didn't know what was going on, but unfortunately, there was nothing he could do. But he wished me all the best. In the meantime, the consul Carlos Enkerlin also apologized for this to my wife.

In short: the immigration authority, or rather its heads of operations, which were clearly put under pressure by German officials, bowed to it. Without German pressure, nothing would have happened. This is once again made abundantly clear by the sentence from BKA official Knobloch to public prosecutor John on page 159 of the main file, volume 3:

> "So the immigration authority is not a problem."

Why should the Mexican immigration authority, which is carrying out a deportation of an immigration case pose a problem for a German authority? Because there never was an immigration case. So one had to be constructed at the request of the German authorities in order to somehow prevent the whole truth from coming to light in the course of extradition proceedings. The Mexican immigration authorities did not pose a problem in **this respect**: It was the German authorities that were set to **disguise** the kidnapping as an immigration case.

The final proof that there were only fabricated passport problems followed by a faked deportation can be found in the deportation order, which is certainly not by chance only in Spanish. This becomes clear on page 33 of volume 2 of the file, the facts of which the presiding judge Schindler referred to only briefly in an anxious/cursory manner, apparently hoping that no one would take a closer look or even have it translated into German.

The Mexican national immigration authority writes there that my deportation order is being carried out in accordance with Section 144 of the Immigration Act, without explaining which of the provisions there actually form the basis for my deportation. Section 144 **is the only** legal basis for deportations from Mexico by the immigration authorities. Section 144 stipulates that a foreigner must be expelled from the national territory if it can be proven that:

1. he/she enters the country without the required documents via a place that is not authorized for the international transit of persons in accordance with para. 1;

This paragraph does not apply, because my wife and I entered the country with valid German passports legally as we were issued standard entry visas.

2. expulsion is possible: ...if a person re-enters the country without authorization after being expelled.

This option is obviously not applicable to us either.

3. …..orders a deportation if someone pretends to be Mexican who is not.

This variant obviously does not apply to our case either.

4. …..orders deportation if a person endangers national or public security due to a previous conviction in Mexico or abroad.

My wife and I are not even close to this in any shape or form.

5. ….orders expulsion if a foreigner makes false statements or submits falsified documents or submits genuine documents that he or she obtained fraudulently.

This is certainly not the case for me or my wife.

6. ….orders expulsion if someone does not comply with an order issued by the immigration authority to leave the national territory.

Neither does this apply to either of us here.

There is therefore no = zero, zilch, nada doubt that there was any basis for any deportation order. A formal deportation order that now reveals itself to have been the sole purpose of an outright deception by the authorities, as there were no grounds for it. In other words, at the request of the German authorities, it was simply intended to create the false appearance that a deportation had been enacted, although in reality an "abduction" had taken place that had no legal basis whatsoever. Everyone hoped that no one would ever check the legal grounds for a deportation order, namely Section 144 of the immigration Act, as has now happened, so that everything was blown open.

Apart from that, the real deportation order would have been settled by me being put on the plane **alone** at the international airport in Mexico City. But here I was accompanied by two Mexican officials. And one of them, who was halfway fluent in English, explained to me that this was all being arranged and paid for by the German authorities - including the two flights for the officers who were supposed to guard me. Even this completely lacks any semblance of a real deportation had it been enacted by the Mexican authorities.

Supplementary: The archive of Stasi documents contains a lexicon with the following explanations of the term "abduction":

"Until the 1970s, kidnapping, i.e. abduction in the sense of criminal law, was an elementary component of the strategy and tactics of the GDR secret police." (https://www.bundesarchiv.de/im-archiv-recherchieren/stasi-unterlagen-einsehen/hinweise-zum-mfs/mfs-lexikon/detail/entfuehrung/)

And in the dictionary of political-operative work compiled by the Law School of the Ministry of State Security in 1969, the offense of kidnapping is interpreted as a manifestation of terror crimes as follows:

> "It is the removal of people against their will by specific means and methods (threat of violence, **deception,** narcotization, intoxication and others) from their original place of residence to other places, states and territories."
> (https://www.bundesarchiv.de/im-archiv-recherchieren/stasi-unterlagen-einsehen/hinweise-zum-mfs/mfs-lexikon/detail/entfuehrung/)

Even without including this, albeit revealing, Stasi information in the assessment of Presiding Judge Schindler's assertion, there can be no doubt that his assertion that a simple deportation was carried out by the Mexican authorities is an outright lie, given the contents of the file and the deportation order referred to by Schindler, was enacted on the basis of deceiving the public when it is so blatantly obvious that: The public prosecutor John, who had been purposely transferred from Hanover to Göttingen, arranged my abduction from Mexico in collaboration with the services controlling him.

One of the most respected German professors of criminal law, Prof. Dr. h. c. mult. Bernd Schünemann, has commented on this problem in an extensive essay entitled "Substantive examination of suspicion and kidnapping in violation of international law as nation-state explosive devices in international extradition traffic" in the journal Goldthammers Archiv für Strafrecht.

1. on page 237 he states:

> "It goes without saying that detention initiated by abduction is a deprivation of liberty that violates the fundamental right under Article 2 (2) section 2 of the Basic Law."

2. he then states on the same page:

> "Even under general state liability law, an unlawful encroachment on fundamental rights triggers a claim to remedy the consequences."

3 On page 239 he explains:

> "It is also generally recognized that the kidnapping of an accused organized by law enforcement authorities of one state (here: Göttingen Public Prosecutor's Office in cooperation with the Office for the Protection of the Constitution, the Lower Saxony State Criminal Police Office and the Federal Criminal Police Office) organized the abduction of an accused person on the territory of another state constitutes an offence contrary to international law, which obliges the abducting state (here: Germany) to return the abductee at the request of the injured state (here: Mexico)."

But what if the injured state - be it out of political consideration (here: its own involvement in the abduction at the request of the German authorities) - does not assert its claim for restitution? Then, according to Schünemann, "an effective means of preventing this blot on the tableau of international legal assistance relations is the granting of restitution claims (= claims for damages) to the abductee himself, which must be aimed at his release, if not the final termination of the criminal proceedings due to a procedural impediment".

4. after all, this is about "criminal practices of law enforcement agencies" (page 237 of the essay), which, if allowed to continue, would amount to an undermining of the presumption of innocence and "the establishment of the law of the fist".

But not only the circumvention of the legal provisions for a formal deportation or extradition proceedings point to the involvement of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution in my case: as I have now discovered by studying the files again, the terms "***Corona***" or "***Corona reference***" can be found in various places on the special volumes for account evaluation next to the file number!!!

I ask myself, how can it be that a reference to ***Corona*** plays a role in an alleged purely economic criminal case and is mentioned again and again in the files ?!?

II Timely and complete legal hearing is the central prerequisite for a fair trial

The principle that a person accused of having committed a criminal offence must be granted a timely hearing is a central guarantee of a fair trial in all civilized constitutional states. In Germany, this principle is guaranteed in Article 103 of the Basic Law and is based on the Roman legal principle of "audiatur et altera pars", i.e. hearing the other party too.

In fact, the right to be heard in criminal proceedings is something of a special manifestation of the right to freedom of opinion, expression and information guaranteed to **all** citizens in German law in Article 5 of the Basic Law as a **right of defense against the state**. This freedom of opinion, expression and information is **the** central fundamental right par excellence. Without freedom of opinion, expression and information, there is no democracy, only lies and propaganda as tools of manipulation and, as a result, totalitarianism instead of democracy. That is why all democracies have guaranteed this central right of defence of the citizen against encroachments by the state. So that the citizen is specially protected against encroachments by the state - for example a state could have been captured by private interests of corporations and/or organizations,. This right is also guaranteed in the US Constitution in its First Amendment.

Since this right of defence becomes all the more important when a citizen is accused by an omnipotent state of having committed a crime, it is of particular importance in criminal proceedings. This is underlined by the fact that Article 103 of the Basic Law makes it clear that the accused in criminal proceedings must (even more so) be guaranteed the right to freedom of opinion, expression and information as a right to a fair hearing, because this is the only way to ensure a fair trial in the face of an attack on the citizen by state authority.

This is because the only reason why citizens have transferred the right to clarify their own affairs to the state courts is their trust in a fair trial, i.e. that all parties to a legal dispute, in particular the accused of a criminal offence who is being attacked by the state, can say and also learn everything relevant to the proceedings: However, an accused can of course only say everything if he is also made aware of all the allegations made. This means, in particular, if he is made aware of the **complete** set of points in any investigation and not - as in this case - a document from which at least 80 decision-relevant pieces of evidence in the form of said telephone conversations between the public prosecutor's office and the complainants and others are missing. It also includes, decision-relevant documents, such as the financial liquidity documents of Viviane Fischer's husband, on the basis of which public prosecutor John closed all investigations against Viviane Fischer.

A current and important example of how crucial such withholding of evidence by the public prosecutor's office is, is the recent decision in favour of the American actor Alec Baldwin in New Mexico, USA. There, the prosecution had withheld a few cartridges and not disclosed them to the defence. As a result of this withholding of evidence, the proceedings were terminated in favour of Alec Baldwin, once and for all.

In short: The freedom of opinion, expression and information, which is protected in Article 5 of the Basic Law, applies all the more to the accused of a criminal offence and is therefore, once again, clearly guaranteed in Article 103 of the Basic Law.

In my particular criminal proceedings, there can no longer be any doubt in my mind that the accusations made against me by the four Berlin lawyers were "fabricated" at the instigation of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution. In the end, it is of secondary importance whether the hatred openly expressed by the witnesses Antonia Fischer and Justus Hoffmann in court is merely a consequence of their own envy, or whether - as the dossier suggests - the Verfassungsschutz (VS)

used these people and their possible emotional instability with the help of undercover agents, to stir up such feelings of emotional turbulence and direct them in such a way that they themselves became undercover assets for the Office for the Protection of the Constitution. This, in consequence, led to the filing of a criminal complaint against me and thus "snatch" the money intended for the committee's investigative work. Since my unlawful "expulsion" from my own position of the Corona Committee, the two complainants have obviously not continued the investigative work to this day and there are no plans to do so, as was clearly evident from their testimony in court, among other things.

In view of the collapse of the accusations, which were obviously false from the outset (at least for everyone not involved in this trial fraud), it must have been about something other than the official accusations, namely about silencing me - and thus everyone else who thinks and works like me - that is, **all of us.** Because what we have learned through the questioning of countless genuine, non-captured experts on the "p(l)andemic" (and what is now corroborated by the RKI files, German equivalent of the US-CDC) has shown to the public at large, that we have been massively manipulated and lied to by a captured media and likewise politicians with the help of captured pseudo-scientists. And once we realized that these lies and manipulations with its destructive and deadly consequences had eroded all trust once and for all, we began to wonder what else we had been lied to about and who was ultimately responsible for this mess. Those in charge knew very well that their house of cards of lies and manipulation would collapse when the full truth comes to light. Well, now it appears the house of cards is collapsing at an accelerating speed worldwide.

Donald Trump's words at his recent trial, whatever else you may think about him, were dead right when he told Americans about the absolutely ridiculous criminal proceedings he was subjected to in New York City: "They're not chasing me, they're chasing you. I'm just standing in the way."

In the meantime panic seems to have set in on the other side of the fence, especially among the psychopathic string-pullers, because their small window of opportunity has already closed. This is why they are acting more and more desperately at all levels and making bigger and bigger mistakes. Individuals on our side of the fence have long since ceased to matter. The younger generation, of all people, which was largely asleep during the P(l)andemic, has now also woken up to the almost insane, and in any case monstrous, slaughter in Gaza and has set something in motion all over the world - regardless of religion, race, gender or nationality - that can no longer be stopped because it has now reached the mainstream media:

In an interview on the TV channel TRT (on the Internet: trt.world)- albeit not propaganda-free (i.e., climate change panic and the occasional virus and p(l)andemic panic etc.) - , four students from University College London, including one Jew, explained in the "Bigger Than Five" section that they knew that the Gaza events were influenced by a misanthropic mindset of ideas of eugenics. The went on to say that this theory of eugenics to this day been responsible for colonialism in any shape or form including all other forms of oppression (i.e., apartheid in South Africa and slavery in the USA). (There are a number of interesting interviews on YouTube, for example in the series "Bigger than Five" on manipulation by the mainstream media with the journalist Jeremy Scahill, or in the series "Nexus" on the Olympic scandal concerning the satanic opening ceremony and the participation of an athlete convicted of raping a child).

The case in point is that from this knowledge of the Gaza incident, it is only a very small step to the realization that the very eugenics agenda may have been driving the p(l)andemic operations too. We have largely cast a big spotlight on its goals of the depopulation agenda and complete digital control of those remaining. Thus, the pieces of the larger picture come together to shed a light on the entire structure, that once out in the open, justice can be comprehensively served. An 80-year-

old Jewish psychiatrist from Canada called Gabor Mate and Holocaust surviver as a young child, explained on TRT:

"There can be no peace without justice."

I was very impressed by the interview with him, because he also explained that we now live in a globally poisoned culture with the visible consequence that, for example, 70 percent of all Americans believe they have to take at least one form of pharmaceutical drug every day. He further explained that the perpetrators of this suffering, despite being severely traumatized - and not, as I believe, simply born psychopaths without any human quality - cannot be cured. It is these adults who don't want to be healed. But, he also says, it is enough for a few good people to stand up and tell the truth. And that is exactly what is happening worldwide now. We on our side of this artificial divide are doing it worldwide since the students use their conscience of humanity and now the public at large are doing their bit worldwide, so the picture of this puzzle is as good as complete.

Back to freedom of opinion, expression and information and the right to be heard in any court proceedings, particularly in criminal proceedings. In criminal proceedings, the principle of the right to be heard requires that the accused must be granted the right to be heard **before charges are brought**. Only if, in accordance with the Roman legal principle of 'audiatur et altera pars', the accused is given sufficient opportunity to comment on the accusation before charges are brought, can it be guaranteed that charges will not be brought or an arrest warrant issued in the first place.

In my case, the three Berlin lawyers filed a criminal complaint against me on September 2, 2022 and attached a document to this criminal complaint as Annex A 3, which strongly suggested that the complainants themselves were fraudsters. In my opinion, they had already embezzled client funds amounting to many hundreds of thousands of euros on September 2, 2022 and intended to access further third-party funds (namely money from the sale of my Göttingen property, which was intended for loan repayment, among other things) to the tune of millions. If the public prosecutor's office had granted me the right to be heard in accordance with Article 103 of the Basic Law at that time, i.e. before the arrest warrant was issued on 15.03.2023 (there was more than enough time for this, the criminal complaint dates from 02.09.2022), would have brought this connection to light in time. My lawyers and I could have informed the public prosecutor's office that the claim that I should not have taken out the loan I first place, because as managing director I was not authorized to manage the company alone, was false and based on a further deception by the complainants. This together with the now proven fact that the Corona Committee's donation account was **actually** at risk so that the conclusion of the **loan agreements** was clearly intended to **temporarily secure part of the donations.** It therefore stands as an undisputed clear fact that I was always willing and able to repay the Corona Committee's money.

1. my actions to secure part of the donations with the help of a loan were covered by the discretion of the managing director of a company, i.e. by the Business Judgment Rule, so that there is no basis for a criminal offence (exactly as already established by Senior Public Prosecutor Reinicke two and a half months before the criminal complaint of 02.09.2022). As managing directors, we had sole management authority and were exempt from Section 181 BGB. A shareholders' resolution to issue loans to each other was therefore not required; moreover, one shareholder always acted on behalf of Vor-gUG, which incidentally has not been officially registered to this day and also never achieved the desired non-profit status. It thus never came into existence as a company to this day and must therefore definitively be considered a failed company.

2. the complainants are using the criminal proceedings they have instituted against me to circumvent the actually competent civil courts in order to obtain funds to which, in my opinion, they have no claim whatsoever in accordance with the statutes of the company and the purpose that

the donors pursued with their donations - namely to promote educational work with regard to the legality and meaningfulness of the state corona measures. And: Contrary to their repeatedly false claims, the company for which they claim to be acting does not exist; contrary to their repeatedly false claims, the Vor-gUG was never registered, precisely because the complainants themselves, in cooperation with another alleged VS-asset (Verfassungsschutzagent), prevented the registration in November or December 2021.

However, this would have meant that there would no longer have been any basis for a criminal investigation, let alone an indictment or even an arrest warrant against me. Instead, the complainants would have had to be investigated and charged, and arrest warrants would have had to be issued against them.

However, those who used the "puppet" public prosecutor John, who was bound by instructions from up on high, wanted to prevent this. That's why he was specially transferred from Hanover to Göttingen: so that he could enact the criminal complaint that had obviously been drawn up by emotionally unstable characters. Without even attempting to investigate, let alone grant me a legal hearing, he issued a warrant for my arrest and drew up an untenable indictment against me. Every effort was to be made to prevent Chief Public Prosecutor Reinicke, who had had the files put away three months earlier in full knowledge of all the circumstances because there was no evidence of any criminal offence, from making the same decision again and then initiating investigations against the three complainants, bringing charges against them and issuing arrest warrants against them.

I was even denied the right to be heard at my very first hearing in Göttingen on November 1, 2023. The judge, who had already blindly signed the fabricated arrest warrant without any examination (judge at Moog Local Court), interrupted my statements with the words that he was not interested in what I had to say.

The right to be heard can no longer be trampled on more brazenly and obviously. Because, as fellow lawyer Mirko Laudon writes on the website https://www.strafakte.de/strafverteidigung/kein-rechtliches-gehoer-im-ermittlungsverfahren:

> "If the court allows this treatment to pass and opens the main proceedings, it makes it clear that it - like the public prosecutor's department heads - is not interested in a fair trial, but at best in a short trial."

And so **Mirko Laudon** continues:

> "It is then no longer possible to do what would have been possible with a proper and **timely** hearing: it is no longer possible to influence the decision of the public prosecutor's office and, if necessary, avoid proceedings. This means that the purpose of questioning the accused in good time as part of the preliminary proceedings can no longer be achieved."

And after everything we have experienced, that was precisely the purpose of the denial of any legal hearing and the denial of any investigation in my case, just as it was the purpose of the abduction in circumvention of extradition proceedings: under no circumstances was the truth allowed to come out before an arrest warrant had been issued against me and the abduction from Mexico completed including my unlawful incarceration in a German prison by way of deprivation of my liberty.

III. obstruction of justice through the arbitrary exchange of facts and the refusal to hear Viviane Fischer on this and corresponding clarifying statements

Because he knows exactly that his conduct - if successful - would qualify as a crime in the legal assessment, namely as a violation of the law punishable by at least one year's imprisonment, the presiding judge at the Regional Court Schindler declared on 17.05.2024 by way of so-called projection that the defence would accuse the chamber of a violation of the law and a qualified deprivation of liberty. The following can be said about this:

Now that the presiding judge, because the originally charged facts have collapsed, has exchanged these facts for other, 'de-novo fabricated facts', he can only prevent the discovery of these new inventions by

1. abruptly interrupting the hearing of evidence at his orders

2. does not even hear the witnesses named by **us** to refute the de-novo fabricated facts and

3. effectively excludes the public from the proceedings and

4. Without a public hearing on these new facts, a judgment was quickly pronounced against me by way of a violation of the law.

In my opinion, this makes Mr. Schindler beyond any doubt guilty of obstruction of justice.

The offence of obstruction of justice is defined in Section 339 StGB as a **crime** punishable by at least one year's imprisonment. § Section 339 StGB states that a judge - including lay judges - or public prosecutor who bends the law to the disadvantage of a party. However, it does not say exactly what constitutes obstruction of justice. Case law has defined this. According to this definition, a violation of the law occurs when - generally speaking - objective legal rules are broken and a decision is made that objectively contradicts the law and is no longer justifiable.

By breaking these rules, according to established supreme court case law, the judge (or prosecutor) must **deliberately** and **seriously** depart from the law. Once again: In my opinion, the substitution of facts in order to achieve the desired - or here presumably: demanded - conviction in a different way after the collapse of the facts constituting the original charges, undoubtedly constitutes the offence of obstruction of justice. This even more so if the judge also denies the defendant the right to be heard on these new, previously uncharged facts, i.e. refuses to take evidence requested by the defence to examine the allegations now (since 3 May 2024) in focus and then also effectively excludes the public from the trial.

Throughout the entire main hearing, the presiding judge had built on the accusation of the public prosecutor's office - this cannot be emphasized often enough - that I had committed embezzlement by taking out a private loan from Corona Committee donations and using the loan privately, including by investing in my property, as managing director of the Corona Committee.

Only when it turned out that

– the content of the indictment was false,

– as Managing Director of the Corona Committee, I had sole management authorization,

and when it was established in the course of the taking of evidence that

– my taking out a loan to temporarily secure part of the donations against immanent confiscation was covered by the managing director's discretionary powers and freedom of action, i.e. by the business judgment rule of company law,

this accusation had to be dropped.

This should have ended the criminal proceedings against me, I should have been acquitted and released immediately. Instead, the presiding judge replaced the now untenable accusations with the assertion that no loan agreements had been concluded - mind you, they were on file in writing! - Instead, there had in fact been an agreement between Viviane Fischer and myself to the effect that the loan agreements had only been concluded as a sham transaction, i.e. with the proviso that they should not be effective, in order to conceal the fact that a trust agreement had in fact been concluded between us, according to which the money was to be transferred to another account and remain there.

This new accusation is based on nothing but a mirage, because Viviane Fischer herself stated when questioned by the chairman that she had - allegedly - assumed that we would both hold the money withdrawn under the loan agreement as a liquidity reserve, but that this had never been explicitly discussed. And she had also explained that transferring the money from the donation account to another account would have been "counterproductive" in her opinion. And on 31.07.2024, she and the lawyer acting on her behalf, Mr. Großenbach, were only prevented by a muzzle from the court from clarifying that there was no sham transaction agreement, but only effective loan agreements and that there was or is no company whose shareholders could be harmed, because there were also no company assets, so that I must be acquitted immediately.

The conclusion of loan agreements was also confirmed by further evidence: on the one hand, there were only ever three written loan agreements, which contain all the constitutive elements of a loan agreement, such as the loan amount, term, regulation of interest, repayment and specific designation of the contracting parties. These agreements were concluded between two fully qualified lawyers and attorneys. There are no statements to the contrary: there were no written agreements to the contrary regarding the conclusion of trust agreements or the agreement of a liquidity reserve instead, or that the loan agreements were only concluded as a sham. Such deviating provisions would also have required the written form. Particularly in the case of two fully qualified lawyers as contracting parties, it can be assumed that they are able to state precisely in legal terms what type of agreement they wanted to conclude. Supplementary documents or, for example, the chat histories referred to by the court do not contain any indications that the loan agreements were only concluded as a sham in order to conceal underlying trust agreements. The safekeeping of donations vis-à-vis donors does not automatically constitute a fiduciary agreement either, so there is no corresponding written agreement here either.

The conclusion of loan agreements was also confirmed during the hearing of evidence by the testimonies of Tobias Weißenborn, Cathrin Behn, Martin Schwab and Roger Bittel as well as further testimonies from the private sphere and from the committee's former accountant. Tobias Weißenborn who was personally and organizationally involved in the conclusion of the loan agreements. None of the witnesses heard in court testified that there had been any talk of sham contracts or trust agreements when the contracts were concluded or in the period thereafter, or that the parties had wanted to conclude anything other than the loan agreements presented.

Moreover, the articles of association of Vor-gUG did not exclude the granting of loan agreements, especially as the non-profit status that the company was aiming for was never achieved.

There was no financial loss or mere threat to the assets of the (non-existent) company, as the conclusion of the loan agreements resulted in the acquisition of a repayment claim, both formally and materially, which would also have been legally enforceable. Sufficient real estate assets to guarantee repayment of the loan amounts were available to me at all times.
I had secured the loan amounts I had taken out with the equivalent value of my property in Göttingen and would have been able to repay them in any case by selling this property. I repeatedly confirmed this in numerous mediation discussions and other public statements and interviews from this period (summer/autumn 2022). The testimony of lawyer Tobias Weißenborn on the conclusion of the loan agreements also confirmed this, as did the other witnesses heard. The Criminal Chamber also states this again in its decision of 11.06.2024 on page 4 below.

The repayment of the loans was ultimately prevented by the intervention of the Berlin lawyer Marcel Templin after the sale of my Göttingen property had already taken place and the subsequent registration of the land charge assigned to him in February 2021 for a claim in a completely different amount. There was already no substantive legal claim for the land charge, as the majority of the members of the "class-action" plaintiff group had already concluded a direct client relationship with my law firm. In addition, Marcel Templin received an amount of 1.15 million from the sale of my property, which realized a total of 1.345 million euros. As proof of this, there are written payment instructions from the notary, numerous emails, bank statements, etc., which are on file, and the questioning of the notary Kleinjohann involved and the witness Hoffmann in court also confirmed this.

In this respect, the Economic Criminal Chamber assumed in its decision of 11.06.2024 on page 6 that the proceeds from the sale of my property would have been sufficient to repay the loan amount of € 700,000 that was the subject of the proceedings and that *"in any case, Mr. Templin had no material claim in this amount".*

Whether Mr. Templin had a claim beyond this has no effect on the present proceedings, as further explained in the Chamber's decision.

To the best of our knowledge, however, the money is still in Marcel Templin's account to this day, without the Göttingen public prosecutor's office having intervened in this regard or secured the funds - despite the criminal complaint we filed at the beginning of December 2023. The defense also formally declared an assignment of the claim against Marcel Templin to Vor-gUG in writing at the end of November last year in the present criminal proceedings.

Just like my ability to repay, the examination of the witnesses listed above confirmed my willingness to repay. In particular, the witness Cathrin Behn stated in court that it was absolutely clear that the sale of my property in Göttingen was to be used to settle the debts from the loan agreements to Vor-gUG. This was also confirmed by the witnesses Weißenborn, Schwab, Bittel and Kuhn as well as the witnesses from the private sphere. Even Viviane Fischer admitted this in court.

This is also evident from a large number of public statements, emails - which are also in the file and were even attached to the criminal complaint - and public interviews from 2022.

How, on the other hand, the Trial Chamber concluded in its decision of 16.07.2024 that I...

> *"since the fall of 2021, as a result of the dispute with Antonia Fischer and Dr. Hoffmann in the summer of 2021, no longer wanted to repay the amounts at all to the previous company existing with them, so that from this point in time there was no longer any willingness to repay to the previous company",*

is not apparent and *does not* arise in this form *either from the sighting of evidence or from the witness statements* or from my own admission. This statement has been freely invented by the court or any statements on the internal company disputes in the pre-gUG have simply been taken out of context.

The Chamber continues:

> *"The reasons why he later decided to use the amount only for the ICIC are of no relevance to the question of guilt or the question of punishment for the acts of embezzlement to the detriment of the predecessor company."*

This finding by the Chamber also lacks any basis and is certainly not the result of the taking of evidence, which was largely forced by the defence.

Only the witness statements of Roger Bittel, Prof. Martin Schwab, Cathrin Behn, Tobias Weißenborn, Ivan Künnemann and also, and even more so, the questioning of Viviane Fischer speak against the above misinterpretations of the court. None of the witness statements even remotely supports the Chamber's assumption.

Even the complainants - who had (presumably intentionally) submitted incomplete documents on the sole management authority of all shareholders to the public prosecutor's office when filing the complaint - attached my e-mail dated 26.08.2022 as Annex 3.

I already point out in this Annex 3 that my property was already being sold at the time and that I could otherwise have taken out a land charge on the property in the amount of € 700,000 at any time to repay the entire loan amount. The loan amounts were to be repaid from the sale of my property - as was repeatedly emphasized during the process.

Given the circumstances also described in court, namely that Viviane Fischer and I had distanced ourselves further and further from the two complainants Dr. Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer from the summer of 2021 onwards, since they no longer attended the weekly committee meetings at all as they had not participated in the committee's activities in any way, it is particularly perfidious to conclude that I had no longer been willing to repay the loan amounts since that time.

It is true that we - i.e. Viviane Fischer and I - wanted to part ways with the two complainants and exclude them from the company by December 2021 at the latest. This did not work due to the 50:50 distribution of votes, as is already known.

However, it was in fact the case that Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer wanted to "take" 50% of the donations with them when they left the company in the form of the settlement agreement before the court. This was despite the fact that they were no longer involved in the activities of the committee in any way, which they confirmed in court.

There was therefore no legal basis for the settlement offered.

All donors also made donations for the continuation of the committee's work and educational work. This can also be seen from the large Excel spreadsheet available to the court, which the committee's accountant had previously prepared. This extremely detailed table lists every donation to the Corona Committee, no matter how small, in the amount of € 5 or € 10. The posting texts listed mainly show "Donation Corona Committee" or "Support SCA". It is therefore perfectly understandable that the majority of donors naturally wanted to support the continuation of the educational work by the Corona Committee and thus primarily the two protagonists of the committee, who essentially

carried out this educational work. These were Viviane Fischer and myself, but from spring/summer 2021 at the latest, the two complainants no longer carried out any investigative work in the Corona Committee. They also stated in court that they did not want to continue their investigative work. Ultimately, they have not done so in the last two years since my exclusion from the pre-society in October 2021.

I, on the other hand, have repeatedly - and publicly - expressed my willingness to repay the loan, including in the detailed program on Bittel-TV on 21.09.2022, where I clearly mentioned that I would repay the loan amounts from the proceeds of the sale of my property. In this regard, I recommend that the Chamber watch this program and **hereby expressly request that it do so,**

> *to grant me permission to play the program on Bittel-TV from 21.09.2022 publicly in the main hearing as part of my last word as a defendant in the courtroom as proof of my willingness to repay the loan amounts totaling € 700,000, which I have consistently and repeatedly asserted in public.*

Of course, when I sold my property, I was concerned with repaying the loan amount to the Corona-Ausschuss-Vorschalt-gUG. As a lawyer, fully qualified lawyer and even Dr. jur., I am well aware that repayment must always be made to the original company. This was also expressly confirmed by the witness statements of Tobias Weißenborn, Ivan Künnemann and Roger Bittel. None of the other witnesses mentioned in their statements that I did not want to repay the original company. The extent to which this was practically possible, as the company never had its own account due to a lack of registration and the lawyer accounts held for the donations were constantly terminated by the banks on the instructions of the State Security Service, is another question.

Even the witness Viviane Fischer confirmed that the repayment of the money took too long for her and that she - allegedly - would not have agreed to the loan amounts being secured by a store of value in the form of my Göttingen property. However, she expressed no doubt that I wanted to properly repay the loan amounts from the property sale to the relevant company.

In this respect, the court is "splitting hairs" and is now again trying to foist a - supposed - "confession" on me by putting words in my mouth that I never uttered.

The use of the chat with Viviane Fischer from January 16, 2021 does not substantiate the Chamber's fictitious claim either: it quotes a chat message from me in which I told her that only she and I had *"sovereignty over the money".*

First of all, it can be said that it is in no way comprehensible that the Chamber wants to base a - apparently firmly planned! - conviction of my person almost exclusively on private chats from 2020 - 2022 between me and Viviane Fischer. The questioning of witnesses - apart from the witnesses for the prosecution! - but is considered as good as superfluous and these are only admitted by the chamber under very limited conditions and previously narrowly defined questions, provided that the defence summons them beforehand in the self-loading procedure.

Secondly, nothing can be deduced from the chat message quoted, except that it states that Viviane Fischer and I had de facto taken care of the management of the committee and Vor-gUG and had insight into the finances due to the fact that we had taken care of them. The other two shareholders, the complainants, on the other hand, did not take care of anything. This was also confirmed by the testimony of Tobias Weißenborn: Tobias Weißenborn, who at the time was still the account manager for Vor-gUG or the Corona Committee, testified in court in the course of his interrogation that he had actively offered to Dr. Justus Hoffmann and also Antonia Fischer to be available to answer questions about the committee's finances, etc.. However, he also confirmed that the two

complainants had had no interest in this at all and had not approached him with any questions or active bookings.

Ultimately, I had actually sold my property - as I had always announced publicly and also in internal mediation discussions, see only Annex 3 to the criminal complaint - at the beginning of October 2022. The property was completely unencumbered at the time, as was also revealed by the notary Kleinjohann in court. It would therefore have been possible without further ado to repay the loan to Corona-Ausschuss-Vorschalt-gUG from the total purchase price of €1.345 million.

As is generally known, I was prevented from doing so by what I consider to be the tortious actions of the notifying party Marcel Templin, who obtained the vast majority of the purchase price of €1.15 million without legal grounds and, in my opinion, by deceiving the notary Kleinjohann. The Chamber confirmed - as described - that the lawyer Templin had no substantive legal claim to the proceeds of the sale of my property, at least in the amount of €700,000.

In a statement dated November 29, 2013, my lawyers also declared an assignment of the claim against the complainant Templin in the present proceedings.

The Göttingen public prosecutor's office is aware of the above decision by the Chamber and was also aware of the assignment of the claim to Vor-gUG. However, it is not known whether and to what extent the public prosecutor's office has taken steps to secure the funds there to date. In this respect, we must assume that the Göttingen public prosecutor's office has been aware of these facts for about 10 months, but has not yet done anything to secure the money to which the Corona Committee would actually be entitled.

However, I am not responsible for the tortious conduct of a third party. As far as we know, the complainant Templin did not even properly deposit the money from my real estate sale, which included client funds from the "class-action" plaintiffs' association, in a lawyer's escrow account, but simply in his business account. Whether the money is still there or has already been spent by the complainant Templin is also beyond our knowledge.

If the repayment of the loan amounts to Vor-gUG was so important to the complainant Templin that he co-signed the criminal complaint dated September 2, 2022, it is questionable why he did not at least repay the amount of €1.15 million acquired by him without legal grounds from the sale of my property to Vor-gUG in the amount of the loans of €700,000. And why did his two partners and shareholders of Vor-gUG, Antonia Fischer and Dr. Justus Hoffmann, not at least work to ensure that their colleague Templin immediately arranged for the loan amounts from the money he had acquired without legal grounds (!) to be repaid to Vor-gUG, which was held by them?

In addition, the majority of the clients from the "class-action" plaintiff group terminated their mandate with the lawyer Templin in August 2022 and expressly and verifiably granted power of attorney to my law firm. This is sufficient for an effective termination of the mandate. Whether the lawyer representing the client likes the reason for terminating the mandate of a client or whether he even considers it to have been brought about by deception is completely irrelevant for the effectiveness of the termination of the mandate. In the present case, there was also no deception on the part of the clients: there had been a data protection incident in the spring of 2022 in the law firm of the port lawyers with regard to the members of the plaintiff class action. This was sufficient to justify termination of the mandate with Marcel Templin for good cause.

Against this background, Marcel Templin no longer even had a substantive legal claim to repayment of the loan from the "class-action" plaintiff community, as he no longer represented them for the most part due to a lack of effective power of attorney. Against this background, the land charge

entered in the land register in favour of the lawyer Templin only one and a half months after the sale of my property was also without any legal basis, as it was carried out without power of representation. However, the basis for the entry of the land charge was solely to secure the loan granted by the plaintiffs' association "class-action". Marcel Templin was also aware of this when he acted.

However, the court still avoids even looking at this second set of offences, which ultimately prevented me from repaying the loan amounts to the Corona-Ausschuss-Vorschalt-gUG.

I, on the other hand, am of the opinion that I do not have to accept the tortious actions of a third party as my own culpable actions.

If the public prosecutor's office had acted in this direction within the last 10 months and had arranged for the money stored in Marcel Templin's account without legal grounds to be returned, there would ultimately no longer have been any legal grounds for the admissibility of the action for adhesion, represented by the two complainants Dr. Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer.

In the overall view, these facts alone permit the conclusion of genuine loan agreements.

In addition, Viviane Fischer's lawyer had himself submitted an affidavit to the court in which I expressly declare - and in this respect affirm in lieu of an oath - that only genuine loan agreements had been agreed between us.

Despite the vague case law of the BGH, which serves to protect the judiciary, in my opinion this behavior of the chairman and the chamber not only leads to an obviously incorrect decision to my disadvantage in accordance with § 339 StGB, because the agreements alleged by Schindler - unlike the loan agreements set out in writing and covered by the Business Judgment Rule - do not exist. Rather, this invention of new facts and the associated denial of the right to be heard is, as Schönke/Schröder/Heine put it (para. 11)*, "an objective breaking of legal rules, so that a decision is made that objectively contradicts the law and is no longer within the bounds of what is justifiable".*

In this way, the presiding judge at the Regional Court, Mr. Schindler, is not only **seriously** departing from the law by committing this elementary violation of the administration of justice, as required by established supreme court case law (para. 12 of the above quotation), but in my opinion he is also doing so **deliberately.** For he knows this not only because, according to his written references, he presumably already considers himself guilty of obstruction of justice and because pressure is and has obviously been exerted on him to bend the law, but he also knows this because we are giving him a little lecture on obstruction of justice here, together with legal sources.

IV. Freedom of expression and information in the "battle for justice"

The following statements not only shed light on what my law firm and I as lawyers have set in motion over the last 30 years, but also on the fact that, contrary to what Schindler claims, in the "fight for justice" even exaggerated and harsh statements are perfectly acceptable, and I therefore also believe that the accusation of obstruction of justice is justified, especially if such statements are made in a heated atmosphere provoked by aberrant state behaviour.

As a reminder: Presiding Judge Schindler began his procedural order of 17.05.2024 with the barely veiled threat to restrict the defence because of its procedural statements in these public criminal proceedings, because these statements were irrelevant and defamatory. He accused us of spreading half-truths and untruths in order to allegedly accuse the public prosecutor's office and the court of

criminal offences without foundation. This, the chairman continued, served to exploit the fact that the public did not know the facts and was not legally versed. In other words, the public is too stupid to understand the difference between right and wrong and good and evil. And the public is incapable of recognizing whether the public prosecutor's office and the court are working properly or not. It could hardly be more presumptuous or arrogant.
Well, it is true that, in my opinion, we have now reached a point at which we must indeed assess the unlawful and unconstitutional conduct of the presiding judge at the District Court, Mr. Schindler, and the other four judges who followed him, the public prosecutor, Mr. John, and other parties involved in the trial as an attempt to jointly commit a violation of the law in conjunction with a qualified deprivation of liberty.

In all our statements, we rely on the fundamental right to freedom of opinion, expression and information in Article 5 of the German Basic Law and the related Article 103 of the Basic Law with the right to a fair hearing formulated therein; specifically, we rely on the principles that have been developed for the so-called **"fight for justice"** by the established case law of the highest courts. This case law says that even in a civil law dispute - especially if it takes place against a backdrop that is heated up by government action and triggers public outrage - strong, even exaggerated words are perfectly acceptable, including accusations of obstruction of justice against judges. This must apply all the more in criminal proceedings, because there is much more at stake than just money. And it must be all the more valid in criminal proceedings that even cause worldwide outrage because of the state's arbitrariness, which is also obvious to the public.

I base the following comments on the mass litigation launched by me and my law firm colleagues at the end of the 1990s which is still ongoing today due to junk real estate financing and the resulting public outrage.

The legal disputes in question concern hundreds of thousands of consumers who were deprived of their livelihoods by German banks through massive fraud. They were duped by the banks' loan brokers into buying at least twice, and often even three times, overpriced apartments, so-called junk real estate, along with full financing from the banks by way of fraud. In legal disputes and in the literature, these cases are referred to as "junk real estate financing brokered by shakedowns". They led to a judicial scandal that eventually exploded into the public eye and were accompanied by a media scandal that is still largely unknown today, which I will explain shortly. These disputes are still characterized by heated and tough arguments in the courts today.

The following should also be added: These transactions were taken to extremes in 2007, 2008 and 2009 in the USA, mainly by Deutsche Bank, because the German judiciary did nothing to stop them, and triggered first the US real estate crisis and then the global economic crisis and the euro crisis.

At that time, my law firm and I represented thousands of injured parties against the banks and we conducted by far the most lawsuits in these cases of shakedown mortgage financing. I heard these cases in court every day for years, sometimes even in two courts in one day, in the morning in Frankfurt and in the afternoon in Stuttgart. I conducted at least 2,500 to 3,000 witness hearings. That is why my colleagues at the law firm and I know very well - also confirmed by many private conversations with judges **after** they retired - that all the judges involved in these cases knew that the banks were lying in court and that the Banking Senate of the Federal Court of Justice was bending the law to protect them. The exact details of this are very exciting, but take up too much space here; I will tell this in detail in a book.

Here just this much: I had learned that the two highest BGH judges responsible for banking matters received money from banks for supposedly academic weekend seminars. In reality, these seminars

only served to conceal the fact that in the evenings, over beer and wine and dinner, the judges and bank representatives discussed in detail how they could best overturn rulings in favour of our clients and against the banks. Two participants in one of the seminars, a respected lawyer and an editor of a consumer protection magazine, gave me affidavits stating that these judges were discussing with the bank lawyers and other bank representatives over dinner and beer and wine in the evening, as described above, how they could undermine three cases in particular that my law firm had just won at the Bamberg Higher Regional Court a few weeks later. One of them even explained that consumer protection - an EU state objective after all! - was a "hydra" that needed to have its "heads chopped off". In a matter of a few weeks, the three judgments in our favour would be overturned. And that's exactly what happened!

In the early 2000s, I filed a criminal complaint against these two BGH judges for obstruction of justice and bribery. Apparently no one had ever done this before, which surprised me when it became known. To my - now naive - surprise, despite the overwhelming evidence, the case was not even investigated. Today, of course, I realize that the public prosecutors, who are bound by political directives, were instructed not to investigate.

So we made sure that the scandal was not buried and went public, since I was very well networked with other legal scholars and lawyers including media representatives. In this way, we ensured that the facts, which are still scandalous from today's perspective, became **public knowledge**. As a result, I and many respected law professors, fellow lawyers, active and retired judges, to whom I had described the events, commented on them in legal journals, which reached the mainstream media including TV. Everyone complained about the corruption at the highest levels of the German courts. I was able to describe Deutsche Bank's unbelievably brazen trial fraud (i.e. Deutsche Bank's brazen lies in the trials) not only in two specialist articles, but also in a whole host of mainstream TV reports as I found strong support in this matter by a number of legal scholars.

Then something happened that shocked me almost more than the corruption at the Banking Senate of the BGH: A legendary SPIEGEL editor, Dr. Hermann Bott, had researched an article very well about Bayerische HypoBank, which was also deeply involved in junk real estate financing (it soon collapsed because of this financing and was bought by the Italian Unicredit Bank). A few days before his article with the headline "An organized mass fraud" was due to appear, the completely distraught Dr. Bott called me and asked me to come to Hamburg. There he handed me the galley proof reading of the article **(*attachment, to be submitted later*)** and explained to me that the article would not appear in SPIEGEL, the most internationally respected and important German news magazine at the time. He went on to explain: "When HypoBank found out about the article, because Dr. Bott naturally wanted to obtain their opinion for the article, they immediately sent a group of lawyers and marketing people from Munich to Hamburg. As a result of the discussions with the editors-in-chief of SPIEGEL, they "bought" the article and made it disappear. This is called "catch and kill" in the USA. HypoBank's quid pro quo for this was an advertising contract with SPIEGEL: in return for payment of many millions of euros, HypoBank ran an entire advertising campaign in SPIEGEL under the slogan "Live, we'll take care of the details". In order not to damage Dr. Bott publicly, I did not make this public at the time, but only informed a few colleagues, legal scholars and other lawyers whom I trusted.

Because we all saw that the judiciary in Germany was corrupt through and through, at least in the key areas, we, namely a colleague from Bremen and I, finally took some of his cases to the European Court of Justice. There, after an absolutely fair and highly motivating oral hearing, the consumers won groundbreaking decisions in favour of the consumers and against the banks. But: The BGH, led by the two corrupt judges, refused to implement this decision. In fact, it tightened its jurisdiction even further in favour of the banks by way of legal twisting.

Although I also managed to publish a very comprehensive article on this judicial scandal in DIE ZEIT, the control of the Banking Senate of the Federal Court of Justice by the banks was so far advanced that, despite the public outrage, nothing changed - except that the Chairman of the Banking Senate of the Federal Court of Justice is forever branded as a compliant puppet of the banks. But perhaps this is also something like "poetic justice".

Against this politically, legally and medially heated backdrop, more and more court hearings took place, in which ever tougher and ever clearer words were used to negotiate and fight for justice. The most important decision for these comments on the of expression freedom and information in the context of the *"fight for justice"* comes from the Berlin Court of Appeal (see BVerfGE 76, 171, 193; Müller NJW 2009, 3746, 3748), which in turn relies on the Constitutional Court. The case before the Berlin Court of Appeal concerned criminal proceedings against a Berlin lawyer. As the investor's representative in a civil case, a so-called junk real estate financing case, he had made the following comments in a motion to recuse himself:

> *"At this point at the latest, it becomes clear that the rejected judges are not objectively impartial judges at the Court of Appeal, but merely a kind of auxiliary force of the plaintiff (the bank, note by the undersigned). It has always been said of the plaintiff's legal representatives that, due to their involvement in political Berlin, they are able to achieve things that no law firm can."*

Although the colleague was initially convicted of criminal libel for this statement made in a civil case, a very carefully working senate of the Berlin Court of Appeal acquitted him and declared:

> *"It is also recognized that in the 'fight for justice', a party to proceedings may also use strong, forceful expressions and meaningful catchwords as 'professional weapons' to emphasize his legal position, even if he could have formulated his position differently (see BVerfG NJW 1991, 2074, 2075; BayObLG NStZ-RR 2002, 40, 41; OLG Hamm NStZ-RR 2006, 7, 8; Senate StV 1997, 485, 486). A lawyer can therefore also make defamatory insinuations and assumptions that strengthen his legal opinion [...]*
>
> *Even if the statements [...] incidentally even contain the accusation of criminal offenses (e.g. obstruction of justice), it is recognized that the critic can in principle even express his criminal assessment of events as a personal legal opinion, even if it does not stand up to objective assessment."*

The KG Berlin, which had to review the lawyer's statements under criminal law, declared that these were permissible expressions of opinion for the purpose of legal prosecution, i.e. in the fight for justice. In its reasoning, the court addresses the particular explosive nature of the junk real estate lawsuits, which triggered massive public outrage, in an exemplary and differentiated manner and explains why defamatory statements for the purpose of legal action against the injured investors can also be appropriate:

> "In this context, it is significant that the civil law dispute concerned the consequences of a failed construction project in which - in addition to specific insolvency law issues - the allegation was significant that the allegedly fraudulent consulting companies responsible for the subsequent financial collapse were economically intertwined with the financing bank. This constellation, which laypersons overwhelmingly consider to be obvious, but which courts have largely rejected, has occupied the courts extremely extensively and intensively. It is a widely discussed problem of economic importance with at least 300,000 injured parties ("junk real estate", "shakedown housing financing", cf. BGH NJW 2002, 2336), which, due to the - at that time, since then somewhat changed (cf. BGHZ 168, 1; BGH NJW 2006, 1957) - which followed the

> predominant case law of the higher courts (see only BGH NJW 2000, 2353; NJW 2000, 2270; NJW 2000, 2268; OLG Cologne VersR 2002, 990, each with far. The choice of words was combative and caused the most violent reactions for years. The choice of words was combative, exaggerated and in parts insulting. Organized resistance formed in networks against this case law, which had been repeatedly thwarted by the European Court of Justice (see only ECJ ZIP 2005, 1959; NJW 2002, 281; Hoffmann ZIP 2005, 1985), as well as a defence organized by banks. Both the judges defending it (against "consumer-friendly" courts, e.g. the Bamberg and Karlsruhe Higher Regional Courts) or attacking the legislator (the "spook of consumer-friendly case law must be brought to an end", quoted from BGH NJW 2002, 2336; the consumer protection laws are, in reference to Otto von Gierke's finding from 1889, a "drop of socialist oil" missing in the draft of the BGB "oil pollution of private law", cf. Bungeroth in Festschrift für Schimansky, Schutz vor dem Verbraucherschutz? p. 279, 281) as well as those arguing in favor of the affected side (Egon Schneider: "Karlsruher Weißwäsche" ZAP 2003, 577; "Glaubwürdigkeitskrise des BGH" ZAP 2003, 841); readers reacting to this: "interessenfinanzierter Vortragstourismus von BGH-Richtern", "dass gegen reisende Richter einwenden ist, dass sie sich bezahlen lassen und dass sie die Arbeit, für die sie bezahlt werden, nicht tun", Nachw. in Schneider ZAP 2003, 841"; "Der Spiegel": "most reliable friend of the banks", quoted from Derleder, Subprime Judikatur, KJ 2009, 3,4; Derleder himself: "the Banking Law Senate under the leadership of Nobbe as a kind of godfather", "phase of repressive ignorance" "disrespectfulness of some judges towards applicable laws", KJ 2009, 3, 7, "The Banking Law Senate has proven to be a kind of player in the financial capitalist production of risk ....", KJ 2009, 3, 24; see also Nassall NJW 2008, 3354) used strong, hurtful expressions to denounce the actions of the respective opposing party, which they considered scandalous, in an issue that was politically significant due to its social consequences. The case law cited also contributed to the private insolvency at issue in the present proceedings due to the maturity of the entire loan in the event of revocation or termination (cf. Derleder KJ 2009, 3, 12). Deutsch (Verbraucherschutz gegen den BGH, NJW 2003, 2881) summarized the situation almost lyrically: "In the rarefied atmosphere of the BGH, the complaints of the impoverished defrauded fade away."

In conclusion, the court states:

> "The defendant had to be allowed to defend himself against the routine adoption of this case law of the BGH by the Berlin courts with similarly powerful words and comparisons."

It is the same here.

Dr. Reiner Füllmich, 20.09.2024