



1 **MOTION TO AMEND THE COMPLAINT**



2  
3 The Plaintiffs KARIN LEFFER and BEOWULF VON PRINCE hereby file a motion to amend  
4 the complaint for a declaratory judgment:

5  
6 In the matter of a complaint concerning compliance with the 2+4 Treaty of 1990 (see Recital 17  
7 of the complaint already filed), alternatively, a complaint concerning the conclusion of a peace  
8 treaty, the place of jurisdiction is also in the United States of America, with President Donald  
9 Trump as Commander-in-Chief of the main victorious power and thus the last instance.

10  
11 **A. CONCERNING JURISDICTION**

12 156. With the amendment of the complaint against the residents of the Federal  
13 Republic of Germany, represented by Foreign Minister Heiko Maas, the jurisdiction in the  
14 United States of America is in any case given. The courts in the USA are always competent for  
15 any breaches in contractual obligations towards the United States. The courts in the USA hold  
16 jurisdiction to determine compliance with contractual obligations towards the United States. In  
17 this case, the contract in question is the Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany  
18 (“2+4 Treaty”); the failure to comply with the terms of this Treaty constitutes a violation of the  
19 previously applicable Occupation Law.  
20  
21

22  
23 **B. CONCERNING THE 2+4 TREATY (Recital 17)**

24 157. Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany (2 + 4 Treaty)

25 Preamble

26 The Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, the  
27 French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United  
28 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of  
America, [...]

Have agreed as follows:

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

ARTICLE 1

(1) The united Germany shall comprise the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic and the whole of Berlin. Its external borders shall be the borders of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic and shall be definitive from the date on which the present Treaty comes into force. The confirmation of the definitive nature of the borders of the united Germany is an essential element of the peaceful order in Europe.

(2) The united Germany and the Republic of Poland shall confirm the existing border between them in a treaty that is binding under international law.

(3) The united Germany has no territorial claims whatsoever against other states and shall not assert any in the future.

(4) The Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic shall ensure that the constitution of the united Germany does not contain any provision incompatible with these principles. This applies accordingly to the provisions laid down in the preamble, the second sentence of Article 23, and Article 146 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany.

(5) The Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America take formal note of the corresponding commitments and declarations by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic and declare that their implementation will confirm the definitive nature of the united Germany's borders.

158. The realisation of the 2 + 4 Treaty is therefore dependent on the entry into force of a constitution that contains no provision whatsoever that challenges the borders of Europe.

159. For this reason, Art. 1 para. 4 is linked to the requirement that a constitution defines national borders. Art. 23 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany (GG) originally read:

For the time being, this Basic Law shall apply in the territory of the Länder of Baden, Bavaria, Bremen, Greater Berlin, Hamburg, Hesse, Lower Saxony, North Rhine-Westphalia, Rhineland-Palatinate, Schleswig-Holstein, Württemberg-Baden, and Württemberg-Hohenzollern. In other parts of Germany, it shall be put into force upon their accession.

160. **Art. 23 GG defines the extent of the Federal Republic of Germany by listing the federal states.**

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

1 A constitution in which an immutability of the borders is laid down, must define the borders of  
2 the national territory.

3 161. Instead, in 1992 Art. 23 GG was overwritten with:

4 Art. 23 GG

5  
6 (1) With a view to establishing a united Europe, the Federal Republic  
7 of Germany shall participate in the development of the European Union that  
8 is committed to democratic, social and federal principles, to the rule of law  
9 and to the principle of subsidiarity and that guarantees a level of protection  
10 of basic rights essentially comparable to that afforded by this Basic Law.

11 162. This can certainly be interpreted as the Federal Republic of Germany's intention  
12 to take over the countries of the EU.

13 **Under no circumstances can this new provision of Article 23 be interpreted as defining the**  
14 **borders of the Federal Republic of Germany.**

15 163. The special thing about the 2 + 4 Treaty is, however, that the 4 powers set the  
16 condition that a constitution must be decided according to Article 146 GG.

17 Art. 146 formerly read from 1949 to 1990:

18 “This Basic Law, which, since the achievement of the unity and freedom of  
19 Germany, applies to the entire German people, shall cease to apply on the  
20 day on which a constitution freely adopted by the German people takes  
21 effect.”

22 This provision could be implemented at any time from the promulgation of the Basic Law on  
23 May 23, 1949.

24 And why is it now imposed on the “Germans” in this treaty, as a condition for the effectiveness  
25 of this treaty, that a constitution be adopted which must be approved by the German people?

26 The “Germans” claim that the Basic Law (GG) was adopted in free determination. However, one  
27 can read about it for example in wikipedia:

28 „In the letter of approval of the military governors to the Basic Law of May  
12, 1949, the reservation was then formulated that the content of the old

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE NO. \_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_ [JDC TEMPLATE]



1 version of Article 23 and Article 144 (2) of the Basic Law would be  
2 interpreted as follows,..."

3 164. The "Germans" now claim that the GG is their constitution. But how can it be  
4 stated in a constitution that it expires when a constitution comes into force?

5 165. The requirement to adopt a constitution, which all Germans must agree to, was  
6 created because under Art. 116 GG, various nationals are grouped together (see Recitals 22, 23).  
7 This also applies to those who made use of the Law on the Regulation of Nationality/Law on the  
8 Renouncement of German Reich Nationality of February 22, 1955 (Recitals 39, 40). Those who,  
9 like the Plaintiff's father as a national of the Free City of Danzig, made use of it nevertheless  
10 remained Germans within the meaning of Art. 116 GG. But he could no longer become a  
11 Member of Parliament of the Federal Republic of Germany because of the electoral laws. Thus  
12 the nationals of the Free City of Danzig, like the Plaintiff, are not represented by the legislators  
13 of the FRG.

14 166. One express condition for the 2+4 Treaty was the confirmation of the German-  
15 Polish border. But neither the Poles nor the deputies of the FRG are free to dispose of the  
16 territory of the Free City of Danzig.

17 It was for this reason that the condition was set that all Germans within the meaning of the GG  
18 must agree.

19 With the consent of all Germans, the nationality of the Free City of Danzig would cease to exist  
20 and therewith the question concerning the territory of the Free City of Danzig. It would also  
21 mean that the nationality of the German Reich would expire and a new state would be created.  
22 This would also mean that reparation claims would cease to apply and the Second World War  
23 could be formally ended.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
Translated S.r.l.  
Via Indonesia n.23  
00144 Roma (RM)  
P.IVA 07173521001

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE NO. \_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_ [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 167. But the nationals of the German Reich have always held on to this German Reich  
2 nationality and have sought to restore the German Reich's ability to act. In the London Debt  
3 Agreement of 1953, the inhabitants of the federal territory commit themselves to reparations  
4 payments under Art. 25. This, however, does not apply to the nationals of the Free City of  
5 Danzig per Article 5.2 of the London Debt Agreement (Recital 67). With the payment of  
6 reparations, the German Reich is restored as a subject of international law.  
7

8 168. The 2+4 Treaty did not give the nationals of the German Reich the reparation  
9 obligations, but rather created the possibility for the nationals of the Free City of Danzig to  
10 determine their rights under international law according to Art. 102 and Art. 103 of the Peace  
11 Treaty of Versailles themselves and to receive compensation/reparations in a constitution.  
12

13 169. Thus, every participant in the war has received payment for his acts of war in the  
14 form of pensions and annuities. Even, for example, Dutch nationals who had joined the SS.  
15 The Plaintiff's father was sent to the war zone of the German Reich by the British as part of the  
16 Allied effort against the German Reich after the outbreak of war in 1940. In 1956, he filed a  
17 claim for damages with the United Nations in New York, calculated to the nearest 1/100 Shs, in  
18 the amount of approximately 10,000,000.00 Shs. In 1957 the United Nations confirmed his  
19 nationality as a national of the Free City of Danzig, but he received only 3% of his claim. The  
20 other claims were classified as reparations and deferred until the settlement of reparations issues  
21 under the London Debt Agreement (Recitals 41-43).  
22

23 This should also be regulated in a constitution.

  
Translated S.r.l.  
Via Indonesia n.23  
00144 Roma (RM)  
P.IVA 07173521001

### 24 **C. CONCLUSION CONCERNING THE 2+4 TREATY**

25  
26 170. The condition set within the 2 + 4 Treaty requiring the borders of the Federal  
27 Republic of Germany to be defined in a constitution has not been fulfilled.  
28

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE NO. \_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_ [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 171. The condition requiring the adoption of a constitution, to which the Germans not  
2 represented by the legislators of the Federal Republic of Germany must also agree, has not been  
3 fulfilled.

4 172. The German-Polish Border Treaty was concluded without the consent of the  
5 nationals of the Free City of Danzig. The territorial question has therefore not been settled.  
6  
7 The German-Polish Border Treaty is merely another treaty between states that can be terminated.  
8 This Treaty is therefore only irrevocable if the new national territory is enshrined in a  
9 constitution. This has not yet happened.

10 173. The USA, as a party to this Treaty, is entitled to demand the implementation of its  
11 conditions.

12  
13  
14 **D. CONSEQUENCES ARISING FROM THIS CONCLUSION,**



Translated S.r.l.  
Via Indonesia n.23  
00144 Roma (RM)  
P.IVA 07173521001

15 why the 2 + 4 Treaty has not been fully implemented:

16 174. The legislators of the FRG have instructed their scientific service to determine the  
17 subject under international law which they rule. In 2006, the expert opinion found that  
18 occupation law still applies, including the provisions of the Transitional Treaty regarding  
19 reparations obligations.

20  
21 175. Art. 4 of the 2nd Adjusted Federal Law of November 23, 2007 therefore  
22 promulgated the adjusted Occupation Law. Art. 2 revoked the abolition of Occupation Law and  
23 thus reinstated it. This means that the United States of America is once again the direct  
24 occupying power in Bavaria.

25 §3 of this Act: Consequences of the adjusted Occupation Law:

26 The rights and responsibilities of the occupying powers and the right of  
27 occupation are preserved.

28  
TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE NO. \_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_ [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 The Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany is officially still in force and with it the  
2 Occupation Law laid down therein within the meaning of Art. 116 GG, i.e. according to Art. 116  
3 of the Danzig Constitution. In addition, the regulations copied verbatim from the Danzig  
4 Constitution into Art. 101 GG concerning legal judges and into Art. 97 GG concerning the  
5 independence of the judiciary.

6  
7 176. These provisions are no longer observed, especially in Bavaria, directly occupied  
8 by the United States of America (Recitals 50-52); cf. the Bavarian Judge and Public Prosecutor”  
9 Act of 2005 et al. With it, judges were put on an equal footing with the public prosecutors bound  
10 by instructions and thus the independence of the judges was abolished by law, an act contrary to  
11 Art. 97 GG.

12  
13 177. For this reason alone, although there are other reasons, Bavaria ought to be  
14 excluded from the European Union.

15 But this is not happening. On the contrary, the EU does not grant the Plaintiffs any protection  
16 against unlawful judges who have also been deprived of their independence.

17 This is even more the case when the Plaintiffs are politically persecuted explicitly because of  
18 their nationality and their right to reparations.

19 The EU thus also rejects its own jurisdiction and indirectly refers to the jurisdiction in the USA.

20  
21 178. The Basic Law has already been amended 60 times, but the provision in Art. 120  
22 GG remains: “The Federation bears the costs of war and occupation.”

23 This is due to Art. 79 GG: The Basic Law cannot be changed, if it concerns peace treaty,  
24 occupation and defense law issues.

25 It is remarkable that the legislators of the FRG formally adhere to this.

26 In reality, however, it is grossly violated. This also happens quite officially, as proven by the  
27 Bavarian Judge and Public Prosecutor Act of 2005.  
28

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_



1 179. On May 23, 2019, the Plaintiffs pointed out the situation under international law  
2 in an open letter to Foreign Minister Heiko Maas, informing 30 unions, 30 employers  
3 associations, and over 500 student fraternities. But there was no official reaction. Thus, the  
4 inhabitants of the Federal territory are not fulfilling their duties and have renounced their rights  
5 according to Art. 25 GG:

6 Article 25 of the Basic Law:

7 The general rules of international law shall be an integral part of federal law.  
8 They shall take precedence over the laws and directly create rights and  
9 duties for the inhabitants of the federal territory.



Translated S.r.l.  
Via Indonesia n.23  
00144 Roma (RM)  
P.IVA 07173521001

10 The “general rules of international law” refers to the Hague IV Convention. According to Art. 43  
11 of Convention Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV.) of 1907, the  
12 occupying power has to maintain the ordre public. With Art. 25 GG, this task was assigned to the  
13 inhabitants of the Federal territory. If the inhabitants of the Federal territory fail to meet this  
14 duty, they are obligated to make reparations according Art. 25 of the London Debt Agreement.

15 180. As said, peace treaty, occupation and defense law issues can be changed by a  
16 promulgating a constitution according to Art. 146 GG, i.e. with the consent of the nationals of  
17 the Free City of Danzig. These were granted the right to determine a succession regulation  
18 concerning their protection and questions of defense law under Art. 102 of the Peace Treaty of  
19 Versailles, and their constitutional rights and questions of occupation law under Art. 103 of the  
20 Peace Treaty of Versailles. If no agreement is reached, the nationals of the Free City of Danzig  
21 have the right to demand a peace treaty, cf. Potsdam Agreement of 1945: The territory of the  
22 Free City of Danzig remains under Polish administration until a peace treaty is concluded.

23 181. A peace treaty must be approved by the main victorious power USA. Only the  
24 USA, as the main victorious power, can enforce a peace treaty.

25 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

26 PAGE NO. \_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_ [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 Therefore it is only the courts of the USA that can decide the extent to which the nationals of the  
2 Free City of Danzig are to be considered in any peace treaty.

3 182. To avoid further repetition, the Plaintiffs refer to the complaint for a declaratory  
4 judgment already filed and the enclosed grounds for appeal against the judgment of the Coburg  
5 Regional Court/Bavaria/FRG of October 1, 2019.

6  
7 **THE DEMAND**

  
Translated S.r.l.  
Via Indonesia n.23  
00144 Roma (RM)  
P.IVA 07173521001

8 183. The 2 + 4 Treaty has been ratified by parliaments and must therefore be enforced.  
9 This means that a constitution to which the Plaintiffs give their consent must be adopted.

10 184. Alternatively, a peace treaty.  
11 The inhabitants of the federal territory (Art. 25 GG and Art. 25 London Debt Agreement) are  
12 making no effort to comply with the 2 + 4 Treaty even 30 years after the conclusion of the 2 + 4  
13 Treaty. They have thus nullified this treaty.

14 185. In addition, they are also essentially in breach of Occupation Law.  
15 This demonstrates the ability of the German Reich to be party to legal actions.  
16 A de facto peace treaty is therefore demanded from the inhabitants of the FRG.

17 186. Greece also demands reparations in the amount of €332 billion. Poland has  
18 submitted an expert opinion on the entitlement to reparations in 2017; in 2018, the claim was  
19 given an estimated value of €690 billion. When the Plaintiff queried whether this includes the  
20 Free City of Danzig, the claim's putative value was increased to €850 billion.  
21 Contrary to the 2 + 4 Treaty, others obviously also want a peace treaty to mark the formal end of  
22 the Second World War.

23 187. In the case of a peace treaty, we Danziger do not renounce our rights for military  
24 protection (Art. 102, Peace Treaty of Versailles) or a guarantee of our rights against an  
25 overwhelming majority Art. 103, Peace Treaty of Versailles).

26  
27  
28  
TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE NO. \_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_ [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 Both the military protection and our rights can only be guaranteed by the United States of  
2 America.

3 188. We therefore demand binding protection by the United States under international  
4 law. It is the desire of the Plaintiffs as representatives of the Free City of Danzig to join the  
5 United States as a 51st state in order to ensure this permanent protection.  
6

7 189. Payment for this protection must of course be provided by the inhabitants of the  
8 FRG according to the London Debt Agreement.

9 190. Furthermore, a national territory is of course required in a size that can be  
10 effectively defended by the USA.

11 191. Furthermore, the Free City of Danzig must receive reparations, see Art. 5.2 of the  
12 London Debt Agreement. These must be sufficient to pay the claims for damages of the nationals  
13 of the Free City of Danzig. The amount of the claims is determined by the Free City of Danzig. It  
14 must be paid in full, without deductions due to the war. This is guaranteed by Art. 102 and Art.  
15 103 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles under international law.  
16

17 As mentioned above, all war veterans, even Dutch nationals who joined the SS, for example,  
18 have received pensions and annuities from the FRG for their war activities. In contrast, the loss  
19 of earnings that the Plaintiff's father submitted to the United Nations in 1956 has still not been  
20 paid.  
21

22 Likewise, the Plaintiffs must of course be compensated by the Free City of Danzig for their work  
23 for the Free City of Danzig and for their political persecution.

24 192. The United States of America did not win two world wars completely in order to  
25 re-establish undemocratic conditions in Europe. The sovereign rights generously granted by the  
26 United States of America were always granted on condition that democratic principles based on  
27 the rule of law would be respected.  
28

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

1 These principles have been defended by the Plaintiffs at the risk of life, health, and freedom,  
2 with the renunciation of family and property; see exhibit concerning the grounds for appeal.  
3 They are thus defending the values of the United States of America. They are therefore  
4 absolutely loyal alliance partners and thus guarantors of NATO's community of values in  
5 Europe.

6  
7  
8 With its victories, the United States has also acquired the right to ensure that, in the future, there  
9 will be no reason to have to defend human rights in Europe again by military means. It is not for  
10 nothing that they have been confirmed as the main victorious power.

11  
12 The United States has thus already acquired the right to judge whether democratic and  
13 constitutional conditions are being upheld in Europe. If this is no longer the case, it is in the  
14 hands of the United States, as the main victorious power, to make arrangements by means of a  
15 peace treaty to ensure human rights in the long term, at least in the core of Europe. There are also  
16 citizens in Europe who are fully committed to defending the rule of law.

17  
18  
19 **MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION**

20  
21  
22 The proceedings pending before the Coburg Regional Court against the Plaintiff KARIN  
23 LEFFER, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 and against the Plaintiff BEOWULF VON PRINCE,  
24 Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 4652/14, indictment, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 are to be suspended  
25 until the place of jurisdiction has been determined.

26  
27  
28  
TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

1 Date: February 14, 2020

2  
3  
4 Beowulf von Prince

Karin YW

5 BEOWULF VON PRINCE  
6 Schweizer Straße 38, Top 7  
7 AT-6830 Rankweil  
8 Austria

KARIN LEFFER  
c/o Beowulf von Prince  
Schweizer Straße 38, Top 7  
AT-6830 Rankweil  
Austria

9 I hereby certify that this is the true signature and signed and solemnly affirmed in my presence of  
10 von Prince, Beowulf Adalbert, born on 27 December of 1953 in Ebern, citizen of Germany,  
11 residing in Schweizer Straße 38, Top 7, AT-6830 Rankweil, Austria and identified himself by  
12 presentation of his valid Passport-No. C4YLG1ROW

13 Place: 9425 Thal, CH  
14 9425 Thal, CH

Date: February 14, 2020

A. Wüchel



15 Signature of public notary

16 M.A. HSG in Law Ilona Zürcher

17  
18 I hereby certify that this is the true signature and signed and solemnly affirmed in my presence of  
19 Leffer, Karin Doris, born on 18 January 1960 in Coburg, citizen of Germany, residing in  
20 Schweizer Straße 38, Top 7, AT-6830 Rankweil, Austria and identified herself by presentation of  
21 her valid Passport-No. CGO7MNRCH

22 Place: 9425 Thal, CH  
23 9425 Thal, CH

Date: February 14, 2020

A. Wüchel



24 Signature of public notary

25 M.A. HSG in Law Ilona Zürcher

26 Exhibit:

27 1 Grounds of appeal against the judgment of the Coburg Regional Court, Bavaria, Federal  
28 Republic of Germany of October 1, 2019.

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: \_\_\_\_\_

PAGE NO. \_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_ [JDC TEMPLATE]