Beowulf von Prince, Äusseres Holz 479, CH-9427 Wolfhalden, Dec. 01, 2019

Beowulf von Prince, Äusseres Holz 479, CH-9427 Wolfhalden
To
Regional Court Coburg
Ketschendorfer Str. 1

D- 96450 Coburg
Germany

Your reference: 1 KLs 123 Js 4652/14
here: Judgment of Oct. 01, 2019, added to the files Nov. 07, 2019, received Nov. 18, 2019
concerning:
 the indictment of the Coburg Regional Court, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 of June 26, 2013;
the arrest warrant issued by the Coburg Regional Court, Az. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 of 19. 9. 2013; and
the arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court, according to extradition request from the Bavarian State Ministry of Justice sent Dec. 23, 2013 to the Federal Office of Justice in Bern, Ref. B 224'163/TMA:
"I hereby request the extradition of the German national Beowulf Adalbert von Prince, born December 27, 1953 in Ebern, for prosecution for the offenses set forth in the arrest warrant of September 19, 2013, Gz. 1 KLs 123 Js 3378/11. ***The persecuted person was already extradited to the German authorities on January 24, 2013 under the above-mentioned Gz. and released from custody on October 18, 2013*** **[...]***"*

Statement of reasons for the revision

The attached evidence of innocence has already been sent to the Coburg Regional Court and was available to the court at the time of the hearing on October 01, 2019. Despite a warning, the order to hand over the documents to the detained defendant was ignored. Even the documents included in the pre-hearing submissions were not referenced in the hearing on October 1, 2019, representing a failure to meet the judge's duty to review all of the facts of the case. The Coburg Regional Court has therefore erred in its ruling.

The matter heard on October 01, 2019 therefore deserves to be reheard on these grounds alone.

The determination of a person's identity includes the designation of nationality. This defines the applicable law and rights and obligations pertaining to said person, including those under international law.

The nationality of the accused is not "German," but instead of the
Federal Republic of Germany and therefore of the European Union.

This must be explained.
As a national of the Free City of Gdansk, the Defendant's father made use of the Law of the Renouncement of German (Reich) Nationality of February 22, 1955. In the written explanation of this act, Gdansk is expressly mentioned in bold.

Exhibit No. 1: Federal Printing Document 849, parliamentary term 1953, debate on the draft of the law to regulate questions of nationality (law on renouncement)

Only persons who had previously been forcibly granted the nationality of the German Reich

were permitted to make use of this law.
Despite the renouncement of German (Reich) nationality, the father of the Defendant remained a German within the meaning of Art. 116 of the Basic Law (GG).

Exhibit No. 2: Documents of the government of Lower Franconia
Deed of Renouncement
Exhibit No. 3: German passport not proof of nationality

The Defendant therefore has it in writing that he is German within the meaning of Art. 116 GG. Who else?
In 1956, the father of the Defendant filed a claim for damages with the United Nations in New York. In 1957, he received only 3% of his claims. The rest falls under reparations under the 1953 London Debt Agreement.
According to Art. 5.2 of this Agreement, the Free City of Danzig is one of the states entitled to reparations.
How can a German within the meaning of the Basic Law be obliged to pay reparations if he himself is entitled to receive reparations?
According to the official documents of the UN published online concerning the Defendant's father's claims for damages in 1956, he describes himself as British. He is of British descent, born in East Africa, only briefly in Danzig (Gdansk), and returned to his homeland, the League of Nations mandate of Tanganyika at the age of 19, until he was sent to the war zone of the German Reich by the British after the outbreak of the Second World War in 1940 and thus as part of the Allies against the German Reich. He was classified by the Soviets as a British spy. His older brother is British. But in 1957 the United Nations confirmed his Danzig nationality.

Exhibit No. 4: Official documents of the United Nations in New York
https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1656856?ln=en

Art. 116 Basic Law: *A German within the meaning of this Basic Law is a person who possesses German citizenship or who has been admitted to the territory of the German Reich within the boundaries of 31 December 1937 as a refugee or expellee of German ethnic origin or as the spouse or descendant of such person.*
Since the father of the Defendant is neither of German descent nor a refugee or expellee who entered the German Reich, but is a German within the meaning of Art. 116 GG, he ought to be in possession of German nationality, too, within the meaning of Article 116 GG.
Art. 116 GG refers to Art. 116 of the Danzig Constitution: *German law as of Jan. 1920 is guaranteed.*
The Free City of Danzig was founded as a sovereign state according to Art. 100-108 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles.
According to Art. 102 of this Treaty, the Free City of Danzig came under the protection of the League of Nations.
According to Art. 103, the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig was to be agreed with representatives of the League of Nations, the latter acting as guarantor of this Constitution:
Art. 49 of the Danzig Constitution: *The Constitution may be changed only with the express consent of the League of Nations.*
Art. 76 of the Danzig Constitution:
Towards foreign countries, all nationals within and outside the territory of the State are entitled to the protection of the State. No national may be handed over to a foreign government for prosecution or punishment.

The European States have, in particular, benefited from the Versailles Peace Treaty. Anyone who questions the Versailles Peace Treaty is questioning the borders of the European Union Member States. The Europeans States therefore have a special obligation towards the people of Danzig, as seen in the battle cry of the French: "*For the freedom of Danzig.*"

To be in possession of German nationality within the meaning of Art. 116 GG means: the rights, duties, and protections according to Art. 116 of German law.
This means that the nationality of the Free City of Danzig is legally identical with the nationality of the Federal Republic of Germany.
As long as this nationality of the Free City of Danzig exists, the Federal Republic of Germany was and is sovereign.

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

However, anyone who made use of the Law of Renouncement of German (Reich) Nationality could logically no longer become a member of parliament of the FRG, as was confirmed in the electoral laws. According to Art. 133 GG, however, these assume the rights and duties of the Allies towards the nationals of the Free City of Danzig.

Exhibit No. 5: Electoral laws

The very first sentence of the Founding Declaration of the Free City of Danzig, the 2nd Act to Adjust Federal Law of Nov. 23, 2007, Art. 4 concerning adjusted Occupation Law states: § 3 *"The rights and duties of the occupying powers and the right of occupation shall be maintained"*..
You can twist and turn it any way you want, that's for sure:
Reparation claims have not expired.
The 2 + 4 Treaty has not been implemented.

Why has the 2 + 4 Treaty not been implemented?

The 2+ 4 Treaty requires that a constitution be drawn up and approved in accordance with Art. 146 GG.
According to Art. 146 GG, all Germans must agree on such a constitution; this includes those Germans who cannot become Members of Parliament and are therefore not represented in the Bundestag. Any approval of a constitution according to Art. 146 GG obviously requires a political representation of all Germans who hold German nationality within the meaning of Art. 146 GG.

If nationals of the Free City of Danzig no longer exist as such, reparations are due.

Further proof that the Federal Republic of Germany is sovereign with respect to the citizens of the Free City of Danzig is provided by the Basic Law.

The GG has been changed about 60 times.
But Art. 120 GG: "*The Federation shall finance the expenditures for occupation costs and other internal and external burdens resulting from the war"* and Art. 133 GG: "*The Federation shall succeed to the rights and duties of the Administration of the Combined Economic Area."*, etc. are still in place.
This is due Art. 79 GG being applied accordingly*: "The GG cannot be amended if it concerns questions of peace treaties, occupation law and defense law."*
But the GG expires on the day on which a constitution according to Art. 146 GG is proclaimed. The Delegates of the FRG obviously cannot proclaim a constitution which is created according to Art. 146 GG. They obviously do not have the sovereignty to decide on this.
Then who? Apparently not even the Three Powers.
But probably only those who are not nationals of the German Reich, but are in possession of German nationality within the meaning of Art. 116 GG.

Is it sufficient to prove that use has been made of the Law of Renouncement of German (Reich) Nationality?
Art. 87 Constitution of Free City of Danzig: "*It is the duty of every citizen to protect the Constitution against unlawful attacks.*" According to the Potsdam Agreement, the Free City of Danzig is to remain under Polish administration until a peace treaty is concluded. Therefore, the Convention Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV) of 1907 is the supreme legal order, here Art. 43 ordre public. Nationals of the Free City of Danzig are required to demonstrate their nationality by standing up for their ordre public.

A further justification for the political reorganization of the Free City of Danzig is that the Federal Republic of Germany is not an effective constitutional state. This declaration was confirmed by the European Court of Human Rights in Sürmeli/Germany, Case No. EGMR 75529/01 Sürmeli/Germany of June 8, 2006, and also Görgülü/Germany, Case No. EGMR 74969/01, of May 26, 2004.
On the other hand, the Permanent International Court of Justice, in its decision Series A/B No.

65, established that the Free City of Danzig is a constitutional state.

Reversing the actual legal situation, the ruling of the Coburg Regional Court of Oct. 01, 2019 presents the Free City of Danzig as a part of Reich ideology. The Coburg Regional Court thus rejects the sovereignty of the FRG.
Up to and including Chancellor Helmut Kohl, all the governments of the FRG have always maintained their nationality of the German Reich and have sought to make the German Reich a subject of international law and a party to international law. They have always acknowledged the obligation/entitlement to pay reparations and thus to a peace treaty.
It was only in view of the estimated reparation claims of €7.5 trillion that the 2 + 4 Treaty was agreed.
Thus, the nationals of the German Reich were not exempted from reparation payments, but the nationals of the Free City of Danzig were granted the right to change the constitution. With a constitutional amendment, the obligations of the UN towards the nationals of the Free City of Danzig would expire.

Whether a constitution according to Art. 146 GG or a peace treaty will be approved is up to the "Germans."
The formal, final end to the Second World War, whether or not by a constitution according to Art. 146 or a peace treaty, would require the participation of the Free City of Danzig as a negotiating partner.

The Free City of Danzig was politically organized in the interest of the Federal Republic of Germany, in the interest of the EU, and thus world peace.
In the interplay between the Public Prosecutor's Office of Bavaria/Coburg Regional Court and the representatives of the Free City of Danzig, this was confirmed as such.

The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court on Oct. 01, 2019 confirmed the full responsibility of the Defendant for all actions of the Free City of Danzig.
This allows a constitution according to Art. 146 GG and the 2 + 4 Treaty to be implemented.

This is not a punishable offense. The governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the German Democratic Republic had committed themselves to this.

Recognizing this as a punishable offense would mean terminating the 2 + 4 Treaty.

Interestingly, despite several years of using his Danzig identity cards, the Defendant was not convicted for this reason like the other card holders.
This may well be interpreted as recognizing that the Defendant was entitled to use the same.

On the other hand, the other card holders were convicted based solely on the statement of the Protector of the State Detective Chief Inspector (KHK) Kellner that a Danzig identity card was a falsified Federal German identity card.
Which state is Mr. Kellner protecting? That of the sovereign Federal Republic of Germany or the solvency of the German Reich?

The Danzig identity card is associated with the renouncement of German Reich nationality and thus the inherited joint and several liability for reparations.
A conviction on the basis of a Danzig identity card can probably be interpreted as meaning that these cardholders would not be allowed to evade reparation claims.

If the judgment of the Coburg Regional Court is not revised, this must be considered confirmed.

This means that reparations are due.

It must therefore be emphasized straight away that without Mr. Kellner's statement that a Danzig ID card is a falsification of a Federal German identity card, acquittals have always resulted when I comes to prosecutions.. Mr. Kellner also revoked his testimony in an appeal

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

hearing before the Coburg Regional Court, whereupon an acquittal was granted.
Even the Public Prosecutor's Office in Coburg has confirmed impunity from the outset without Mr. Kellner's testimony. Indirectly, impunity was also confirmed by the fact that no permission was requested to prosecute the Defendant with regard to the Danzig ID cards during his extradition from Switzerland. The Swiss Federal Ministry of Justice, responsible for the indictment that led to the ruling of October 1, 2019, has condemned this indictment as political persecution.

The judgment of the Regional Court of Coburg must therefore be revised.

Request to defend himself according to Art. 6 ECHR
Grounds: In its entirety, this case is extremely complex. Questions have not been asked and therefore not answered to date. The overall matter certainly exceeds the knowledge of judges. It is not reasonable to expect a lawyer, especially a public defender with other clients, to familiarize himself with the matter.
Undoubtedly, it is the Defendant who has the most expertise in the case.

An expert opinion is therefore requested to verify this knowledge.

Reasons for appeal:

Re: the ruling of the Coburg Regional Court of Oct. 01, 2019, issued Nov. 07, 2019, received Nov. 18, 2019.

1. Under A. Preamble to the ruling of the Regional Court of Coburg of Oct. 01, 2019, it says:
. . . that on June 26, 2013, the Coburg Prosecutor's Office filed charges with the Regional Court.
The sobering fact is that on August 11, 2011, the Coburg Public Prosecutor requested extradition of the Defendant from Swiss Confederation.Therefore, this charge was served to the defendant in the JVA under case no. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 during his extradition custody by the Regional Court of Coburg.

Evidence: Extradition request of August 11, 2011
Evidence: Files of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice
Exhibit No. 6: Extradition decision of the Federal Office of Justice, Bern dated August 20, 2012, Swiss Case No. B 224`163/TMA
Exhibit No. 7: Letter of service of the indictment in Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 to Kronach Prison, stating a deadline to respond
Exhibit No. 9: Extended extradition request under the same Case No. issued Dec. 23, 2013 by the Federal Office of Justice in Bern B 224'163/TMA
"I hereby request the extradition of the German national Beowulf Adalbert von Prince, born December 27, 1953 in Ebern, for prosecution for the offenses set forth in the arrest warrant of September 19, 2013, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3378/11.
The persecuted person was already extradited to the German authorities on January 24, 2013 under the above-mentioned Gz. and released from custody on October 18, 2013* [...]*"

Grounds for appeal of the ruling of October 01, 2019, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 4652/14 on the indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11.

Preliminary remark:
The indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 was created during the extradition of the accused, arrested on Dec. 21, 2012, extradited on Jan. 24, 2013, and in custody until October 18, 2013.

Exhibit No. 7 cited above
Exhibit No. 9 cited above

In the event of extradition, the state receiving the request does not lose sovereignty over the extradited person; rather, it extends its sovereignty over the extradited person to the territory of the requesting state. If the extradited person makes a purchase, this is an export. If the extradited person earns money, he has to pay tax on it in the state receiving the request. If the extradited person provides a signature, the place of signature is the domicile in the state receiving the request. In effect, the extradited person takes on a status not unlike that of a diplomat.
If there is a breach of the provisions of the ECHR, the complaint is directed against the state receiving the request.

The basis of any extradition is the "speciality principle," Art. 14 of the European Convention on Extradition (ECE), i.e. extradition can only take place for the specifically requested case. If extradition is to be made for another case, this must first be requested. However, the target person may take legal action in the state receiving the request.

In the case of extradition, the authorities of the requesting state thus act only on behalf of the authorities of the state receiving the request.

The matter in Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 4652/14, based on Indictment No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11, is therefore purely a matter for the Swiss courts. Complaints concerning any violations of the ECHR must therefore be directed against the state receiving the request. Such a complaint against Switzerland has already been filed in Strasbourg. However, it was not accepted because the appeals process has not yet been exhausted. The appeals process requires that it first be addressed by the authorities acting on behalf of Switzerland, in this case the German authorities, before coming before Strasbourg.
A complaint under the ECHR is hereby lodged.

Furthermore, the hearing against the Defendant held on Oct. 1, 2019 came about only due to the extradition of the Defendant from the Kingdom of Belgium.
Here, too, the German authorities are in breach of EU law and the ECHR.

2. Under A. Preamble to the judgment of the Coburg Regional Court is stated:
. . . no trial possible due to alleged lack of availability of the Defendant.
It is correct that on August 11, 2011, the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office did not make a request to the Swiss Confederation in the matter of Danzig identity cards, but fraudulently concealed the fact that extradition was requested only because of the same.

Evidence: as before

The remark of the Coburg Regional Court that no hearing could be held is therefore incorrect.

Evidence: The Defendant was arrested on December 21, 2012, was extradited on January 24, 2013 and was only released on October 18, 2013.
Exhibit No. 8: Extradition request of December 23, 2013
"***…The persecuted person was already extradited to the German authorities on January 24, 2013 under the above-mentioned Gz. and released from custody on October 18, 2013*** **[...]**"

Evidence: Delivery of Indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 to the Defendant in Kronach Prison in July 2013

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

It is correct that no trial could take place during this period because no request for extradition had been made in the matter of Danzig identity cards, which the Coburg Regional Court stated as the basis of its ruling of October 1, 2019, Indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11.
It is true that the indictment in the matter of Danzig ID cards, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 was in breach of the principle of speciality, Art. 14 ECE and is therefore null and void.
It is true that the indictment in Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 was delivered to the Defendant in prison in July 2013 with a deadline of three weeks to respond.

Exhibit No. 7: Letter of service of the indictment in the prison

It is correct that no main hearing could be held, however, because the Defendant has stated that he is also subject to Swiss sovereignty even while held in German prison.

Evidence: Files of the Coburg Regional Court

It is correct that the Coburg Regional Court on Sept. 19, 2013 had issued the arrest warrant for Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11, which, however, could not be enforced although the Defendant was in German prison because he was under Swiss sovereignty.

Exhibit No. 8: Arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court dated September 19, 2013, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11

It is correct that the Bavarian State Ministry of Justice issued a request for extended extradition of the Defendant on Dec. 23, 2013 expressly under the same Case No. to the competent Swiss Federal Office of Justice B 224’163/TMA in order to cure the violations of the terms and conditions during his detention in 2013 – Indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11.

Exhibit No. 9: Extradition request of Dec. 23, 2013, Ref. No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3378/11

It is correct that the Swiss Federal Office of Justice responsible for indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 did, in its decision of March 10, 2014, reject the entire extradition on the grounds that extradition was not requested for the prosecution of criminal acts but for political reasons.

Exhibit No. 10: Decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice of March 10, 2014 Case No. B 224'163/TMA

It is therefore correct that damages and compensation for pain and suffering are due for the proceedings under Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 .

Evidence: Art. 15 of the Federal Act in International Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters

It is obvious that, in August 2011, extradition was requested only for the purpose of prosecution for the Danzig identity cards.

Evidence: Ruling of the Coburg Regional Court, dated Dec. 01, 2019; the investigations had already commenced in June 2011.

It is obvious that these prosecution measures could only be carried out while the Defendant was in custody.

Evidence: Even before the arrest of the Defendant, hearings were scheduled in the matter of Danzig identity cards and a hearing date was scheduled for each week.

Evidence: Already after the third trial, the already scheduled trial dates were cancelled, because no convictions for Danzig ID Cards could be upheld due to support by the Defendant.

Exhibit No. 11: Ban on mail and visits imposed against the Defendant

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

The innocence of the Defendant has therefore already been admitted by the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office. If the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office had been convinced of the guilt of the Defendant, then an extradition request would have been duly issued from the very beginning.

The proceedings in Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 are therefore without foundation.

Evidence: as before; claim for damages for a full 300 days' imprisonment

Evidence: Even if the Defendant had been extradited for conviction for alleged illegal possession of weapons, he would have been released on probation at the latest after serving 2/3 of the sentence.
Evidence: Criminal Code

Exhibit No. 12: Order of the Coburg Regional Court, dated Sept.18, 2013, Case No. 2 Ns 118 Js 181/08: "The Defendant remains in custody until Oct.18, 2013 despite offering bail of €1,344,000.00/day."

Exhibit No. 8: The arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court, dated Sept. 19, 2013, Case No.: 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 was only issued to justify the "remand in custody" in the ruling of the Regional Court dated Sept. 18, 2013.

The Defendant was therefore already in pre-trial detention in 2013 on the basis of Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11.

The Swiss Confederation has authorized the extradition only for the purpose of bringing him to trial for alleged illegal possession of weapons, in order to have this international arrest warrant repealed. The decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice, dated Aug. 20, 2012, Case No. B 224'163/TMA: "...in connection with the arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court. For all other purposes, the extradition is rejected." This includes a conviction for alleged illegal possession of firearms.

The conviction for alleged illegal possession of firearms is therefore void. Compensation and damages for pain and suffering must therefore be paid for its inclusion in the Defendant's criminal record.

3. Under A. Preamble to the judgment of the Regional Court is stated:
After Defendant´s return to Germany, he was arrested and an arrest warrant was issued on January 03, 2017.
It is correct that, on April 15, 2016, the Aargau Cantonal Police broke down the door of the Defendant's apartment and he was handed over in handcuffs to the waiting German police, who had been informed of the action. The German police had an unsigned arrest warrant in their possession.
The Cantonal Police, as well as the other competent authorities of the Canton of Aargau, were aware that the extradition of the Defendant had been expressly rejected.
Moreover, the Cantonal Police and the other authorities of the Canton of Aargau were aware that, under the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons between Switzerland and the EU, the Defendant has an unrestricted right of residence in Switzerland and therefore, just like a Swiss citizen, may not be expelled from the country. The Office for Migration, Aarau had even sent an email query in this regard to the Swiss Federal Office for Migration, Berne.

The Defendant is therefore undisputedly entitled to full compensation. The negotiations are still ongoing.

The Defendant was first in custody due to criminal allegations of fraud related to a property transfer to Ms. Hain at cost, having received €15,000.00 and repaying €43,000.00.
If the extradition had been justified, it would have been added to an aggregate penalty, which, in turn, would have had to have been suspended on probation after having served 2/3 of it. This was not done despite the Defendant's petition to that effect. Even without an aggregate penalty, he should have been released from prison for the alleged fraud on Oct.14, 2016. This was rejected by the Freiburg Chamber of Enforcement of Sentences, Case No.:2 StVK 381/16 on these grounds: *Mr. von Prince is convinced that he is a national of the Free City of Danzig and considers its identity cards to be legitimate.*

The sentence for alleged fraud was 9 months, suspended on probation.

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

This suspension on probation was revoked because of two penalty orders. The Defendant has obtained a copy of a fellow prisoner's judgment, where it states that even several penalty orders do not lead to the repeal of a previous sentence suspended on probation, § 407 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (StPO).
Despite his complaint in this regard, the Defendant was not released, obviously due to the indictment under Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11.

On Jan. 10, 2017, the Defendant was supposed to be released from custody.
But then the arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court, dated Jan. 05, 2017 was delivered to the Defendant. A review of custody was immediately requested, but not carried out.
It was only on Jan. 12, 2017 that the review of custody took place at the Coburg Regional Court. The Defendant rejected the assigned judges on the grounds of bias because they wanted to hear the matter as a purely Swiss matter, the nullity and damages of which have already been determined.
The judges could not ignore this. Nevertheless, the Defendant remained in custody. This imprisonment has already led to a dramatic deterioration of the Defendant's health. The duty lawyer therefore made the binding proposal that the Defendant be released from custody on the day of the trial if he confessed. For that he naturally had to withdraw his bias applications. The Defendant had no idea what to confess, but agreed.
The Defendant was aware of the convictions for the Danzig ID cards. Under his responsibility, however, these had only been produced after the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office itself had put them back into circulation (by Mr. Heinemann).
The Defendant was also aware that the convictions for the Danzig ID cards were based on Mr. Kellner's claim that a Danzig ID card was a forgery of a Federal German one. However, Mr. Kellner revoked this statement before the Coburg Regional Court, leading to a subsequent acquittal.

So what was the Defendant supposed to confess?
The hearing was held on April 07, 2013. But the Public Prosecutor's Office revoked the agreement. The Defendant therefore did not make a confession. No proof of guilt could be provided. Not even a week later. The Defendant therefore had to be released from custody on April 13, 2017. The Defendant did not make a new request for a hearing as this was impossible for health reasons alone. On the night of Oct. 27, 2017, the Defendant had to go to the emergency room for stomach bleeding. He was transferred to the intensive care unit, where four large stomach and one duodenal ulcers were found. If he had been admitted just a few hours later, it could have been too late.

A complaint was filed against Switzerland in Strasbourg.
The complaint was not accepted because the appeals process has not yet been exhausted.

4. Under A. Preamble to the judgment of the Regional Court is stated:
Arrest on July 17, 2019 in Belgium

On the basis of the information available on the Internet about the Defendant, the Belgian police were informed of the whereabouts of the Defendant and arrested him on July 17, 2019. During the review of custody, the Defendant presented evidence of his innocence, which the judge found to be insufficient. The review of custody was stopped without any further opportunity for the Defendant to present further evidence of his innocence. The Defendant was able to supply the duty lawyer, Ms. Stephanie Moor, with copies of the German acquittals on a USB stick. But she was on vacation at the time and therefore no longer reachable. On July 23, 2019, the court of first instance in Eupen heard the case for extradition. The Defendant was unfamiliar with Belgian law concerning European arrest warrants and therefore made no argument at the hearing. Ms. Moor's vacation replacement was sitting behind the Defendant at the hearing and did not say a word. The hearing quickly came to a close because the Defendant had not made an argument under Belgian law. In prison, the Defendant immediately lodged an appeal by post to the court in Eupen and three further appeals the following day. Nevertheless, the appeal was rejected because it had not been filed with the prison. The notice of appeal contained no legal indication that an appeal had to be filed with the prison itself. The

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

Belgian law on the European arrest warrant states that an appeal must be lodged with th court of first instance.
The Defendant had applied for asylum. The Asylum Office had schedule a hearing for 10:00 am on Sept. 04, 2019 in the prison by the asylum office. On September 3, 2019, at 4:40 p.m., the Defendant was informed by the warden’s office that he was going to be extradited the next day. The Defendant presented the notice of a scheduled hearing and pointed out that the asylum application took precedence over extradition. The prison authorities promised to take care of it. Back in his cell, the Defendant immediately tried to make a phone call. But the phone credit had already been blocked. Consequently, the Defendant used the phone of his cellmate. No one could be reached at the Public Prosecutor's Office at that hour and neither was any lawyer available. The next morning the cellmate was led out of the cell without explanation. Nevertheless, the Defendant was able to use his telephone. However, after the first ringing tone, this phone was also locked. Subsequently, the Defendant was extradited to Germany.

The Defendant would like to take this opportunity to express his thanks that he was spared the arduous detention pending deportation.

The Defendant was denied a hearing.

The court of first instance in Eupen, in its ruling of July 23, 2019, only approved extradition for the purpose of verifying the accusation admissible under Belgian law: *Forgery of one document in 83 cases.*
For this case to hold, there must be a document that had been forged.

The mere similarity of a document, as the defendant confessed, is not punishable.

However, the ruling of the Coburg Regional Court of October 1, 2019 is based on convictions based on Mr. Kellner's statement that a Danzig ID card is a forgery of a Federal German ID card. Mr. KHK Kellner revoked this assertion in an appeal hearing before the Coburg Regional Court, which is why the Coburg Regional Court also issued an acquittal.

Again:
At the Coburg Regional Court, the Defendant was tried on the grounds that a Danzig ID card looks similar to an official document. No evidence or witness claiming a Danzig ID card is a forgery of a German ID card and therefore a forged document was not produced. The witness, Mr. Kellner, did not repeat the testimony he had already revoked.
The Defendant would have strongly disagreed with this statement.
Without Mr. Kellner's statement that a Danzig ID card was a forgery of a German ID card, acquittals have been consistently granted on the merits.

Once again with all clarity:
The Defendant was extradited as part of an investigation into the forgery of one document in 83 cases. A Danzig ID card has the inscription: “Freie Stadt Danzig” (“Free City of Danzig”).
For someone who cannot read Latin characters, the red shield with two silver crosses and topped with a crown appears, making it self-evidently a Danzig ID card. **No one has claimed that this identity card is a forgery of a Danzig identity card/document. Therefore, acquittals have always been issued on the merits of the case.**
The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court, on the other hand, is based on the refuted assertion that a Danzig identity card is a forgery of a Federal German identity card. However, there is no longer any evidence or witnesses to support this finding.

No evidence of forgery of documents was therefore presented to the Defendant. This should have been either another document of a Danzig identity card or a witness who claims that the identity card used by the Defendant is a forgery of a Danzig identity card.

The Defendant only testified that his Danzig ID card resembles an official document. It should.

The Defendant has thus correctly identified himself.

The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court cites as evidence of guilt the convictions for alleged falsification of documents. The Defendant was not heard on these convictions or whether they had been properly pronounced. All he has stated is that the Danzig identity cards look similar to an official one.

The Defendant was not questioned about the convictions for the allegedly forged Federal German identity documents.
Otherwise, the Defendant would have referred to the acquittals in the case, i. e. would have provided evidence to the contrary.

The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court of October 1, 2019 therefore also constitutes a breach of Framework Decision 2002/584 JI and of the judgment of the court of first instance in Eupen of July 23, 2019.

Here too, the appeal to the courts of Luxembourg and Strasbourg must therefore be through German authorities.

5. Under VI page 15, the judgment of the Regional Court of Coburg claims:
The Defendant acted with the knowledge of doing wrong.
and
Under D Part 3 VI page 47:
The Defendant states that, after the police returned a forged identity card to Mr. Heinemann, a confidant of the Defendant, he assumed that the production and use of these identity cards was not punishable...

That the Defendant therefore assumed that the production of the documents for later use was not punishable is far-fetched. The return of a previously forged document by the police alone has no value as a definitive statement, but is a factual procedure. It does not in itself mean that the production and use of such cards is not punishable.

This line of argument is beyond the understanding of the Defendant.

The Defendant had already travelled to Switzerland on April 28, 2009. For the Defendant and the Co-Defendant Mrs. Karin Leffer, VG Danzig was thus de facto history (of course, not its legitimate interests).

The co-founder of VG Danzig, Mr. Heinemann, then produced Danzig identity cards, driving licenses, and registration plates without the knowledge of the Defendant or Mrs. Leffer. These were confiscated by the Neustadt bei Coburg Police Inspectorate on Sept. 03, 2009 and were handed over again on July 05, 2010 and thus put into circulation.

What explanatory value does this factual process have?

No criminal proceedings have been initiated against Mr. Heinemann. Mr. Heinemann used his Danzig ID cards and number plates in various legal matter. It was thus declared that no criminal prosecution would be brought because of the Danzig identity cards.

The fact that these Danzig identity cards were officially acknowledged and that these identity documents were reissued without any consequences proves that no criminal offense was committed.

Further uncontrolled distribution by Mr. Heinemann and possible abuse would have fallen back on the Defendant and Mrs. Leffer.

The Defendant therefore felt almost compelled to take matters into his own hands. In order to avoid any misunderstanding about the use of a Danzig identity card, the Defendant in

Switzerland passed the first general law under which Swiss law applies.

The Free City of Danzig is firmly anchored in Swiss federal law. For example, the country code DA is still registered there on cars for the Free City of Danzig. Similarly, under the London Debt Agreement, Art. 5.2 the Free City of Danzig is entitled to reparations.
The production and use of Danzig identity cards by the Defendant is legitimate because it is not an act of deception in legal matters. This is thanks to Mrs. Karin Leffer, who acted only after notarial certification.

Accordingly, acquittals have always resulted in all known cases, with the exception of the convictions based on Mr. Kellner's statement that Danzig ID cards were the forgery of a German ID card.
All the convictions cited in the ruling of the Coburg Regional Court of Oct. 01, 2019 are based solely on Mr. Kellner's statement that a Danzig ID card is the forgery of a Federal German ID card.
Mr. Kellner later revoked this statement in the case of Dr. Bohn before the Coburg Regional Court, which is why Judge Barausch of the Coburg Regional Court also granted an acquittal.

How can it be argued here that the Defendant should have known that a Danzig identity card could be punishable?

The fact that the Defendant had and still has no sense of wrongdoing with regard to the Danzig identity cards has already been disproved by the fact that the Defendant has always identified himself in Switzerland with his Danzig identity card. This is documented, inter alia, by the files of the extradition proceedings B 224'163/TMA. During questioning at the Public Prosecutor's Office in Sion, the Defendant identified himself with his Danzig identity card. The copy of this was taken on file. It was with this identity that the Defendant was extradited.

Again:
Of course, the Defendant confessed that a Danzig identity card looks similar to an official document.

However, Belgium extradited the Defendant only for the forgery of one document in 83 cases.

For a document to be forged, there must be an original document that has been forged. It is not without reason that Mr. Kellner claimed that a Danzig identity card looked similar to a German Federal identity card. But if an identity card with a red shield and two silver crosses looks similar to a German Federal identity card, then so surely a Swiss identity card or any other ID would, too.

List of acquittals

13/1 Confiscation, dated Sept. 03, 2009 and return dated July 05, 2010 by police inspection Neustadt b. Coburg, to Manfred Heinemann, Sonneberg

13/2 Return of identity card, dated June 7, 2011 by Sigmaringen police, to Klaus Kern

13/3 Termination, Ref: 102 Js 9878/11, dated Nov. 30, 2011 by Public Prosecutor´s Office (StA) Coburg, Dr. Berg, to Karl-Heinz Hofmann

13/4 Termination, Ref: 113 Js 9907/11 dated Dec. 05, 2011 by StA Coburg, Dr. Knecht-Günther and StAin Krapf, to Klaus Engel

13/5 Termination, Ref: 3 Cs 123 Js 715/12 dated Jan. 30,2012 by StA Coburg, to Peter Loer

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

13/6 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 661/12 of Jan. 31, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Josef Lengauer

13/7 Termination, Ref: 106 Js 967/12 of Feb. 03, 2012 by StA Coburg, Krapf, to Andre Ott

13/8 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 1721/12 of March 05, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Lothar Fleischer

13/9 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 1889/12 of March 14, 2012, by StA Coburg, to Erwin Kiefer

13/10 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 2176/12 of March 16, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Dirk Müller

13/11 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 1989/12 of March 20, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Roman Bodurka

13/12 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 2000/12 of April 25, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Hans Kink

13/13 Return of ID card, Ref: 3 Cs 116 Js 2426/12 dated Jan. 29, 2013, StA Hechingen, to Udo Ruppricht

13/14 **No-proceedings order, dated Jan. 20, 2014**, StA Graubünden, to Beowulf von Prince = judicial acquittal 1st class from the local and temporally responsible public prosecutor

13/15 Rejection of extradition, dated March 10, 2014 of the Federal Office of Justice Bern, **responsible authority for indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11** - to Bavarian State Ministry of Justice in Munich

13/16 see 17: The only witness of the Public Prosecutor's Office KHK Kellner no longer maintains his assertion in the trial Dr. Bohn that the Danzig identity card is the forgery of a German Federal identity card. See Dr Bohn judgment

13/17 Acquittal Dr. Bohn, Ref. 2 Ns 101 Js 2078/12 of Nov. 11, 2013, Coburg Regional Court

13/18 Termination, Ref: 384 Js 37381/17 dated Dec. 20, 2017 StA Halle und Ref: 353 Js 37200/17 dated Nov. 23, 2017 StA Halle, to Wolfgang Kottwitz

13/19 Termination for lack of evidence (evidence is on file!) - Rheinfelden Public Prosecutor's Office dated Sept. 28, 2017, Public Prosecutor Simone Stöckli, to Karin Leffer

13/20 **Decision of the Aarau Higher Court of Jan. 26, 2018, termination is acquittal of Karin Leffer 2014 / 2048**

13/21 **Order of the Cantonal Court of Grisons 2018**

We therefore plead infringement of the established case law based on the acquittals listed above.

6. The Regional Court of Coburg expressly confirms the motive of the defendant under page 51, F sentencing, point 2:
He is making a stand for a better legal system
That's not a criminal offense.
The Coburg Regional Court writes that the Defendant describes the Federal Republic of Germany as an ineffectual constitutional state.

From the founding declaration on political reorganization, the Defendant refers to the judgements of the European Court of Human Rights, e.g. in the Sürmeli and Görgülü cases.

As the first sentence in the founding declaration, reference is made to the 2nd Federal Adjustment Act of Nov. 23, 2007, Art. 4 Adjusted Occupation Law §3: Consequences of the adjusted occupation law: “The rights and obligations of the occupying powers and the right of occupation are maintained”.

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

Since the Defendant is directly affected, he is not only particularly entitled to criticism, but also directly obliged to do so.

The direct concern is evidenced by the criminal record.

a. The previous conviction for insult concerns the accusation against the Jena tax office. The Defendant had accused the same of using Nazi methods. This was admittedly not a collegial greeting.

b. The next accusation: fraud
The facts of the case:
Mrs. Hain has asked the Defendant to provide her with a plot of land to house her dogs. The Defendant offered a plot of land approximately 60 meters from the road at his cost, €3/m^2. However, Mrs. Hain preferred the fully developed property directly on the road. After months of use, Mrs. Hain granted a notarial order, according to which the Defendant would receive the €16,200.00, i.e. the price he had requested. It was also agreed that Mrs. Hain would submit a building application. If the building application was not rejected for building code reasons, the Defendant would instead be paid the average price of land approved for building.
Subsequently, a report was filed against the Defendant by the clerk of the Coburg District Office under the subject line: Execution of the Forest Act; sells forest as building site.

This is a demonstratively exaggerated provocation of the Defendant.

The Defendant is a retired senior forest inspector. During his probationary period as a civil servant, he was already active in private forest consultancy and had, among other things, arranged for replacement measures to be carried out in private forests during a bark beetle calamity. This would have been the task of government lawyers. Due to the delicate legal situation, they were unable to cope with this. In probably the best of all probationary period assessments given, the Defendant was certified as having very good theoretical knowledge.
It was also known that the Defendant was quite aware that the Forest Act was no reason to grant a building permit.
The whole thing is exaggerated because the Defendant had already obtained a building permit for this property once before. The Bavarian Administrative Court in Bayreuth has confirmed that his rights have been infringed unlawfully and that he is therefore entitled to compensation. However, instead of suing for these damages, the Defendant preferred to engage in productive activity.
Therefore, this cannot be a case of any sort of deception. No increase in assets or pecuniary loss has taken place if a property is transferred at cost price. The Defendant received €15,000.00 and repaid €43,000.00.

c. The Defendant was accused by the Clerk of the District Office of being in illegal possession of weapons.

This is the absolutely necessary possession of weapons for the exercise of the profession as senior forest inspector (FOI) and thus professional hunter. The weapons were purchased on official order at his own expense. In return, the Defendant has retained a lifetime right to hunt in the Bavarian state forests. The withdrawal of a weapon possession permit requires an appropriate criminal conviction. That does not exist.

Already as a FOI (in employment), the Defendant gained a reputation as a deer murderer beyond government borders, because he exceeded the roe deer quota by a factor of 5. He has continued this as district manager of the forestry and domain office in Coburg and saved over 20 kilometers in fencing costs.

According to the Weapons Act, officially registered weapons cannot lead to the criminal offence of illegal possession of weapons. Which is logical, of course. Officially registered weapons are known to the Office.

If the weapon possession permit is withdrawn, the weapons would have to be confiscated/confiscated ex officio if possessed illegally, otherwise the office would be an accessory and even an accomplice in illegal possession of the weapons.

In Switzerland, everyone owns an assault rifle and a semi-automatic pistol. The possession of weapons is therefore generally permitted. Only the improper possession of weapons is punishable. Because of the lack of double criminality, no extradition should have taken place. But the plaintiff's possession of firearms is also legal in Germany.
Therefore, extradition was only authorized for the purpose of bringing the Defendant before the competent legal authority to allow an international arrest warrant against him to be revoked. A conviction was therefore rejected.
The inclusion of this unlawful conviction in the judgment of the Coburg Regional Court must therefore also lead to an appeal.

d. The criminal record for the Defendant does not list the further criminal complaint by the Clerk of the Coburg District Office concerning the alleged fraud in selling a building plot not approved for development. The buyers have been summoned by the police under the threat of arrest for failure to appear. They do not sign the transcript of the interview.

The land in question is classified as building land. The Defendant bought a development right. When he exercised this in the only possible place, the police appeared and stopped the construction. The Defendant was charged with trespassing, the already laid sewer was torn out.

Judge Bauer, who had already been rejected for prejudice in the alleged fraud trial, already knew that he would be hearing the case of illegal possession of weapons and trespassing.

He also already knew the penalty for illegal possession of firearms and therefore dropped the trespassing charges as a petty offense.

The prejudiced Judge Bauer knew that he would always be the one to hear charges against the Defendant because the system for assigning judges at the court does not comply with Art. 101 GG and has not been created as a reciprocally rotating system. Instead, the cases are allocated according to the alphabet.
No decision has yet been made on the bias applications. To date, the Defendant has not received any judgments for his claims under §§275, 345 StPO and §§125, 126 of the German Civil Code (BGB). The Defendant requested a ruling from the Rheinfelden Justice of the Peace as late as 2015.
According to §§43 (3), 44, 45 Administrative Procedures Act (VwVfG), these “judgments” thus constitute incurably void administrative acts and must therefore be disregarded.

The appeal is therefore justified.

e. To the alleged trespassing at the Forchheim tax office.
In fact, the Defendant had a scheduled appointment at the Forchheim tax office. The conviction was in absentia. The Defendant was already in Switzerland.

f. On the alleged misuse of titles.
This was the subject of legal proceedings and the proceedings were discontinued. Apparently, the Defendant was later sentenced in absentia.

g. The suspended sentence pronounced in the case of Mrs. Hain (fraud) was revoked by the prejudiced unlawful Judge Bauer on the basis of the two penalty orders. This is not permitted under §407 StPO.

The motive of arguing for a better legal system is therefore justified.

7. The judgment did not mention the Defendant's motive relating to the 2nd Federal Adjustment Act (BMJBBG) of November 23, 2007
Although the self-reading procedure also contains the declaration on the foundation of the political reorganization of the Free City of Danzig, the judgment of the Coburg Regional Court did not mention **the Defendant's motive relating to the 2nd Federal Adjustment Act of November 23, 2007, Article 4.**

Again, in explanation,
One can twist and turn this law any way you like.
It is therefore clear:
The 2 + 4 Treaty of 1990 has not yet been implemented.
There are still parties entitled to reparations.
According to Article 5.2 of the London Debt Agreement, the Defendant is entitled to reparation.
It is in the interest of international law to express this unambiguously and to act accordingly.
It is a civic duty to ensure compliance with the 2 + 4 Treaty and is not a criminal offense or a punishable motive.

8. Penalty grounds: The Free City of Danzig nationality as "Reich" ideology
a. Re: the right to reparations:
Art. 25 of the London Debt Agreement obliges the inhabitants of the Federal Republic of Germany to make reparation payments.

Art. 5. 2 of the London Debt Agreement lists the Free City of Danzig is one of the states entitled to reparations.

For this reason, the Law of the Renouncement of German (Reich) Nationality of February 22, 1955 was created. At the written hearing, Danzig was expressly mentioned in bold.

The father of the Defendant made use of this law. The government of Lower Franconia expressly confirms that he nevertheless remained German within the meaning of Art. 116 GG. This is not "Reich ideology!" It is nothing of the sort!

In 1956, the Defendant's father brought an action for damages before the United Nations. He received only 3% of his claims. The rest falls under reparations under the London Debt Agreement.
Therefore the following remark:
According to official documents of the United Nations, the father of the Defendant was sent to Germany by the British after the outbreak of the Second World War. He was classified by the Soviets as a British spy.
However, he was not paid by the British for this.
He was drafted into the German Wehrmacht, evaded this draft, went into hiding instead, and undermined the army's campaign. He was therefore not entitled to any military pension from the German side either.
All participants in the war, including, for example, Dutch SS members, received wages and pensions for their activities during the war.
The Defendant's father fulfilled his civic duties in accordance with the Danzig Constitution. He must also be rewarded for this, or the Defendant is entitled to that inheritance. In case of doubt, the treasury of the Free City of Danzig in the amount of 11.7 tons of gold must be used for this purpose. Certainly, nobody denies that the nationals of the Free City of Danzig are entitled to this state treasure.

In 1952, the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Swiss Confederation that the property of nationals of the Free City of Danzig may not be used for reparations payments.

Switzerland assumes that a passport is proof of nationality.
As confirmed by the Munich District Office, this is not the case for a German passport. A German passport that can be issued on the basis of Art. 116 GG does not constitute proof of

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

citizenship; see also the Law of Renouncement of German (Reich) Nationality and also electoral laws.
The fact that the Defendant identified himself with his Danzig passport was therefore justified; see the demands for reparations of the Greeks and Poles.
How can someone be called upon to make reparations if he himself is authorized to receive reparations?

b. More about the 2 + 4 Treaty.
With the 2 + 4 Treaty, the parliaments of the 4 powers assured the Germans that they would enjoy full sovereignty.

However, the 2 + 4 Treaty contains conditions.
An essential one is the immutability of the European borders. For this purpose, the German-Polish Border Treaty had to be concluded. The Defendant has filed a complaint against this with the Federal Constitutional Court on the grounds that it requires compensation to be paid. The claim was not accepted. Why?

A further essential condition of the 2 + 4 Treaty is that the "Germans" adopt a constitution according to Art. 146 GG. Why do the 4 Powers make it a condition of the sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Germany that a constitution according to Art. 146 GG be adopted? Especially since this possibility has been in the GG from the beginning?

Neither the Poles, nor the deputies of the FRG can dispose of the territory of the Free City of Danzig; see the Potsdam Agreement: The Free City of Danzig remains under Polish administration until a peace treaty is concluded.

Anyone who, like the father of the Defendant, made use of the Law of Renouncement of German (Reich) Nationality could logically not become a Member of Parliament of the FRG. This is laid down in the electoral laws: Excluded from the election is anyone who has made use of the Law Regulating Nationality and has been granted the legal status of not being able to become a Member of Parliament of the FRG.

All Germans, however, must agree on any constitution according to Art. 146 GG. This includes those Germans who cannot become Members of Parliament, but are nevertheless Germans within the meaning of the GG. With a constitution according to Art. 146, the different nationalities would come together under Art. 116 GG. With a consent according to Art. 146 GG, the nationality of the Free City of Danzig would cease to exist as would the territorial question. No reparations could or can be claimed from the nationals of the Free City of Danzig. As part of a new state, all claims for reparations are thus extinguished, thus formally ending the Second World War.

If there are no nationals of the Free City of Danzig, no constitution according to Art. 146 GG can be implemented. This clears the way for claims for reparations. If the nationals of the Free City of Danzig have not articulated their rights, these will be included.

To implement a constitution according to Art. 146 GG, a separation of the Germans within the meaning of Art. 25 GG, Inhabitants of the federal territory, must occur first.
This can only be achieved by different legal entitlements/claims to different legal applications.

The beginning of the prosecution of the Defendant coincides with the promulgation of serious laws.

Bavaria has always claimed more sovereignty and therefore did not want to join the Basic Law as early as 1949 and therefore founded the sister party to the CDU, the CSU. In 1973, Bavaria brought an action before the Federal Constitutional Court to establish that the German Reich continues to exist. The Federal Constitutional Court has found that the German Reich continues to exist, but is not capable of acting.

Bavaria has been suing against the state fiscal equalization system for years, but all in vain. A Bavarian Member of Parliament has sued in vain against the implementation of the euro.

Presumably this is the reason why Bavaria has enacted the Judges and Public Prosecutors Act and thus abolished the independence of judges.

According to the ruling of the ECJ of May 27, 2019, Bavarian courts are not judicial authorities within the meaning of EU law.

On April 19, 2006 with the 1st Act to Adjust Federal Law, the entry into force of the Courts Constitution Act (GVG), the Civil Procedure Code (ZPO) and the Criminal Procedure Code (StPO) was repealed.

In 2006, the report of the scientific service of the German Bundestag on the sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Germany was published. After that, Occupation Law still applies, including: Report of the scientific service of the German Bundestag from 2006.
Transition Agreement and "enemy state clauses" in the light of the sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Germany under international law
Accordingly, the following provisions of the Transition Agreement remain effective after 1990 from part six: Article 3, paras. 1 and 3,

Transition Agreement
Part Six, REPARATIONS
Article 3
(1) The Federal Republic shall in the future raise no objections against the measures which have been, or will be carried out with regard to German external assets of property, seized for purpose of reparation or restitution,....

On Nov. 23, 2007 the 2nd Act to Adjust Federal Law with Article 4: Adjusted Occupation Law, was published.

So there is clearly a need for action.

Who can act and how?

The GG has certainly been amended 60 times.
But Art. 120, 133 and Art. 146 GG still exist unchanged. This is due to Art. 79 GG.

Who can change Article 79 GG? This is indirectly stated in Art. 146: "All Germans." These are not the Members of Parliament of the FRG. They constantly change the GG, but not the articles mentioned. So only those who cannot become Members of the FRG parliament can change these articles in the GG.

And who are these?

The Defendant.

It is known in the relevant circles that the father of the Defendant made use of the Law of Renouncement of German (Reich) Nationality. And the people in these same circles probably know that he filed for damages with the United Nations.

They also should know that the Defendant has brought an action against the German-Polish Border Treaty.

He is therefore predestined to act.
The Defendant's personality profile is already described in his probationary period assessment as an official: He likes to take on a lot of responsibility. He is critical of his superiors, but positive about them. He has good powers of assertion. He can be persuasive. He has good theoretical knowledge. It is expected to become quieter over the years, etc.

With this assessment, the Defendant should have had a steady climb up the career ladder, but he refused to do so because he did not study forestry just to sit around in an office.

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

The Defendant has delivered the productivity of 45 years of employment in just 15 ye without ever demanding or receiving additional compensation.

The Defendant had not claimed damages for the infringement of his rights by the Free State of Bavaria in 1999.

So how do you get someone who is predestined to make the fundamental changes that everyone expects? This person obviously does not attach importance to a special social position nor to lying in the cemetery as the richest man.

One puts this person under existential pressure. He must fight back whether he wants to or not.

The attacks are carried out by authorities through criminal proceedings. These attacks are factually unfounded and therefore obviously political in nature.

The Defendant defends himself just as provocatively. From this interplay, the Defendant together with Mrs. Karin Leffer is confirmed in the indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 as representatives of the Free City of Danzig.

On the basis of the Polish expert opinion on the entitlement to reparations, the Defendant submitted a 33-page letter to the International Court of Justice in The Hague concerning the Free City of Danzig without any further documentation and without mentioning the London Debt Agreement and the 2 + 4 Treaty. The letter was answered Jan. 9, 2018 with Ref. No. 149506. The website of the International Court of Justice is being revised and the transcripts of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials have been published. The United Nations has placed the official documents concerning the father of the Defendant online in all of its official languages.

The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court of Oct. 01, 2019 states that the Defendant is fully responsible for the actions of the Free City of Danzig.

The Greeks are constantly demanding reparations. Poland submitted an expert opinion on its entitlement to reparations in 2017. In 2018, Poland valued its claims at €690 billion. When asked whether this includes the Free City of Danzig, the claim amount was increased to €850 billion.

Certainly, the decision must now be made whether the 2 + 4 Treaty and Article 146 GG will finally be implemented and a peace treaty negotiated to bring the Second World War finally to a formal end.

The further development of the EU also depends on this. How does the EU intend to proceed without the German question being resolved? A Europe with sovereign states or with a state in which Occupation Law still applies? The 2 + 4 Treaty is a state treaty that can be terminated as long as no constitution has been implemented. Without a constitution, in which the immutability of European borders is laid down, the German-Polish Border Treaty can also be terminated.
Therefore, absolutely nothing has been finally settled, as agreed as a condition for the 2 + 4 Treaty.

Is it possible for a court to decide this, in the name of the people, de facto taking the place of the legislature, in management without a mandate?

If even the Members of the Bundestag have to commission an expert opinion in order to gain an overview of the Federal Republic of Germany's position in international law, judges are certainly also overburdened to address this matter.

Not to mention a duty lawyer who may also have a second mandate or even a third mandate.

The legislators of the Federal Republic of Germany have always acted in awareness of their nationality of the German Reich and have seen the Federal Republic of Germany as the legal

successor of the German Reich - see Hallstein Doctrine. Even Chancellor Helmut Kohl held to this in 1989, when he announced after the fall of the Wall: “Everything is possible, even a peace treaty.”

Never before, however, has it been considered that the Federal Republic of Germany could be the legal successor of the sovereign state Free City of Danzig under Art. 116 GG. Thus, the Federal Republic of Germany was and is sovereign and not obliged to make reparations as long as the nationals of the sovereign Free State Free City of Danzig exist. The expression of this sovereignty is Art. 146 GG.

Once again: This sovereignty must be exercised now. When else?

The Defendant therefore requests an expert opinion.

It is intended to shed light on the significance of the Basic Law with regard to the nationals of the Free City of Danzig. Especially as Germans in the meaning of Art. 116 GG with regard to Art. 116 of the Constitution of Danzig, according to which the nationals of the Free City of Danzig are in possession of German nationality within the meaning of Article 116 GG. In addition, the interpretation of Art. 25 GG, Art. 16 GG, and Art. 79 and Art. 146 GG from the point of view of the nationals of the Free City of Danzig. As well as the question of how the Free City of Danzig can be one of the states entitled to reparations under Art. 5.2 of the London Agreement on Debt, but its nationals are Germans within the meaning of the Basic Law.

The appeal was filed within the time limit.

The grounds for the revision of the judgment are violation of law.

The rights violated by the decision of the Coburg Regional Court of Oct. 1, 2019 in detail:
1. The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court violates Art. 43 HLWC or Art. 25 GG and thus against Art. 5.2 of the London Debt Agreement of 1953; here the right to compensation from the Second World War and the right to be exempt from payments made so far and from future payments.

Thus also against the Law on the Regulation of Nationality, Law of Renouncement of German (Reich) Nationality of February 22, 1955.

2. Thus further on the right, among other things to change Art. 79, 120 and 133 GG.
The Agreement on the International Covenant on Civil Rights is also cited, also with regard to Bavaria's interests. Theoretically, Bavaria could, in the course of a constitution according to Art. 146 GG or in the course of a peace treaty become an independent state.

3. The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court violates the conditions of the extradition decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice of Aug. 20, 2012, Case No.: B 224’163/TMA, and the principle of speciality according to Art. 14 European Extradition Convention (ECE).

It violates Art. 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14 ECHR.

During the illegal extradition from April 15, 2016 - April 13, 2017 the condition of detention and insufficient or wrong medical care violated Art. 2 and 3 ECHR.

It is emphasized that negotiations for damages are ongoing because of the extraditions. The Swiss Confederation Finance Department only puzzles who is responsible for this (Responsibility Act). Action for excessive duration of proceedings is filed in Strasbourg.

Exhibit No. 14: Letter from the Federal Office of Justice in Bern dated May 7, 2018

4. The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court violates Art. 1, 3 and 6 of the Framework Decision on the European arrest warrant, and against the judgment of the Court of First Instance in Eupen.

Thus against Art. 1, 6, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 41, 47, 48, 49 and 50 of the Charter of

Fundamental Rights of EU. This also violates Art. 5, 6, 7, 13 and 14 ECHR.

The application for a preliminary ruling is hereby submitted to the ECJ in accordance with Article 267 TFEU in the urgent procedure according to Article 107 of the Rules of Procedure of the Court.

The question must, because of the extradition procedure, in fact be raised in representation of Belgian courts.
Question: Is the judgment of the Coburg Regional Court compatible with the above provisions?

5. The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court violates Art. 25 in conjunction with Art. 116 GG.
Reason again: According to the Potsdam Agreement, the Free City of Danzig is under Polish administration until a peace treaty is concluded. For the nationals of the Free City of Danzig, the Hague IV is therefore the supreme legal order - see Art. 25 GG.

According to Art. 43 HLWC ordre public this right is to be upheld vis-à-vis the Free City of Danzig - see Art. 25 GG. The ordre public of the Free City of Danzig is defined in Art. 116 of the Constitution of the Free City of Danzig as German law at the time of Jan. 1920. This right is guaranteed by Art. 116 GG. It may not be withdrawn according to Art. 16 GG.

The ordre public of the Free City of Danzig also includes the right of property, Art. 14 GG.

The judgment, also in connection with the convictions that are included in the judgment, deprives the Defendant of the right to property; here:
a. his claims stemming from the Second World War
b. not to be used for any claims arising from the Second World War, nor towards Jewish citizens or organizations and the State of Israel,
c. to his right to dispose of his property - here transfer of his property to Mrs. Hain,
d. to sell his designated building land as such,
e. to use his purchased development right,
f. to exercise his profession as a professional hunter, because he is convicted of illegal possession of firearms for his hunting weapons,
g. to keep his property right an acquired brokerage license,
h. his right to an independent judge, Art. 97 GG,
i. his right to a legal judge, Art. 101 GG,
j. his right of property of a judgment served with an original signature by the judge, in accordance to §§ 275, 345 Criminal Procedure Code, in conjunction with §§ 125, 126 Civil Code

6. The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court thus also violates Art. 16 GG: No one may be deprived of German nationality, i. e. the right to German law according to Art. 116 GG.

7. The judgment of the Coburg Regional Court violates the prohibition of double jeopardy. According to Art. 54 Schengen Agreement, Swiss decisions in the same case must also be taken into account. In the case of convictions, these are also entered into the SIS system of the Schengen States. Acquittals must therefore be given equal consideration.

8. Even the national prohibition of double jeopardy is violated.
This again against Art. 50 of the Fundamental Rights of the EU (CFREU) and thus against Art. 7 ECHR.

Beowulf von Prince

Exhibits
1 Federal Printing Document 849, 2nd parliamentary term 1953, debate on the draft of the law to regulate questions of nationality (law on renouncement)
2 Deed of renouncement of the government of Lower Franconia
3 German passport no proof of nationality

4 Official documents of the United Nations
5 Election laws
6 Extradition decision of the Federal Office of Justice, Bern, dated Aug. 20, 2012, Case No. B 224`163/TMA
7 Letter of service of the indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 to the Kronach Prison
8 Arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court, dated Sept. 19, 2013, Case No. 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11
9 Extended extradition request of Dec. 23, 2013, Ref. No.1 KLs 123 Js 3378/11
10 Rejection of the extradition by the Federal Office of Justice of March 10, 2014, Case No. B 224'163/TMA
11 Visit ban
12 Decision Coburg Regional Court of Sept. 18, 2013, Ref. 2 Ns 118 Js 181/08
13/1 Confiscation, dated Sept. 03, 2009 and return dated July 05, 2010 by police inspection Neustadt b. Coburg, to Manfred Heinemann, Sonneberg
13/2 Return of identity card, dated June 7, 2011 by Sigmaringen police, to Klaus Kern
13/3 Termination, Ref: 102 Js 9878/11, dated Nov. 30, 2011 by Public Prosecutor´s Office (StA) Coburg, Dr. Berg, to Karl-Heinz Hofmann
13/4 Termination, Ref: 113 Js 9907/11 dated Dec. 05, 2011 by StA Coburg, Dr. Knecht-Günther and StAin Krapf, to Klaus Engel
13/5 Termination, Ref: 3 Cs 123 Js 715/12 dated Jan. 30,2012 by StA Coburg, to Peter Loer
13/6 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 661/12 of Jan. 31, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Josef Lengauer
13/7 Termination, Ref: 106 Js 967/12 of Feb. 03, 2012 by StA Coburg, Krapf, to Andre Ott
13/8 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 1721/12 of March 05, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Lothar Fleischer
13/9 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 1889/12 of March 14, 2012, by StA Coburg, to Erwin Kiefer
13/10 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 2176/12 of March 16, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Dirk Müller
13/11 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 1989/12 of March 20, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Roman Bodurka
13/12 Termination, Ref: 123 Js 2000/12 of April 25, 2012 by StA Coburg, Siller, to Hans Kink
13/13 Return of ID card, Ref: 3 Cs 116 Js 2426/12 dated Jan. 29, 2013, StA Hechingen, to Udo Ruppricht
13/14 **No-proceedings order, dated Jan. 20, 2014**, StA Graubünden, to Beowulf von Prince = judicial acquittal 1st class from the local and temporally responsible public prosecutor
13/15 Rejection of extradition, dated March 10, 2014 of the Federal Office of Justice Bern, **responsible authority for indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11** - to Bavarian State Ministry of Justice in Munich
13/16 see 17: The only witness of the Public Prosecutor's Office KHK Kellner no longer maintains his assertion in the trial Dr. Bohn that the Danzig identity card is the forgery of a German Federal identity card. See Dr Bohn judgment
13/17 Acquittal Dr. Bohn, Ref. 2 Ns 101 Js 2078/12 of Nov. 11, 2013, Coburg Regional Court
13/18 Termination, Ref: 384 Js 37381/17 dated Dec. 20, 2017 StA Halle und Ref: 353 Js 37200/17 dated Nov. 23, 2017 StA Halle, to Wolfgang Kottwitz
13/19 Termination for lack of evidence (evidence is on file!) - Rheinfelden Public Prosecutor's Office dated Sept. 28, 2017, Public Prosecutor Simone Stöckli, to Karin Leffer
13/20 **Decision of the Aarau Higher Court of Jan. 26, 2018, termination is acquittal of Karin Leffer 2014 / 2048**
13/21 **Order of the Cantonal Court of Grisons 2018**
14 Letter from the Federal Office of Justice in Bern dated May 7, 2018

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