

1 KARIN LEFFER
Rodacher Str. 84a, D-96450 Coburg, FRG
2 because of political persecution at the moment contacted at:
KARIN LEFFER
3 c/o Beowulf von Prince
Schweizer Strasse 38, AT-6830 Rankweil, Austria
4 E-mail: karinleffer@gmail.com
and
5 BOWULF VON PRINCE
Schweizer Strasse 38, AT-6830 Rankweil, Austria
6 E-mail: prince.beowulf@outlook.de

7 Pro Se Plaintiffs

8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT AND BANKRUPTCY COURTS**
10 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

11
12 LEFFER, et al.

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, et
16 al.,

Defendants.

) Case No.: 19-cv-3529-CJN
)
)
)

) *Title of Document:*
) EMERGENCY APPLICATION
)

) [PROPOSED] ORDER
)
)

17
18 EMERGENCY APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER

19 that arrest warrants in connection with the Free City of Danzig may not be executed

20 It is known that an arrest warrant has been issued against the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER and a
21 new arrest warrant can be issued against the Plaintiff BOWULF VON PRINCE at any time or
22 has already been issued again. These warrants are based on the bill of indictment Case Number 1
23 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 with the criminal charge that „Mrs Karin Leffer and Mr von Prince are the
24 representatives of the Free City of Danzig".
25
26
27

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application

CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I. BRIEF JUSTIFICATION 3

II. THE PROCEEDINGS, INDICTMENT 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 IS ILLEGAL

1. The need to reorganize the Free State of Danzig to implement the 2+4 Treaty..... 5

2. The further accusation: „recognize German law only in part."..... 5

3. Debtors want to negotiate against creditors..... 6

4. No independence of public prosecution and judiciary..... 7

5. Authorities obviously act as organizations of the German Reich..... 8

6. Who is responsible in the proceedings 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11?..... 8

7. The prosecutor presumably responsible for the indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11

 a. Statement of the Chief Commissioner for Criminal Investigation, Mr. Kellner..... 9

 b. Acknowledgement of receipt by the criminal investigation department..... 10

 c. The career of Mrs. Public Prosecutor Haderlein..... 10

8. Judge prevents witnesses from being questioned... does not fit my sentence...

 a. The inadmissible question to the witness at the fraud 11

 b. Non-processing of the criminal report..... 11

9. The already proven innocence of the Plaintiffs
Breach of the European Convention on Extradition (ECE)

 a. Postal and visiting ban..... 12

 b. Questioning of the Plaintiff..... 12

 c. Deprivation of liberty..... 13

 d. Non-processing of arrest complaints..... 13

 e. Service of the bill of indictment without the approval of Switzerland..... 13

 f. Refusal of bail..... 14

 g. Issue of the arrest warrant because of the illegal bill of indictment 14

 h. Claim for damages for the violations..... 14

10. The liability question..... 15

III. CONCLUSION..... 17

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 GROUNDS FOR THE EMERGENCY APPLICATION

2 **I. BRIEF JUSTIFICATION**

3 **There is imminent danger.** The charge in this indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 reads: "Mrs
4 Karin Leffer and Mr von Prince are the representatives of the Free City of Danzig."

5 Therefore, this suit has been filed in the District Court of Columbia in Washington, D.C. It
6 should first be determined that jurisdiction in the matter of the Free City of Danzig lies with the
7 courts in the USA.

8 Due to the Extradition Agreement between the EU and the United States of America, the
9 Plaintiffs must expect to be arrested at the airport when entering the United States of America.

10 With the execution of an arrest warrant for the proceedings 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11, the United
11 States of America will enter into joint liability. Thus the competence in the proceedings 1 KLs
12 123 Js 3979/11 lies with the courts of the United States of America.

13
14 The Plaintiff BEOWULF VON PRINCE has submitted evidence of his nationality to the Free
15 City of Danzig:

- 16 a. the official copy of the Government of Lower Franconia/Bavaria/FEDERAL REPUBLIC
17 OF GERMANY for the purpose of rejecting nationality of the German Reich
18 b. the documents of the Plaintiff's father, published on the Internet by the United Nations in
19 New York, confirming the nationality of the Free City of Danzig
20 c. the Nationality Act of the Free City of Danzig.

21
22 The Plaintiffs have sufficiently demonstrated that the Treaty between the FEDERAL
23 REPUBLIC OF GERMANY and the German Democratic Republic on the one hand, and the
24 United States of America, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
25 Ireland and the Republic of France on the other hand, has not been fulfilled from 1990 to the
26 present. The Plaintiffs have sufficiently demonstrated that the organs of the FEDERAL

1 REPUBLIC OF GERMANY have been replaced by organs of the German Reich.

2 The nationals of the Free City of Danzig and the Free City of Danzig have not yet received any
3 reparations.

4 The criminal prosecutions in connection with the Free City of Danzig and this nationality raise
5 suspicions of war crimes.

6 Arrest warrants in connection with the Free City of Danzig and this nationality may not be
7 issued.

8
9 The Plaintiffs have already proved that the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY is the legal
10 successor of the Free City of Danzig (see Recital No. 23). This can be seen, among other things,
11 from Article 79 of the Basic Law in conjunction with Article 146 of the Basic Law.

12 According to Article 79(1), second sentence, of the Basic Law, the Basic Law may not be
13 amended insofar as it concerns issues relating to peace treaties, occupation law and defence law.

14 The Basic Law has already been amended 60 times. But for example not Article 116: "German in
15 the meaning of the Basic Law is..." But the Basic Law can be changed if a constitution is adopted
16 according to Article 146 GG. A constitution according to Article 146 GG must also be approved
17 by the Germans in the meaning of the GG, who cannot become Members of the FEDERAL
18 REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, because they are not nationals of the German Reich. These are the
19 Danzig people (see Recital Nos. 165, 166). The sovereign authority to decide on matters of peace
20 treaties, occupation law and defence law therefore lies with the nationals of the Free City of
21 Danzig. The nationals of the Free City of Danzig are thus the true sovereign of the FEDERAL
22 REPUBLIC OF GERMANY. If the nationals of the German Reich do not fulfil their duties
23 towards the nationals of Danzig, the protection of the Danzig is again transferred to the
24 occupying powers.

25 The Plaintiffs are not really suing the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, but the
26 inhabitants of the Federal territory, who have again submitted to the law of the National Socialist
27 German Reich.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1
2 Mr. Jeffrey Harris, attorney at law, therefore does not represent the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF
3 GERMANY, but actually the German Reich.

4 Nevertheless, the criminal prosecution against the Plaintiffs continues.
5

6 **II. THE PROCEEDINGS, INDICTMENT 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 IS ILLEGAL**

7 **1. The need to reorganize the Free State of Danzig to implement the 2+4 Treaty**

8 An amendment of the complaint was therefore brought in respect of point 14 of the first
9 complaint, the 2 + 4 Treaty. This states that this Treaty has not been implemented and that the
10 United States of America therefore continues to enjoy sovereign rights over the Germans.

11 The Plaintiffs have argued that a political organization of the Free City of Danzig is required for
12 both the implementation of the 2 + 4 Treaty or a peace treaty, as recognized under international
13 law (see Recitals 50-74, 166, 180).

14 In the founding declaration on the political reorganization of the Free City of Danzig of May 23,
15 2008, the motive for this political reorganization of the Free City of Danzig was mentioned in the
16 very first sentence. This is the 2nd Act to Adjust Federal Law of Nov. 23, 2007, Art.4, § 3: "*The*
17 *rights and obligations of the occupying powers and the occupation law shall continue to exist.*"

18 This clearly states that the 2 + 4 Treaty has not been implemented and that it can only be
19 implemented if a political reorganization of the Free City of Danzig exists. The political
20 reorganization of the Free City of Danzig was therefore carried out.

21 Nevertheless, the prosecution of the Plaintiffs continues.
22

23 **2. The further accusation: „...recognize German law only in part."**

24 The further accusation in the bill of indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11. "Mrs Karin Leffer and Mr
25 von Prince recognize German law only in part."

26 A demarcation between the nationals of the Free City of Danzig and the nationals of the German
27 Reich cannot be made by founding a political party (Due to the electoral laws, nationals of the

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1
2 Free City of Danzig cannot become Members of Parliament anyway, see Exhibit 5 of the
3 complaint: Electoral Laws). A demarcation between the nationals of the Free City of Danzig and
4 the nationals of the German Reich can only be made under international law by the nationals of
5 the Free City of Danzig insisting on the ordre public of the Free City of Danzig.

6 This has been done (see Recitals 50-66).

7 Before the Plaintiffs reorganized the Free City of Danzig politically, they founded the Bund für
8 das Recht to demand German occupation law. This is the right of the Free City of Danzig,
9 defined in Article 116 of the Danzig Constitution. That this right is not respected is easy to
10 prove. According to German occupation law, sentences are to be signed by the judge and handed
11 over with this signature. Despite years of reminders, for example, the Plaintiff never received a
12 judgment signed by the judge for the hearing of March 30, 2006 at the Coburg District Court.

13
14 With the judgement of the Coburg Regional Court on October 01, 2019, the Plaintiff BEOWULF
15 VON PRINCE was confirmed as the responsible representative of the Free City of Danzig.

16 Thus the 2 + 4 Treaty can be implemented or a peace treaty can be concluded - see Amendment
17 of the complaint.

18 Nevertheless, criminal prosecution against the Plaintiffs continues.

19
20 **3. Debtors want to negotiate against creditors**

21 With the filing of the lawsuit in the District Court of Columbia, Washington D.C., there is
22 evidence that the Plaintiffs want a court decision.

23 By filing the suit in Washington D.C., the Plaintiffs submit to a court decision by a neutral court.

24 Finally, the nationals of the German Reich who are obliged to pay reparations cannot give a
25 neutral judgment in matters of reparations against the nationals of the Free City of Danzig who
26 are entitled to reparations.

27 A judge who has debts cannot negotiate about his debts against the creditor.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1
2 Especially if the debtor, because of his own debts, prosecutes the creditor as a fraudster.

3
4 **4. No independence of public prosecution and judiciary**

5 The German Federal Ministry of Justice, among others, was informed of this procedure. It was
6 pointed out that the Federal Ministry of Justice is responsible for ensuring compliance with
7 federal law. It is therefore entitled to issue instructions to the judicial authorities, in this case the
8 Bavarian public prosecutor's office. German public prosecutors act in accordance with
9 instructions (Recital No. 179).

10 Courts Constitution Act (GVG)

11 Section 146

12 *The officials of the public prosecution office must comply with the official instructions of their
superiors.*

13 Section 147

14 *The right of supervision and direction shall lie with:*

15 *1. the Federal Minister of Justice and Consumer Protection in respect of the Federal Prosecutor
General and the federal prosecutors;*

16 *2. the Land department of justice in respect of all the officials of the public prosecution office of
the Land concerned;*

17 *3. the highest-ranking official of the public prosecution office at the Higher Regional Courts and
the Regional Courts in respect of all the officials of the public prosecution office of the given
18 court's district.*

19 - see also the ruling of the ECJ of May 27, 2019: German public prosecutors are not judicial
20 authorities in the meaning of EU law ECJ: C-508/18 and C-82/19 as well as C-509/18).

21
22 The same applies to Bavarian judges. According to the Bavarian Judge- und Public Prosecutor's
23 Law from the year 2005 the judges are subject to the disciplinary law for civil servants and
24 soldiers. The position of judge and public prosecutor in Bavaria therefore alternates constantly.
25 There is legally no difference between a Bavarian judge and public prosecutor. There is no
26 separation of powers (see Recitals 50-52).

27 Nevertheless, the criminal prosecution against the Plaintiffs continues.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 **5. Authorities obviously act as organizations of the German Reich**

2 Therefore, German ministries were informed that the further prosecution of the Plaintiffs meant
3 that they were not acting as organizations of the Federal Republic of Germany, but as an
4 organization of the German Reich. In this regard, the 1973 ruling of the German Federal
5 Constitutional Court was quoted: *"The German Reich and the people of the German Reich*
6 *continue to exist. They are merely not capable of acting due to a lack of organization.*

7 *The Federal Republic of Germany is not the legal successor of the German Reich."*

8 This judgement called for the replacement of the organizations of the Federal Republic of
9 Germany by organizations of the German Reich.

10 This has obviously happened.

11
12 **6. Who is responsible in the proceedings 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11?**

13 The judge pronounces his judgement in the name of the people. According to the German
14 Federal Constitutional Court, this is the people of the German Reich.

15
16 Mrs. Franke, Judge of the Coburg Regional Court/Bavaria/GERMANY, represents in the
17 proceedings 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 the people of the German Reich or the inhabitants of the
18 Federal territory - Article 25 of the Basic Law for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY -
19 who submit to the law of these judges.

20 In her judgment of October 01, 2019, Judge Franke expressly pointed out that an appeal may be
21 lodged against it. This has been done. But the Federal Attorney General did not recognize the
22 Plaintiff's appeal because it was not filed by a lawyer. The Federal Supreme Court did not served
23 a judgment (no signature - no expression of will of a responsible person) (Exhibit 3 -
24 Memorandum FRG).

25
26 Thus, the person responsible for the bill of indictment remains the clerk of the public
27

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 prosecutor's office who drafted the bill of indictment 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11. This is Mrs. Ursula
2 Haderlein, President of the Coburg Regional Court and thus the disciplinary superior of Judge
3 Franke.

4
5 **7. The prosecutor presumably responsible for the indictment 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11**

6 **a. Statement of the Chief Commissioner for Criminal Investigation (KHK), Mr. Kellner**

7 During his extradition custody in 2013, the Plaintiff was called into the interrogation room of the
8 prison. There, Mr. Chief Commissioner for Criminal Investigation (KHK) Kellner and a colleague
9 waited.

10 The Plaintiff asked: "What is this about?" Mr. KHK Kellner replied, "About Gdansk ID cards."

11 The Plaintiff asked, "What about it?" Mr. KHK Kellner replied: "The Free City of Danzig does
12 not exist." The Plaintiff replied: "Who says so?" Mr. KHK Kellner: "**Mrs. Public Prosecutor**
13 **Haderlein.**"

14 Further details:

15 The Plaintiff: "Is Mrs. Haderlein's signature on the International Court of Justice in The Hague or
16 my signature with the stamp of the Free City of Danzig?" The Plaintiff wanted to testify and start
17 with the motive. This begins with the fact that the Plaintiff was wrongly convicted of alleged
18 fraud on March 30, 2006. Mr. KHK Kellner did not want that. He said that we would be sitting
19 there this afternoon. The matter is all too well known to the Coburg police. After all, when he
20 was still in Germany, the Plaintiff complained to the police about it almost every week and filed
21 charges of forgery of documents etc. (The documentation of the most important events now
22 comprises a book of 1,000 pages). When the Plaintiff once again wanted to file a complaint, this
23 time for extortion of testimony, the police received the Plaintiff with the words: „You know that
24 this is useless." The Plaintiff: „I still pressed charges." The Plaintiff was taken to a room and told
25 to record his complaint. The police removed themselves from the room but left the door open.
26 The Plaintiff recorded his complaint on tape. Then a policeman came and said, „You did a great
27 job."

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application

CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 Since Mr. KHK Kellner did not want to take the Plaintiff's statement during the interrogation in
2 jail, the Plaintiff raised his voice. A judicial officer opened the door to the interrogation room
3 and asked: „What's going on here?" The Plaintiff replied, „The police officers are hard of
4 hearing." That concluded the questioning.

5
6 **b. Acknowledgement of receipt by the criminal investigation department**

7 The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER was supposed to pick up a confiscated laptop, confiscated during
8 the house search of the office of reorganization of the Free State of Danzig on July 14, 2011. The
9 police officer presented a letter from Mrs. Public Prosecutor Haderlein for the acknowledgement
10 of receipt in such a way that the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER had to see that **Mrs. Haderlein was**
11 **the person responsible.**

12
13 **c. The career of Mrs. Public Prosecutor Haderlein**

14 She could have acted like her colleague, Mrs. Siller from the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office.
15 The latter had ordered the termination of the proceedings for Danzig's identity cards several
16 times. In the mass trials for Danzig identity cards, a defendant had asked Judge Bauer why Mrs.
17 Siller had ordered the proceedings to be discontinued, but he is now on trial. Judge Bauer's
18 answer: " I will not let Mrs. Siller come from Hof to answer this question." Apparently, Mrs.
19 Siller had been transferred to Hof for punishment. The region around Hof is called the Bavarian
20 Siberia.

21 In contrast, Mrs. Haderlein was appointed President of the Coburg Regional Court (continuation
22 of Recital No. 113, involved Public Prosecutor Lohneis was appointed President of the Coburg
23 Regional Court).

24 Evidence no. 1: Newspaper report
25
26
27

1 **8. Judge prevents witnesses from being questioned: „... does not fit my sentence...”**

2 **a. The inadmissible question to the witness**

3 On March 30, 2006, Judge Bauer had heard against the Plaintiff BOWULF VON PRINCE for
4 alleged fraud. The Plaintiff asked the main witness in the case, the government lawyer from the
5 Coburg District Office, the question: "Why do you report me under subject: Execution of the
6 Forest Act: „sells forest as a building site,, and not under: „enforcement of the zoning law?" (The
7 forest law is no obstacle to building development. The Plaintiff had built a house with four
8 condominiums in the forest. The Plaintiff had already once obtained a building permit for the
9 land in question. The Bayreuth Bavarian Administrative Court ruled as late as 1999 that the
10 Plaintiff's rights had been unlawfully violated when his building application was refused.
11 Compensation is still pending).

12 Evidence: Bayreuth Administrative Court, Case No.: B 2 K 97.784 of Febr. 25, 99

13
14 Judge Bauer dismissed this question with the comment, „I will not allow this question because
15 this question does not fit into my ruling." In fact, he had already written the verdict.

16 Evidence: witnesses

17 Evidence: multiple charges: at the Munich State Criminal Police Office

18 with the then Bavarian Minister President Stoiber

19 with the then Bavarian Interior Minister Beckstein

20 finally on Febr. 26, 2007 shortly before the hearing in second

21 instance with the Office for the Protection of the Constitution by a

22 witness of the negotiation

23 Evidence: Tape recording

24 Newspaper report

25 Evidence: four requests to rectify the court minutes and the negative decision

26 of the Judge Bauer

27 Evidence: Claim in the court transcript that the judge would have interrupted the hearing in

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application

CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 order to reach a verdict. Witnesses prove that the judge, without interrupting the
2 hearing, turned over a few pages in his file and read out the already prepared verdict.
3

4 **b. Non-processing of the criminal report**

5 After the Plaintiff had obtained a building permit with the ruling of the Bayreuth Bavarian
6 Administrative Court, the municipality rededicated the plots of land and thus again prevented the
7 development. The Plaintiff filed a complaint because he was prosecuted for rededication. Public
8 Prosecutor Haderlein refused to process the complaint - without signature (see also Recitals No.
9 97, 99, 101)

10 Evidence No 2: Letter from the Public Prosecutor dated May 23, 2007, Ref. 105 AR 184/07
11

12 **9. The already proven innocence of the Plaintiffs in Case 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11**

13 **Breach of the European Convention on Extradition (ECE)**

14 **a. Postal and visiting ban**

15 A postal and visiting ban was imposed on the Plaintiff during his extradition custody in 2013, so
16 that anyone who applied for a Danzig identity card could be sentenced in mass trials undisturbed
17 by the Plaintiff's advice. They were convicted on the basis of Mr. KHK Kellner's statement that a
18 Danzig identity card was a forgery of a German Federal identity card, as instigators and
19 accomplices in a forgery of documents. The Plaintiffs are described as perpetrators.

20 If there had been a justified suspicion of a criminal act, the SWISS CONFEDERATION would
21 have been requested to extradite them to this criminal prosecution.
22

23 Even the Swiss lawyer's mail was read.
24

25 **b. Questioning of the Plaintiff**

26 Even questioning the Plaintiff about the Danzig identity cards was a violation of the principle of
27 speciality. The Plaintiff had only been extradited for the purpose of bringing him to trial for
28

1 alleged illegal possession of weapons, in order to have an international arrest warrant against him
2 revoked. Innocence is already stated in the arrest warrant issued by the Coburg Regional Court:
3 "File an inadmissible appeal against the revocation of the weapons possession permit." There is
4 no inadmissible appeal. Even the withdrawal of a weapon possession permit does not turn
5 officially reported weapons into illegal weapons possession. Failure to comply with the return of
6 the gun permit is merely an administrative offence. Since the Plaintiff is a professional hunter,
7 his weapon possession permit may only be revoked on the basis of a criminal conviction, etc.

8
9 **c. Deprivation of liberty**

10 The Plaintiff was held in captivity in violation of the conditions of the Swiss Federal Office of
11 Justice's extradition decision of August 20, 2012. According to the German legal commentary on
12 a violation of the principle of speciality, this constitutes a deprivation of liberty.

13
14 **d. Non-processing the arrest complaints**

15 The plaintiff's arrest complaints were not processed. The Plaintiff has therefore gone on hunger
16 strike. After a week, all the arrest complaints were suddenly and of course unfoundedly rejected.

17
18 **e. Service of the bill of indictment without the approval of the competent Federal Office of**
19 **Justice in Bern, Switzerland**

20 The Plaintiff was presented with the indictment 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 with the request to
21 comment on it within three weeks and to appoint a mandatory lawyer, otherwise he would
22 receive a mandatory lawyer appointed by the court.

23 The plaintiff replied: "Even in German prisons, the accused (Plaintiff) is subject only to Swiss
24 law and will only make a statement on this matter to Swiss authorities".

1 The Plaintiff filed a claim for damages with the Swiss Supreme Court in Bern and filed a
2 voluntary complaint with the Swiss Federal Office of Justice in Bern regarding indictment 1 KLS
3 123 Js 3979/11.

4 The Plaintiff has sued Mr. General Prosecutor Lückemann of the Bamberg Higher Regional
5 Court at the Bamberg District Court in an action for a declaratory judgment to establish the legal
6 relationships; here for a declaratory judgment to establish the legal provisions of the Weapons
7 Act on September 15, 2013.

8 Thereupon, the Bamberg Higher Regional Court rejected the Plaintiff's appeal on the grounds of
9 the conviction for illegal possession of firearms. Therefore, the Public Prosecutor's Office
10 returned this action for declaratory judgment of the Plaintiff on September 17, 2013 on the
11 grounds that the rejection of the Plaintiff's appeal does not allow the Plaintiff to file an action at
12 the Bamberg District Court.

13 In the meantime, Mr. General Prosecutor Lückemann had been appointed President of the
14 Bamberg Higher Regional Court. The judges of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court thus had to
15 rule on the infringement of the extradition decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice, for
16 which their disciplinary superior is responsible.

17
18 **f. Refusal of bail**

19 With judgement of Sept. 18, 2013, Case Number 2 Ns 118 Js 181/08 the Coburg Regional Court
20 rejected the bail offer of the Plaintiff in the amount of 1.344.000,-€ even per day (Recital 107,
21 Exhibit 11 of the complaint).

22
23 **g. Issue of the arrest warrant because of the illegal bill of indictment 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11**

24 On September 19, 2013, the Regional Court issued an arrest warrant against the Plaintiff, Case
25 Number 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11, in which it is stated on the last page that this warrant cannot be
26 executed because the Plaintiff is under Swiss sovereignty. Why then was this warrant issued?
27

1 Because the Plaintiff had of course also sued the head of the prison. He should have released the
2 Plaintiff from prison, which the head of the prison knew.

3 The Plaintiff had to be released from prison on October 18, 2013. He had served his 10 months
4 sentence for allegedly illegal possession of firearms.

5
6 **h. Claim for damages for the violations**

7 Immediately after his release from prison, the Plaintiff filed a claim for damages at the Leuk and
8 west of Raron District Court/Switzerland. The claim: 1.344.000,-€ bail/per day was rejected for
9 insignificance. Then the claim cannot be smaller. 300 days innocent imprisonment x 1.344.000,-
10 € is 403.200.000,-€. This claim was presented with the Case Number of the German Office of the
11 Federal President by fax and twice by bailiffs and thus as an official document. Claims arising
12 from authentic instruments which are not contested within 30 days are deemed to be recognized
13 and enforceable. According to § 226 of the German Fiscal Code (tax laws), claims against the
14 state are to be directly set off against taxes.

15 Already in 2010, the Plaintiff had submitted a claim for damages of more than € 48.000.000 to
16 the Coburg Regional Court via the District Court Hinterrhein (Thusis) Switzerland and thus as an
17 authentic document. The Plaintiff had submitted this claim to various tax offices. In no case
18 could a legal basis be given according to which this claim was unjustified.

19
20 It has therefore already been admitted that the Plaintiff is also entitled to damages from the
21 German side on account of the proceedings 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11.

22 Nevertheless, this procedure is not discontinued.

23
24 **10. The liability question**

25 According to the Extradition Agreement between EUROPEAN UNION and USA, an arrest
26 warrant must be executed on the basis of the proceedings 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11. Just as the
27 KINGDOM OF BELGIUM has done.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 The Coburg Regional Court has been informed that the proceedings 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 are
2 pending in Washington D.C.

3 Nevertheless, no suspension or at least temporary suspension of the proceedings, at least a
4 temporary suspension of the arrest warrant against Mrs KARIN LEFFER is ordered.

5 Judge Franke of the Coburg Regional Court has now announced that she cannot revoke the arrest
6 warrant of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER for formal reasons. Therefore, for formal reasons, it has
7 to be heard before the Coburg Regional Court.

8 As the whole criminal prosecution of the Plaintiff BEOWULF VON PRINCE proves, it is no
9 longer organs of the Federal Republic of Germany that are acting, but the organs of the German
10 Reich.

11 The Criminal Code of the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY is no longer applied, but the
12 law of the National Socialist German Reich "*§ 2: Anyone who commits an act which the law
13 declares to be punishable or which deserves punishment according to the basic idea of a penal
14 law and according to healthy public sentiment will be punished. If no specific penal law is
15 directly applicable to the act, the act shall be punished according to the law whose basic idea
16 best applies to it.*

17 This §2 was banned by the decision of the Permanent International Court of Justice in The Hague
18 in 1935, Ref. A/B No. 65 - available: <http://www.icj-cij.org/pcij/series-a-b.php?p1=9&p2=3>

19
20 The public prosecutor determines what the healthy public sentiment is and thus speaks for the
21 people.

22 Where there is no prosecutor, there is no judge.

23 The prosecutor is Mrs. Ursula Haderlein, representing the people.

24 Anyone who submits to the laws of the German Reich will be held jointly responsible.

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 The Plaintiffs are officially prosecuted as representatives of the sovereign state Free City of
3 Danzig. In international law this constitutes an act of war.

4 The Plaintiffs are officially prosecuted because they insist on their ordre public. This constitutes
5 a violation of the Convention Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV.)
6 and thus a war crime - see Indictment No. 2 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

7 For this case the enemy state clauses of the United Nations Art. 53 and 107 were created (see
8 Recital No. 60 of the complaint and Memorandum EU Recital No. 208).

9 Article 53 of the Charter of the United Nations:

10 *"1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional*
11 *arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no*
12 *enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional*
13 *agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of*
14 *measures against any enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this Article,*
15 *provided for pursuant to Article 107 or in regional arrangements directed against*
16 *renewal of aggressive policy on the part of any such state, until such time as the*
17 *Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the*
18 *responsibility for preventing further aggression by such a state.*

19 *2. The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of the Article applies to any state*
20 *which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the*
21 *present Charter."*

22 Article 107 of the Charter of the United Nations:

23 *"Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to*
24 *any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory*
25 *to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the*
26 *Governments having responsibility for such action."*

27 With Art. 25 of the Basic Law for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, every inhabitant
28 of the federal territory was directly, immediately obliged to comply with the Hague IV., here Art.
43 ordre public (see Recital 38).

If this is nevertheless infringed, the provisions of the Transitional Treaty on Reparations were
expressly reaffirmed by correspondence dated 27/28 September 1990.

(see Memorandum EU, Recital No. 209):

1 *Legal basis for immediate execution without further judicial review.*

2 *Federal Law Gazette 1990, Part II, page 1386 ff.*

3 Confirmed by the 2006 report of the Scientific Service of the German Bundestag.

4 *1.4. the exchange of notes of September 27/28, 1990. This exchange of notes*
5 *provides ...pursuant to Art. 3, that.... remain in force,from the sixth part:*
6 *Article 3(1) and (3).....*

7 PART SIX, Article 3, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Transitional Treaty of 1954,
8 which expressly remains in force, states

9 *1. The Federal Republic shall in the future raise no objections against the*
10 *measures which have been, or will be, carried out with regard to German*
11 *external assets or other property, seized for the purpose of reparation or*
12 *restitution, or as a result of the state of war, or on the basis of agreements*
13 *concluded, or to be colcluded, by the Three Powers with other Allied*
14 *countries, neutral countries or former allies of Germany.*

15 *3. No claim or action shall be admissible against persons who shall have acquired*
16 *or transferred title to property on the basis of the measures referred to in*
17 *paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article, or against international organisations,*
18 *foreign governments or persons who have acted upon instructions of such*
19 *organisations or governments.*

20 This means that the inhabitants of the federal territory do not have the capacity to be a party in
21 case of violation of the ordre public, i.e. acts of war.

22
23 The Coburg Regional Court confirmed now that the arrest warrant against the Plaintiff KARIN
24 LEFFER is maintained.

25 Evidence No. 3: Order of the Coburg Regional Court dated April 27, 2020

26
27 The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER may be arrested at any time on account of these proceedings 1
28 KLS 123 Js 3979/11.

There is therefore imminent danger.

Therefore, an emergency application is made, that arrest warrants in connection with the Free
City of Danzig may not be executed.

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 Evidence of innocence was already presented in the preliminary complaint, but then also in the
2 amendment of the complaint.

3 To date, none of the Defendants has contradicted these.

4
5 In relation to the prosecuting authority, the Coburg Public Prosecutor's office/Bavaria, the
6 confirmation that an arrest warrant in the matter of the Free City of Danzig may not be executed
7 will only have effect if the already acknowledged damages are at least partially executed.

8
9 Therefore, an application for an enforceable deed against German assets in the USA is filed at
10 the same time - see Exhibits.

11
12 **If the arrest warrant is nevertheless not revoked, there is suspicion of incitement to**
13 **deprivation of liberty, threat, coercion, slander and obstruction of justice. The Plaintiffs**
14 **are to be deprived of the opportunity to defend themselves.**

15
16 Date: May 27, 2020

17
18 Name: Karin UV

Name: Beowulf von Prince

19 KARIN LEFFER
20 c/o Beowulf von Prince
21 Schweizer Straße 38
22 AT-6830 Rankweil
Austria

BEOWULF VON PRINCE
Schweizer Straße 38
AT - 6830 Rankweil
Austria

23 Exhibits

24 Application for an enforceable deed in the amount of \$20,000,000 against German assets in the
25 USA

26 Evidence No.1: Press report

<https://www.obermain.de/lokal/obermain/art2414,818456>

By Mathias Mathes February 14, 2020

11:10 a.m. Updated on: February 22, 2020 03:33

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application

CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 *The judiciary in Coburg and Bamberg has new heads of authority. At the*
2 *inauguration, from left to right: the Bavarian Minister of Justice Georg*
3 *Eisenreich, the new President of the Bamberg Regional Court Anton Lohneis,*
4 *the new President of the Coburg Regional Court Ursula Haderlein and Lothar*
5 *S... Photo: Mathias Mathes*

6 *Change at the Upper Franconian judicial authorities: Ursula Haderlein is the*
7 *new President of the Coburg Regional Court. Her predecessor Anton Lohneis*
8 *now holds this top position at the Bamberg Regional Court.*

9 *At the farewell ceremony for Anton Lohneis on Thursday, Bavarian Justice*
10 *Minister Georg Eisenreich broke a lance for an independent judiciary. He said*
11 *that peace, freedom, democracy, and prosperity were not something that could*
12 *be taken for granted, but rather had to be constantly defended and won anew.*
13 *The judicial authorities would have a leading role to play in this. "The*
14 *independence of the judiciary must never be called into question in a*
15 *constitutional state," Eisenreich stressed.*

16 *In addition, he spontaneously invited representatives of the Coburg judicial*
17 *authorities to a meeting as early as next week. The background: Coburg is a*
18 *pilot location for the introduction of the electronic file into the Bavarian judicial*
19 *system. According to the new president of the regional court, there is still a lot of*
20 *sand in the gears during the implementation. A factual discussion in the Ministry*
21 *of Justice is intended to provide quick remedy in the form of practical solutions.*

22 *Lohneis and Haderlein - according to Justice Minister Eisenreich "two*
23 *outstanding personalities of the Upper Franconian judiciary" - know each other*
24 *very well as a result of years of cooperation in Coburg. Lohneis has not only*
25 *served as president of the Regional Court, but also as public prosecutor, senior*
26 *public prosecutor and director of the Coburg District Court.*

27 *Ursula Haderlein was Senior Public Prosecutor in Schweinfurt*

28 *Ursula Haderlein began her career in 1998 at the public prosecutor's office in*
Coburg and also worked as a judge and senior public prosecutor. Most recently,
she spent five years as senior public prosecutor in Schweinfurt. "I was warmly
received in Coburg," she emphasized. And Anton Lohneis looked back with
gratitude: "The Coburg judiciary was a stroke of luck for me both professionally
and personally."

Prior to this, Mrs Ursula Haderlein worked as group leader at the public
prosecutor's office in Coburg under the leadership of Mr Lohneis. In this
function, she was the clerk of the indictment 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11.

Evidence No.2: Letter from the Public Prosecutor dated May 23, 2007, Ref. 105 AR 184/07

Evidence No. 3: Order of the Coburg Regional Court dated April 27, 2020

Comment on this:

There is no signature of any judge and therefore no responsible person.

It is certified that there is also no signature of a judge in the original.

The letter is stamped with the Bavarian Regional Court.

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application

CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 There's no such thing as the Bavarian Regional Court.
2 With this stamp "Landgericht Bayern" it is expressed that here not independent
3 judges act, but persons bound by instructions.
4
5

6 Service List:

7 Via Swiss Mail to:
8 District Court of Columbia, Washington DC

9 Attorney of the FRG, European Union, Kingdom of Belgium
10 Jeffrey Harris
11 HARRIS & COOKE, LLP
12 1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
13 Ste 700
14 Washington, D.C. 20036
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Emergency application

CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 KARIN LEFFER
2 registered address: Rodacher Str. 84a, D-96450 Coburg, FRG
3 because of political persecution at the moment contacted at:
4 KARIN LEFFER
5 c/o Beowulf von Prince
6 Schweizer Strasse 38, AT-6830 Rankweil, Austria
7 E-mail: karinleffer@gmail.com
8 and
9 BOWULF VON PRINCE
10 Schweizer Strasse 38, AT-6830 Rankweil, Austria
11 E-mail: prince.beowulf@outlook.de
12 Pro Se Plaintiff

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT AND BANKRUPTCY COURTS
9 FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

11 LEFFER, et al.

12 Plaintiff(s),

13 vs.

14 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, et
15 al.,

16 Defendant(s).

) Case No.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

) Title of Document:
) [PRPOSED] ORDER for

) EMERGENCY APPLICATION

17
18 The plaintiff BOWULF VON PRINCE has submitted evidence of his nationality to the Free
19 City of Danzig:

20 The official copy of the government of Lower Franconia/Bavaria/Federal Republic of Germany
21 for the rejection of nationality of the German Reich,
22 the documents of the plaintiff's father, published on the Internet by the United Nations in New
23 York, in which the nationality of the Free City of Danzig is confirmed.

24
25 The plaintiffs have provided sufficient evidence that the Treaty between the Federal Republic of
26 Germany and the German Democratic Republic on the one hand, and the United States of
27 America, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Proposed order Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529
(CJN)

1 Republic of France on the other hand, has not been fulfilled from 1990 until today. The plaintiffs
2 have sufficiently demonstrated that the organs of the Federal Republic of Germany have been
3 replaced by organs of the German Reich.

4 The nationals of the Free City of Danzig and the Free City of Danzig have not yet received
5 reparations.

6 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that criminal prosecutions in connection with the Free City of
7 Danzig and this nationality raise suspicion of war crimes.

8 Arrest warrants in connection with the Free City of Danzig and this nationality may not be
9 executed.

10
11 Date: _____

Hon. Carl J. Nichols
United States District Judge

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Proposed order Emergency application CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529
(CJN)