

1 KARIN LEFFER  
registered address: 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

5 and

6 BOWULF VON PRINCE  
Schweizer Strasse 38, AT-6830 Rankweil, Austria  
7 E-mail: prince.beowulf@outlook.de

8 Pro Se Plaintiff

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

12  
13 LEFFER, et al. )  
14 Plaintiff(s), ) Case No.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)  
15 vs. ) *Title of Document:*  
16 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, et ) MOTION for JOINDER of PARTIES for the  
al., ) FURTHER DEFENDANT UNITED  
17 Defendant(s). ) STATES OF AMERICA  
[proposed] ORDER

18  
19  
20 The Plaintiffs KARIN LEFFER and BOWULF of PRINCE file a motion for joinder of parties  
21 with the further Defendant the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA under Rules 18-21 Federal  
22 Rules of Civil Procedure.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2	I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE MOTION FOR JOINDER OF PARTIES FOR	
3	THE FURTHER DEFENDANT USA .....	3
4	II. PARTIES, JURISDICTION OF THE COURT.....	6
5	A. Jurisdiction over treaties concluded by the USA .....	6
6	B. On the capacity of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER to be a party before this Court ..	8
7	1. Direct obligation to bring an action against the UNITED STATES	
8	according to the Basic Law for the FRG .....	8
9	2. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is directly affected because of her	
10	commitment to the preservation of the Basic Law, the treaties of the FRG	
11	also with the USA .....	9
12	3. The action against the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is necessary	
13	to protect the UNITED STATES from further damage .....	9
14	a. Failure of the Government of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
15	to provide clarification - responsibility of the UNITED STATES .....	9
16	b. No clarification on the termination of the 2 + 4 Treaty .....	10
17	c. No clarification that essential provisions of the Basic Law and	
18	legal provisions of the FRG are no longer being observed .....	10
19	d. Lack of information by the USA .....	12
20	e. Direct infringement of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER .....	12
21	• The fact that essential provisions of the Basic Law and the	
22	2 + 4 Treaty are not observed means that the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER's	
23	rights have been violated .....	12
24	• In spite of the filed complaint Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN	
25	the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is still wanted with an arrest warrant,	
26	with the official accusation: „Mrs. Karin Leffer is the representative	
27	of the Free City of Danzig." .....	13
28	• Joint liability of the USA .....	14
	4. Conclusion .....	15
	III. CLAIMS	
	A. Statement of reasons for the Plaintiff's claims KARIN LEFFER .....	16
	1. The USA occupation zone .....	16
	2. Regulation of the rights of the occupying powers .....	17
	3. Regulation of reparations .....	17
	4. NATO-Treaty .....	18
	B. Statement of reasons concerning the amount of the Plaintiff's claims	
	KARIN LEFFER .....	20
	1. Facts of the case .....	20
	2. For comparison .....	23
	IV. RELIEF .....	24

1                    I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE MOTION FOR JOINDER OF PARTIES FOR  
2                    THE FURTHER DEFENDANT USA

3 226. Although this action has been brought, Mr President of the UNITED STATES OF  
4 AMERICA Donald Trump is manifestly unaware of it. Mr. President Donald Trump calculates  
5 that the "Germans" owe € 1'000'000'000'000,- in defense costs for the last 25 years. President  
6 Donald Trump complains about the foreign trade surpluses, especially of the "Germans".

7 The Plaintiffs have quoted from the scientific report of the German Bundestag from 2006,  
8 according to which reparations obligations still exist. The Plaintiffs quoted from the 2nd Act to  
9 Adjust Federal Law of Nov. 23, 2007, Art. 4, according to which the rights and obligations of the  
10 occupying powers and occupation law continue to exist.

11 At the Munich Security Conference, Mike Pompeo, Secretary of State of the UNITED STATES  
12 OF AMERICA, praises the superiority of Western values.

13 He does so in a de facto and de jure dictatorship.

14 The Plaintiffs have proven that the independence of judges in Bavaria was quite obviously and  
15 provocatively revoked by law.

16 The Plaintiffs prove that the public prosecutors, who are bound by political instructions, were  
17 and continue to be appointed disciplinary superiors of the judges. Now the judges are to decide  
18 on the cases of their superiors.

19 In their supplementary claim (ECF Doc. No. 6), the Plaintiffs prove that the 2 + 4 Treaty of 1990  
20 has not been implemented until today.

21 Thus, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are still direct occupying powers.

22 Everyone therefore believes that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are responsible for the  
23 de facto dictatorship in Bavaria.

24 The Plaintiffs are also suing the EU. The Plaintiffs therefore assume that the EU also informs the  
25 states of the EU about this lawsuit. But this has obviously not happened.

26  
27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 3 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 The EU criticizes Poland for its judicial reform and Hungary for its authoritarian leadership  
2 style.

3 But the EU remains silent on Bavaria.

4 According to Art. 1 of the 2 + 4 Treaty, the "Germans" must define their borders in a binding  
5 manner, as they were defined in Art. 23 of the Basic Law - Scope.

6 For example, the Saarland, which was declared a sovereign state in 1947, joined the FEDERAL  
7 REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, in which the Saarland was accepted as another state of the FRG.

8 This should have happened in the same way with the states of the German Democratic Republic.

9 Instead, Art. 23 was titled European Union.

10 Also the SS (Schutzstaffel) wanted a multinational Europe. It provided that the different  
11 countries had to fulfil a certain hierarchical order.

12 Bavaria, as the birthplace of the Nazis, the SS and the leader of the SS, Heinrich Himmler, was  
13 to take precedence, followed by the rest of Germany. Poland and others were to play a  
14 subordinate role.

15 And what do we have now? A Bavaria that, thanks to major investments, now has the largest  
16 economic output per capita in Europe.

17 And what Bavaria allows itself with its justice system, Poland is forbidden.

18 A clear claim to dominance, which is being demonstrated here.

19 Therefore, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA must be sued, so that the government of the  
20 UNITED STATES is officially informed that they are still responsible.

21  
22 **Summary of the claim Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN**

23 227. The Plaintiff, KARIN LEFFER, first brought an action against the FRG, the SWISS  
24 CONFEDERATION, the KINGDOM OF BELGIUM and the EUROPEAN UNION, stating that  
25 no court in Europe is able to guarantee the Plaintiff the procedural guarantees of due process of  
26 law. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER therefore enjoys immunity before those courts.

27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 4 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 The Defendants cannot refute this finding and have therefore accepted the jurisdiction of this  
2 Court for the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER.

3  
4 228. The Defendants claim to enjoy immunity before the courts in the United States.  
5 However, it has thus been admitted that Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER has immunity before courts in  
6 Europe and can neither be sued nor sue there.

7 229. The FRG refuses to comment with reference to the Hague Agreement on the Service of  
8 Judicial Letters. The Plaintiffs are to bring an action against it in GERMANY. What a joke when  
9 the Plaintiffs find that in the FRG no ordinary court proceedings can be conducted and  
10 judgments are not signed.

11 230. The EU refers to settlement cases, according to which they have immunity before the  
12 courts in the USA. The Plaintiffs point out that the only settlement case for these proceedings is  
13 the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials.

14 231. The Defendants have, on the basis of international law, assured the Plaintiff that they will  
15 be sued in courts which meet the procedural guarantees of Article 6 ECHR.  
16 These are the courts in the USA.

17 The EU cannot oppose this and has thus recognized the jurisdiction of this Court in Washington  
18 D. C.

19 232. There is no immunity between Plaintiffs and Defendants. There are also no agreements  
20 on the service of judicial letters. Only the national rules on service of documents apply.

21 The objection that the Defendants have immunity before courts in the USA is therefore incorrect.  
22

23 233. The Defendants cannot refute that the 2 + 4 Treaty has not been implemented and have  
24 thus acknowledged that the USA is still responsible for the FRG.

25 234. The Defendants cannot rebut that essential provisions of the Basic Law (GG) for the  
26 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, as well as essential laws of the FEDERAL REPUBLIC  
27

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 5 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 OF GERMANY (FRG) are not complied with and thus the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
2 (USA) again have direct occupying power with direct governmental authority in Bavaria.

3 **Conclusion**

4 235. The Defendants have agreed that the courts of the USA have jurisdiction over the  
5 Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER.

6 **The Defendants cannot deny that they do not enjoy immunity vis-à-vis the Plaintiffs before**  
7 **courts that meet the procedural guarantees of Article 6 of the European Convention on**  
8 **Human Rights. The jurisdiction of this Court is thus recognized.**

9 Nevertheless, the courts of the FRG ignore this by means of anonymous letters, which must,  
10 however, be enforced by the USA on request, see Exhibit No. 1.

11  
12 **Here the question of power is asked demonstratively and provocatively.**

13  
14 II. PARTIES, JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

15 **A. Jurisdiction over treaties concluded by the USA**

16 236. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER, brings this action against the UNITED STATES OF  
17 AMERICA for breach of treaties of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

18 Treaties of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are the law of the UNITED STATES OF  
19 AMERICA. The courts of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are responsible for examining  
20 whether the law of the UNITED STATES, in this case international treaties of the UNITED  
21 STATES, are being observed.

22 237. The courts of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA have jurisdiction to inform the  
23 Government of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA of any apparent violation of international  
24 treaties, unless there is no other means of informing.

25 This case is given here.

26 What political consequences the UNITED STATES draw from the violation of their treaties is  
27 not the subject of the proceedings.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 6 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 238. Anyone who is a party to a treaty with the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and is  
2 therefore also subject to the law of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is entitled and even  
3 obliged to sue.

4 The 2 + 4 Treaty of 1990 is violated.

5 Violated are essential provisions of the Basic Law (GG) for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF  
6 GERMANY (FRG).

7 All treaties of the FRG are based on the fact that the substantial regulations of the Basic Law  
8 (GG) for the FRG are kept. This is the basis, among other things, of the Transition Agreements  
9 between the USA and the FRG. In these Transition Agreements the FRG was granted limited  
10 sovereign rights. The limitation of sovereign rights is still in place, as can be seen from Article  
11 79 of the Basic Law:

12 Evidence: Art 79 (1.2) mutatis mutandis:

13 *The Basic Law cannot be amended if it contains provisions of peace treaties,  
14 occupation law- and defence law issues.*

14 Obviously, the US government is not aware that this regulation is still fully effective.

15 In this lawsuit already filed in Washington D. C., Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN, 18 international  
16 treaties are named - not exhaustively - that have been violated by the FRG.

17 Not mentioned is the violation of the NATO-Treaty.

18 **As a consequence, the Extradition Agreement between the EU and the UNITED STATES**  
19 **OF AMERICA is also affected.**

20 239. The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA must denounce this Agreement, otherwise the  
21 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA will participate in the political persecution of civil rights  
22 activists, such as the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER As in the case of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER,  
23 the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are jointly liable for the violation of international treaties.  
24 For example, for violation of the European Convention on Extradition between the FRG and the  
25 SWISS CONFEDERATION.

26 This Court therefore has jurisdiction.

27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 7 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 **B. On the capacity of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER to be a party before this Court**

2 **1. Direct obligation to bring an action against the UNITED STATES according to the Basic**  
3 **Law for the FRG.**

4 240. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is a German within the meaning of Article 116 of the  
5 Basic Law for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

6 Pursuant to Article 25 of the Basic Law for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, she is  
7 directly obliged to ensure that the general rules of international law are observed. Otherwise, the  
8 Plaintiff itself is directly and jointly and severally liable.

9 Evidence: "Article 25 of the Basic Law:

10 *The general rules of international law shall be an integral part of federal law. They*  
11 *shall take precedence over the laws and directly create rights and duties for the*  
*inhabitants of the federal territory."*

12 241. This regulation concerns the protection of the public order of the nationals of the Free  
13 City of Danzig.

14 Under the Potsdam Agreement, the Free City of Danzig was placed under Polish administration  
15 until the conclusion of a peace treaty. This regulation was undoubtedly still valid until the  
16 conclusion of the 2 +4 Treaty. This treaty was not implemented.

17 242. For comparison: Austria was integrated into the German Reich in 1938 without  
18 resistance. Austria was thus extinguished under international law and took part in all acts of war,  
19 including those against the Free City of Danzig. But Austria was newly created as a subject of  
20 international law with the State Treaty of 1955. Otherwise the Peace Treaty of Versailles would  
21 have had to be renegotiated.

22 The same is of course much more true for the Free City of Danzig, which is under the protection  
23 of the League of Nations and whose Constitution is guaranteed by the League of Nations.

24 The Free City of Danzig is one of the states entitled to reparations - see Article 5.2 of the London  
25 Debt Agreement. But the nationals of the Free City of Danzig are also Germans within the  
26 meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law. According to Art. 25 of the London Debt Agreement,  
27 the inhabitants of the Federal Republic of Germany become liable to pay reparation in the event



1 of reunification. By reunification is not meant territorial reunification, but the case that the  
2 general rules of international law are again violated.

3 With Article 25 GG everyone goes into direct, solidary joint liability.  
4

5 243. There must therefore be the individual possibility to evade this liability.

6 If no other way is possible, legal action for violation of Article 43 of the Convention Respecting  
7 the Laws and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV.) must be filed with the responsible occupying  
8 power.

9 This is hereby done.  
10

11 **2. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is directly affected because of her commitment to the**  
12 **preservation of the Basic Law, the treaties of the FRG also with the USA.**

13 244. She is directly affected by the violations of the Basic Law for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC  
14 OF GERMANY, as well as by the violation of further international treaties of the UNITED  
15 STATES. To date, the Plaintiff has suffered considerable financial losses and psychological  
16 stress, which has also resulted in health problems.

17 Therefore, she is not only entitled to sue, but forced to do so.  
18

19 **3. The action against the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is necessary to protect the**  
20 **UNITED STATES from further damage.**

21 a. Failure of the Government of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA to provide clarification -  
22 responsibility of the UNITED STATES

23 245. Despite the complaint already file, Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN, the Government of  
24 AMERICA is not informed that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA have the sole power of  
25 government in Bavaria/FRG and can dispose of all assets of Bavaria without restriction.

26 It is inconceivable to any German that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are not aware that  
27 Bavaria is a de jure and de facto dictatorship. Everyone holds the UNITED STATES OF

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 9 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 AMERICA responsible for the fact that legal judges were replaced by unlawful exceptional  
2 judges who were then deprived of their independence. Under German law, this is punishable as  
3 high treason under § 92 of the German Criminal Code.

4  
5 b. No clarification on the termination of the 2 + 4 Treaty

6 246. It is claimed above all by the rulers of the FRG and is also presented on Wikipedia as if  
7 the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY is a sovereign state after the conclusion of the 2 + 4  
8 Treaty of 1990. Obviously the government of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA believes  
9 this.

10 The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER has already proven in the lawsuit in Washington D. C., Case No.  
11 1:19-cv-03529-CJN and in the supplementary action (ECF 6) that the conditions for the legal  
12 validity of this 2 + 4 Treaty have not been fulfilled until today. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER  
13 proves that the 2 + 4 Treaty, which is recognized under international law, has not been  
14 implemented to date. In order to be effective under international law, a confirmed representation  
15 of the Free City of Danzig had first to be established.

16 In this action, Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN, the "Germans" were asked to state their position as  
17 to whether they still wanted to implement the 2 + 4 Treaty or whether they would rather have a  
18 peace treaty.

19 Conclusion:

20 Obviously, both are rejected, because obviously the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA assume  
21 that the terms and conditions of this treaty are fulfilled.

22  
23 c. No clarification that essential provisions of the Basic Law and legal provisions of the FRG are  
24 no longer being observed.

25 247. Cause for complaint Az. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN is that essential provisions of the  
26 constitution of the FRG are no longer complied with.

27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 10 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 The rulers of the FRG claim towards the inhabitants of the FRG and the rest of the world that the  
2 German Democratic Republic of Germany would have joined the Basic Law for the FEDERAL  
3 REPUBLIC OF GERMANY and thus the Basic Law for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF  
4 GERMANY would be the common constitution.

5 But that is wrong.

6 The Basic Law was never a constitution and could never be one. This is only evident from  
7 various provisions of the Basic Law.

8 To adopt a constitution is one of two conditions of the 2 + 4 Treaty. The second condition is that  
9 the future constitution must define the state borders as they were defined in Article 23 for the  
10 scope of the Basic Law.

11  
12 248. According to this, the scope of application should simply have been extended to the  
13 countries of the German Democratic Republic.

14 But this did not happen. Rather, Article 23 of the Basic Law has been titled EUROPEAN  
15 UNION.

16 That would not be a problem, if the essential provisions of the GG were observed.

17 249. All treaties of the FRG are based on the fact that the GG is respected.

18 The GG is neither a constitution nor an international treaty, but a declaration of self-commitment  
19 to the three western occupying powers. The rights and obligations of the occupying powers have  
20 nevertheless been preserved.

21 According to Article 120 of the Basic Law, the "Germans" have committed themselves to taking  
22 over the tasks of the occupying powers.

23 The Basic Law was promulgated on May 23, 1949. Nevertheless, the full governmental power of  
24 the occupying powers was still fully preserved. Only at the beginning of the 50s of the last  
25 century various sovereign rights were transferred to the FRG on a contractual basis. The  
26 occupying powers have nevertheless always retained various rights of reservation.

1 Conclusion

2 It was not until the 2 + 4 Treaty of 1990 that these reserved rights were to be replaced for  
3 Germany as a whole.

4 As already stated, this Treaty was not respected by the Germans and was definitely cancelled.

5 Thus, the legal status as before the 2 + 4 Treaty still applies. This applies at least to the UNITED  
6 STATES OF AMERICA.

7 Essential provisions of the Basic Law as well as treaties of the FRG are no longer observed.

8 Thus, the legal status as before the foundation of the FRG is established.

9 Thus, at least Bavaria, as an occupation zone of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, is again  
10 subject to the direct governmental authority of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

11 Thus, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA once again dispose of the entire assets of Bavaria.

12

13 d. Lack of information by the USA

14 250. The Government of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA has not been informed of  
15 this, despite the complaint lodged, Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN. This can be seen from the  
16 statements of Mr. President of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Donald Trump and his  
17 Secretary of State Mike Pompeo.

18

19 e. Direct infringement of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER

20 • The fact that essential provisions of the Basic Law and the 2 + 4 Treaty are not observed means  
21 that the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER's rights have been violated.

22 251. At first, the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER, together with others, had founded the  
23 „Association for the Law" to protect the GG. After this was unsuccessful, the Plaintiff KARIN  
24 LEFFER together with others, reorganized the Free City of Danzig politically in order to  
25 implement the 2 + 4 Treaty. These efforts were violently suppressed. Everyone who joined the

26

27

28

TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 12 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 political reorganization of the Free City of Danzig was prosecuted and sentenced on false  
2 charges. Some went to prison as a result.

3 The bill of indictment for this, Case Number: 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11, could only have come about  
4 through violation of the European Convention on Extradition with Switzerland. Anyone who  
5 possessed a Danzig identity card was convicted of instigation and complicity in forgery of  
6 documents. This accusation is based solely on the statement of Mr. Protector of the State  
7 (Staatsschützer) Chief inspector (Kriminalhauptkommissar KHK) Kellner. He had claimed that a  
8 Danzig ID card was a forgery of a German federal ID card. Mr. KHK Kellner no longer upholds  
9 this statement. Therefore, all convicts would have to be rehabilitated. But this does not happen.  
10 Therefore, there is an urgent suspicion that the criminal offences have been committed, such as §  
11 339 perversion of justice - 5 years imprisonment, § 344 prosecution of innocent people - 10 years  
12 imprisonment, § 345 execution against innocent people - 10 years imprisonment, in over 100  
13 cases.

14 252. Despite the present action, the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is still wanted with an arrest  
15 warrant, with the threat of a prison sentence of several years, which cannot be suspended for  
16 probation.

17 Evidence: Exhibit No. 1 Decision of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court of June 17, 2020

18  
19 253. In Bavaria, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA continues to be responsible for the  
20 prosecution of these offences. The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA have also made it an  
21 obligation in the 2 + 4 Treaty that the "Germans" themselves regulate in a constitution how the  
22 above-mentioned penal provisions can be effectively observed. But this was refused to the  
23 population by the rulers of the "Germans".

24 • In spite of the filed complaint Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is  
25 still wanted with an arrest warrant, with the official accusation: „Mrs. Karin Leffer is the  
26 representative of the Free City of Danzig.”

27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 13 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 254. In the letter, Exhibit No. 1, headed Bamberg Higher Regional Court, the Plaintiff is  
2 informed that the criminal charge is "Reich Citizen". There is no such criminal charge. This letter  
3 is stamped with the Bavarian Higher Regional Court. There is no such Higher Regional Court.  
4 Nor is this letter signed.

5 255. An arrest warrant issued on the basis of this letter would have to be executed by the  
6 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA without examination. This could also be done on the basis of  
7 Interpol documents.

8 The Secretary General of Interpol is Mr Jürgen Stock.

9 [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/J%C3%BCrgen\\_Stock\\_\(Jurist\)](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/J%C3%BCrgen_Stock_(Jurist))  
10 *Jürgen Stock initially worked as a criminal police officer in Hesse from 1978 to 1987. In 1998  
11 Stock was appointed professor and founding rector of the Police College of Saxony-Anhalt.*

12 He would certainly agree that a German arrest warrant that is not signed must be executed.  
13 Of course, this has absolutely nothing to do with the legal system in the FRG. Hardly any other  
14 country has such detailed regulations that a judicial as well as official letter must be signed by  
15 the issuer. As a rule, a German warrant of arrest certifies that nobody has signed this warrant.  
16 But if such a warrant, for which nobody is responsible, is executed, it is irrelevant whether the  
17 accusation in it is correct.

18  
19 • Joint liability of the USA

20 256. Under the Extradition Agreement between the EU and the UNITED STATES OF  
21 AMERICA, the USA must extradite the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER without examining the legal  
22 situation in the event of an extradition request by Bavaria.

23 This would make the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA jointly liable for political persecution.  
24 The USA would thus recognize unlawful judges who have been deprived of their independence  
25 as legitimate judges and recognize the immediate area of occupation of the USA, Bavaria, as a  
26 totalitarian dictatorship that is in no way inferior to or even superior to the Chinese.

27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 14 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 257. President Donald Trump calculates that the FRG would have to spend €  
2 1'000'000'000'000,- on NATO.

3 He obviously does not know that this is not a political demand of his, but that he is authorized to  
4 collect this sum from German assets.

5 In his speech at the Munich Security Conference, Mr. Mike Pompeo conjures up Western values.  
6 Yet Bavaria is a dictatorship.

7  
8 **It is ridiculous for Mr Donald Trump to get upset about the Chinese security law but to**  
9 **have arrest warrants executed for which there is not even a criminal offence.**

10  
11 The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA would execute a Bavarian arrest warrant and thus  
12 themselves prevent the 2 + 4 Treaty from being respected.

13 The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA would themselves participate in the violation of  
14 international treaties.

15  
16 The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA would themselves take sides for the inhabitants of the  
17 federal territory who are obliged to make reparations (Article 25 of the London Debt Agreement  
18 of 1953 and Article 25 of the Basic Law), at the expense of the reparation claimants of the Free  
19 City of Danzig.

20 In order to avoid greater damage, the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is therefore obliged to file a  
21 claim for damages for the defense of the Basic Law, international treaties and the 2 + 4 Treaty  
22 against the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

23  
24 **4. Conclusion**

25 **Where no plaintiff, no judge.**

26 258. Without the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER filing an action here, she would be jointly  
27 responsible for the violation of the USA treaties and would thus also violate US law.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 15 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 259. It can be seen from the statements of President Donald Trump and his Secretary of State  
2 Mike Pompeo that the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER represents the legal position of the government  
3 of AMERICA. But obviously the government of the UNITED STATES does not know about the  
4 violations of the treaties with the USA.

5 **Therefore, it is the duty of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER, as the holder of the right of the**  
6 **USA** with respect to the treaties of the USA which are applicable to the Plaintiff, to bring an  
7 action against the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Obviously this is the only way to inform  
8 the Government of AMERICA of the actual legal situation.

9 **Here, the question of power is being asked demonstratively and provocatively.**

10  
11  
12 III. CLAIMS

13 **A. Statement of reasons for the Plaintiff's claims KARIN LEFFER**

14 **Formal jurisdiction of the USA over the Plaintiff's claims.**

15 **1. The USA occupation zone**

16 260. The German Reich violated the Briand-Kellogg Pact (Non-Aggression Pact) - Charge No.  
17 1 of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials. In no case is this more clearly proven than the attack  
18 against the unfortified Free City of Danzig, which was placed under the protection of the League  
19 of Nations, Article 102 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles.

20 The German Reich has violated the Hague IV. Convention - Indictment No. 2 of the Nuremberg  
21 War Crimes Trials. In no case has this been proven more clearly, as in the case of the Free City  
22 of Danzig, whose Constitution is guaranteed by the League of Nations, Article 103 of the Peace  
23 Treaty of Versailles. The nationality of the German Reich was forced upon the population of  
24 Danzig, and the male population was forced into military service against its own protecting  
25 powers and thus enslaved. Finally, the unfortified city of Danzig was declared a fortress, thus the  
26 protection of unfortified cities was abolished, Art. 25 of the Hague IV. Convention ordered the  
27 destruction of Danzig. No other state suffered greater losses in %.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 16 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]



1 The German Reich fought a house-to-house combat for the capital Berlin and thus declared it a  
2 fortress. A fortress enjoys no protection whatsoever during the war. What applies to the capital  
3 applies to the whole country.

4 Without a say of the "Germans", (who should represent them under international law?) the assets  
5 of the German Reich and its nationals were disposed of by the victorious powers. Dismantling  
6 was carried out, the East Germans were expropriated without compensation (to this day) and  
7 expelled. The German foreign assets were confiscated without compensation.

8 Germany as a whole was divided into occupation zones for the purpose of taking further  
9 reparations. Among other things, Bavaria became an occupation zone of the USA for any taking  
10 of property.

## 11

### 12 **2. Regulation of the rights of the occupying powers:**

13 261. The Basic Law of 1949 is a self-commitment of the "Germans". This was not confirmed  
14 by any contract. For this reason, the promulgation of the Basic Law did not involve any  
15 assignment of rights to the inhabitants of the federal territory. The responsibilities of the  
16 occupying powers remained fully intact.

17 Only after the London Debt Agreement of 1953 were certain sovereign rights transferred to the  
18 "Germans".

### 19

### 20 **3. Regulation of reparations:**

21 262. In the London Debt Agreement, the inhabitants of the federal territory committed  
22 themselves to the payment of reparations, Art. 25. According to Art. 5.2, the Free City of Danzig  
23 is one of the states entitled to reparations.

24 The "Germans" thus became the asset managers of reparations claims. The "Germans" were thus  
25 given the responsibility to ensure that the reparations could be paid.

26 The 2 + 4 Treaty does not contain any provisions on reparations issues.

1 Reparations cannot be claimed by nationals of the Free City of Danzig, which are also Germans  
2 within the meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law (a clever move by the "Germans").

3 **Only if the nationals of the Free City of Danzig agree to a constitution in accordance with**  
4 **Article 146 of the Basic Law do the reparations claims expire.** With a consent to this  
5 constitution this nationality would expire. These nationals of the Free City of Danzig are part of  
6 the new state. No nationals of this new state can then be called upon to make reparations.

7  
8 263. The "Germans" have accumulated 6.000.000.000.000, -€ in trade surpluses.

9 These assets originate from the administered reparations claims.

10 Part owners are still the USA.

11 **This means that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are responsible for claims for**  
12 **damages resulting from violations of the general rules of international law, especially when**  
13 **these emanate from Bavaria.**

14  
15 **4. NATO-Treaty**

16 264. The damages of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER or the claims of the Plaintiff were incurred  
17 because the Plaintiff had and is committed to the observance of the Basic Law and its laws and  
18 thus to the treaties of the USA and thus to the alliance of values of NATO.

19 265. NATO is first and foremost an alliance of values for the preservation of democracy,  
20 individual freedom and justice. Only in the second place is NATO a defense alliance.

21 What is the point of spending trillions on armaments for secondary tasks if nothing is done for  
22 the first tasks?

23 266. As Mike Pompeo confirmed at the Munich Security Conference, the UNITED STATES  
24 naturally assume that citizens are committed to democracy, individual freedom and the rule of  
25 law. The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA overlook the fact that this requires constitutional  
26 rules under which citizens can effectively assert these rights. In the United States, the  
27 independence of the courts is consolidated by the right to a jury. There is the right to possess

1 weapons to protect against arbitrary state power. In Europe, the possession of a kitchen knife is  
2 already classified as an illegal weapon in purely legal terms. In theory, a housewife could be  
3 charged with illegal possession of a weapon.

4 267. In the FRG there is the protection against state arbitrariness by the criminal law  
5 provisions like § 92 high treason, § 339 perversion of justice, § 344 prosecution of innocent  
6 people and § 345 execution against innocent people.

7 The question is who prosecutes these criminal offences.

8 This was and is reserved for the occupying powers in the occupied territory of the FRG.

9 Again: Also the constitutional fathers of the USA have the possibility that the delegates are  
10 bought into their considerations.

11 In Switzerland, the citizens have the possibility to submit legislative proposals themselves.

12 Nevertheless, as the Swiss Citizens Initiative for a judicial reform states, the "classe politique"  
13 has brought the state power under its control to the detriment of its citizens.

14  
15 268. Conclusion: The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER contributed and still contributes to the  
16 preservation of NATO's first objective rather than all military forces of NATO.

17 She is thus also making a significant contribution to NATO. She acts in the interests of the USA  
18 and thus as a member of the USA and NATO.

19 It can be seen that her commitment is much more important, as is all NATO's military  
20 expenditure.

21 What use is all the military expenditure for the external enemy if the real enemy of Western  
22 values is within?

23 What is the use of all the military expenditure against the Russian Federation if the Russian  
24 Federation is rather linked to Western values, like Bavaria?

25 President Donald Trump calculates that the "Germans" owe 1.000.000.000.000, -€ in defense  
26 costs. On what should the "Germans" spend defense expenditures for NATO? From what and  
27 who should NATO protect the "Germans"?

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA \_\_\_\_\_ CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 19 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 Bavaria is the Trojan horse in NATO. Bavaria is the enemy of NATO.

2 The "Germans" have accumulated trade surpluses from reparations demands.

3  
4 269. With this action, the Plaintiff ensures that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, on the  
5 basis of international law, can ensure that NATO will once again become what it was created to  
6 be.

7 Or the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA will no longer protect a de facto dictatorship through  
8 NATO.

9 Then the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA will be able to save trillions of dollars in armaments  
10 spending in the future.

11 Once again:

12 Among other things, these trade surpluses are managed reparations.

13 Part owners are the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

14 The claims of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER are caused by Bavaria.

15 The owner of Bavaria, the USA, is therefore responsible.

16 Therefore, the claims of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER are directed against the USA.

17  
18 **The USA is again directly responsible for what happens in Bavaria. Therefore, the USA is**  
19 **liable.**

20 **The claims are to be settled therefore by the USA.**

21  
22 **B. Statement of reasons concerning the amount of the Plaintiff's claims KARIN LEFFER**

23 **1. Facts of the case**

24 270. The Plaintiff's claims result essentially from the criminal prosecution, Case Number of  
25 the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office/Bavaria/FRG: 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11.

26 This bill of indictment could only be brought about by violation of the obligations and conditions  
27 of the extradition decision of the Swiss Federal Office of Justice in Bern of August 20, 2012,

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 20 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 Case Number: B 224`163/TMA. It was carried out as an unauthorized criminal prosecution  
2 measure against the Plaintiff BEOWULF VON PRINCE. For this purpose, the Plaintiff VON  
3 PRINCE was given a ban on mail and visits against the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER. This  
4 prevented Mr VON PRINCE from using his knowledge and documents to assist in the criminal  
5 prosecution of Danzig ID card holders. In mass trials everyone who possessed a Danzig identity  
6 card was convicted as an instigator and accomplice for falsification of documents. The  
7 convictions were based solely on the erroneous (in the medical sense) statement that a Danzig  
8 identity card was a forgery of a Federal German identity card,

9 What motive someone should have for wanting to possess a fake Federal German identity card if  
10 he or she has a genuine German identity card has not yet been answered.

11 According to German law, forgery of documents is only punishable if it is intended to commit  
12 deception in legal relations.

13 What kind of deception in legal relations could be possible with a Danzig identity card has not  
14 yet been explained. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER has confirmed the information on a Danzig  
15 identity card only by presenting notarially certified documents.

16 To date, it has not been explained who would perform an act by presenting a Danzig identity  
17 card that they would not also perform by presenting a German identity card.

18 This indictment 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 persistently conceals the fact that with the issue of a  
19 Danzig identity card a peace agreement was concluded and that these peace agreements were  
20 sent to the United Nations.

21 This corresponds to nothing other than the implementation of the 2 + 4 Treaty.

22 Here, those who have been and are being prosecuted for their efforts to comply with the treaties  
23 with the USA have been and will be prosecuted.

24 In this bill of indictment 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 it is concealed that the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER,  
25 under the responsibility of Mr VON PRINCE, only made the statements on Danzig identity cards

26  
27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 21 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 after the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office had reissued Danzig identity cards which had  
2 initially been confiscated, thus putting them back into circulation and declaring them admissible.

3  
4 Mr KHK Kellner no longer maintains his statement.

5 As a result, even the Coburg Regional Court had to grant an acquittal.

6 No other public prosecutor's office has initiated an investigation of Danzig ID cards - about 15  
7 known cases.

8 First-class judicial acquittals were granted by the competent Swiss side.

9 In order to remedy the violations of the terms and conditions of Mr. VON PRINCE's extradition,  
10 the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office/Bavaria has requested subsequent extradition, expressly  
11 under the same file number.

12 By decision of March 10, 2014, the competent Swiss Federal Office of Justice subsequently  
13 refused the entire extradition of Mr VON PRINCE on the grounds that extradition was not  
14 requested for criminal offences but for political reasons.

15 Thus, the competent office declared the proceedings 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 illegal.

16  
17 271. According to Art. 54 SDÜ/CISA (Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement),  
18 Swiss decisions must be respected by all EU authorities.

19  
20 272. Nevertheless, Mr VON PRINCE, as the person responsible, was sentenced to 8 months  
21 imprisonment on probation by the Coburg Regional Court/Bavaria/FRG.

22 273. The penalty should not be higher for the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER either. However, the  
23 Bamberg Higher Regional Court or Bavaria has now announced that the Plaintiff KARIN  
24 LEFFER is to be sentenced to several years of imprisonment, which cannot be suspended on  
25 probation.

26 Evidence: Exhibit No. 1 Decision of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court/Bavaria/FEDERAL  
27 REPUBLIC OF GERMANY of June 17, 2020

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 22 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

1 In doing so, the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER has made these proceedings the subject matter of the  
2 complaint Case No. 1:19-cv-03529-CJN and has thus submitted herself to these accusations of  
3 the indictment.

4 274. There is the urgent suspicion that more than 100 times the elements of crime such as §  
5 339 perversion of justice - 5 years imprisonment, § 344 prosecution of innocent persons - 10  
6 years imprisonment, § 345 execution against innocent persons - 10 years imprisonment, have  
7 been fulfilled

8 275. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER and Mr VON PRINCE are described in the bill of  
9 indictment 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 as offenders.

10  
11 276. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER was forced to leave her family, home and house because  
12 of the proceedings and had to give up her professional activity.

13 Even in exile, the Plaintiff had to and must expect to be arrested.

14 Therefore, she cannot appear for the hearing in the USA in the proceedings Case No. 1:19-cv-  
15 03529-CJN.

16  
17 **2. For comparison**

18 277. Billions will be made available for the economic consequences of the lockdown.

19 What is a lockdown in relation to what the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER has done and is doing for  
20 her efforts to preserve the post-war order?

21 What is a lockdown in relation to what the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER has suffered and is  
22 suffering?

23 Other political refugees receive support and sympathy.

24 The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is wanted with an arrest warrant and the whole world assumes  
25 that the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is a criminal, although she already wants to face a fair trial  
26 with this complaint. Nevertheless she is still wanted with an arrest warrant.

1 278. Because of the trial 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER could not  
2 practice her beloved profession since March 19, 2014. The Plaintiff was forced to stop this  
3 activity and to take over a task that at least a general should have fulfilled or better the director of  
4 the CIA.

5 Apparently, the CIA is so busy with "terrorists" that it cannot see what is happening right under  
6 its nose. In return, the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER does more educational work in the interest of  
7 the USA and NATO than both institutions together.

8 This must be rewarded accordingly.

9 Punitive damages must be made for this.

10 Punitive damages should amount to a level that discourages the "perpetrator" from further  
11 violating good faith in the future.

12 It should not exceed 10% of the income of the "offender".

#### 14 IV. RELIEF

15 **WHEREFORE**, the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER prays for the following relief:

16 a. For an award for compensation. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER asserts a loss of earnings  
17 and additional expenses due to the escape in the amount of € 474'090,00 according to the  
18 enclosed calculation – Exhibit No. 2.

19 b. For an award for punitive damages. The Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER leaves it to the  
20 discretion of the Court to determine the damages and the punitive damages.

21 c. The damages and the punitive damages shall be enforced against the gold reserves of the  
22 Federal Republic of Germany stored with the FED.

23 Evidence for the gold reserves of the FRG at FED, 33 Liberty St, New York, NY 10045, United  
24 States:

25 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gold\\_repatiation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gold_repatiation)

26 [https://www.capital.de/geld-versicherungen/10-dinge-%C3%BCber-die-deutschen-goldreserven-  
27 60911](https://www.capital.de/geld-versicherungen/10-dinge-%C3%BCber-die-deutschen-goldreserven-60911)

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 24 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]



1 Date: August 4, 2020

2  
3 Beowulf von Prince

Karin Leffer

4 BEOWULF VON PRINCE  
5 Schweizer Strasse 38  
6 AT-6830 Rankweil  
7 Austria

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

8 Exhibit

1 Decision of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court of June 17, 2020

2 Calculation of the loss of earnings and damage suffered by the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER

11 Servicelist:

12 Via Server:

District Court of Columbia, Washington D.C.

13 Attorney of the FRG, European Union, Kingdom of Belgium

14 Jeffrey Harris

15 HARRIS & COOKE, LLP

1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,

Ste 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: Motion for joinder of USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529 (CJN)

PAGE NO. 25 OF 25 [JDC TEMPLATE]

## Oberlandesgericht Bamberg

Az.: 1 Ws 252/20  
210 Ws 173/20 Generalstaatsanwaltschaft Bamberg  
1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 Landgericht Coburg  
123 Js 3979/11 Staatsanwaltschaft Coburg



In dem Strafverfahren gegen

**Leffer** Karin Doris (geb. Leffer),  
geboren am 18.01.1960 in Coburg, Staatsangehörigkeit: deutsch, wohnhaft: Laufenburger  
Straße 16, 4310 Rheinfelden, Schweiz

Verteidiger:

Rechtsanwalt **Nahrath** Wolfram, Bizetstraße 24, 13088 Berlin, Gz.: 65/13 St

Rechtsanwalt **Held** Alexander, Judengasse 3, 98574 Schmalkalden

wegen Betrugs u.a.

hier: Haftbeschwerde der Angeklagten **Leffer** Karin Doris

erlässt das Oberlandesgericht Bamberg - 1. Strafsenat - durch die unterzeichnenden Richter am  
17. Juni 2020 folgenden

## Beschluss

1. Die Beschwerde der Angeklagten gegen den Beschluss der 1. Strafkammer des Landgerichts Coburg vom 27.04.2020 wird verworfen.
2. Die Angeklagte hat die Kosten ihres erfolglosen Rechtsmittels zu tragen.

## Gründe:

Die zulässige (§§ 304 Abs. 1, 306 Abs. 1 StPO) mit Schriftsatz ihres Verteidigers Rechtsanwalt Nahrath vom 11.05.2020 erhobene Beschwerde der Angeklagten gegen den Beschluss der 1. Strafkammer des Landgerichts Coburg vom 27.04.2020, mit dem der Haftbefehl des Landge-

richts Coburg vom 15.09.2014 gegen die Angeklagte aufrechterhalten wurde, ist unbegründet. Sie war daher mit der Kostenfolge aus § 473 Abs. 1 Satz 1 StPO zu verwerfen.

Die angefochtene Entscheidung entspricht der Sach- und Rechtslage. Deren Begründung wird durch das Beschwerdevorbringen nicht entkräftet. Der Senat teilt die Auffassung des Erstgerichts und tritt den Gründen der angefochtenen Entscheidung bei. Zur weiteren Begründung wird - auch unter Berücksichtigung des Vorbringens des Verteidigers in den Schriftsätzen vom 11.05.2020 und vom 10.06.2020 - auf die zutreffende Stellungnahme der Generalstaatsanwaltschaft Bamberg in ihrer Antragschrift vom 20.05.2020 Bezug genommen. Auch der Senat ist der Auffassung, dass der mittlerweile eingetretene Zeitablauf sowie der Umstand, dass der als Haupttäter anzusehende Verurteilte Beowulf von Prince lediglich eine Bewährungsstrafe erhielt, die Verhältnismäßigkeit der Haftanordnung nicht infrage stellen. Die Generalstaatsanwaltschaft hat auch zutreffend (ohne die Vorschrift ausdrücklich zu nennen) auf § 56 Abs. 3 StGB hingewiesen, der hier angesichts der gemeinhin als „Reichsbürger-Problematik“ bezeichneten allgemeinbekannten virulenten Erscheinungsformen im öffentlichen Leben durchaus relevant ist. Der Schutz des Vertrauens der Bevölkerung in die Funktionsfähigkeit der verfassungsmäßigen Verwaltung und Rechtsprechung steht nicht außerhalb der Zwecke des Strafrechts, wie zahlreiche Strafvorschriften des Besonderen Teils des Strafgesetzbuches (nur beispielhaft und ohne Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit: §§ 86, 86a, 90, 90a, 111, 132, 132a) belegen.

gez.

Räth  
Richter  
am Oberlandesgericht

Held  
Vorsitzender Richter  
am Oberlandesgericht

Dr. Schiener  
Vorsitzender Richter  
am Oberlandesgericht



Für die Richtigkeit der Abschrift  
Bamberg, 17.06.2020

*Tomak*  
Tomak, JAng

Urkuftsbeamtin der Geschäftsstelle

Authenticated copy

Bamberg Higher Regional Court

Ref: 1 Ws 252/20

210 Ws 173/20 Bamberg General Public Prosecutor's Office

1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11 Coburg Regional Court

123 Js 3979/11 Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office

Received June 22, 2020

Wolfram Nahrath

Attorney at Law

in the criminal proceedings against

Leffer Karin Doris (née Leffer)

born on Jan. 18, 1960 in Coburg Nationality: German, resident: Laufenburger Str. 16, 4310 Rheinfelden, Switzerland

Defense counsel:

Lawyer Nahrath Wolfram, Bizetstraße 24, 13088 Berlin, Gz.: 65/13 St

Lawyer Held Alexander, Judengasse 3, 98574 Schmalkalden

for fraud, among other things.

here: Complaint of the defendant Leffer Karin Doris

the Bamberg Higher Regional Court - 1st Criminal Senate - by the undersigned judges at June 17, 2020 the following

Decision

1. Dismiss the appeal of the defendant against the decision of the 1st Criminal Chamber of the Coburg Regional Court of April 27, 2020
2. Order the defendant to pay the costs of its unsuccessful appeal.

Reasons:

The admissible appeal (§§ 304 para. 1, 306 para. 1 German Code of Criminal Procedure) lodged by the defendant in a written statement by their defence attorney Nahrath on May 11, 2020 against the order of the 1st Criminal Chamber of the Coburg Regional Court of April 27, 2020, by which the arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court of Sept. 15, 2014 against the defendant was upheld, is unfounded. It was therefore to be dismissed with the consequence of costs arising from § 473.1 sentence 1 StPO.

The contested decision is consistent with the factual and legal situation. The grounds of that decision are not invalidated by the appeal. The Senate shares the view of the first court and concurs with the grounds of the contested decision. For further substantiation, reference is made - also taking into account the submissions of the defence counsel in the pleadings of May 11, 2020 and June 10, 2020 - to the pertinent statement of the Bamberg General Public Prosecutor's Office in its application of May 20, 2020. The Senate is also of the opinion that the passage of time that has occurred in the meantime and the fact that the convicted man Beowulf von Prince, who is to be regarded as the principal offender, received only a suspended sentence, do not call into question the proportionality of the detention order. The Office of the Public Prosecutor General also correctly (without explicitly mentioning the provision) referred to § 56.3 of the Criminal Code, which is certainly relevant here in view of the generally known virulent manifestations in public life that are commonly referred to as the "Reichsbürger problem". The protection of the public's confidence in the functioning of the constitutional administration and jurisdiction is not outside the purposes of criminal law, as is demonstrated by numerous penal provisions of the Special Part of the Criminal Code (only by way of example and without claiming to be exhaustive: §§ 86, 86a, 90a, 111, 132, 132a).

signed. [note: no signatures]

Räth  
Judge  
at the Higher Regional Court

Held  
Presiding Judge  
at the Higher Regional Court

Dr. Schiener  
Presiding Judge  
at the Higher Regional Court

For the accuracy of the copy  
Bamberg, June 17, 2020  
Tomak, court employee  
civil servant of the court

Bavaria  
Higher Regional Court

## Calculation of damages

### 1. Loss of earnings:

Loss of earnings from March 19, 2014 to July 18, 2020 = 6 years 4 months

Loss of earnings for practice for acupuncture massage therapy

Annual earnings in the FRG in 2012 = 20'527,-€

In the year 2013 already negative press reports about mass trials against Danzig led to loss of earnings. The mass trials could only take place through violation of the obligations and conditions of extradition.

Net income in 2012 € 20'527,- x 6 years = 123'162,- + 6'842,- =

130'004,-€ x factor 2,5 = 325'010,-€

### 2. Loss of rent or rental costs

96.5 m<sup>2</sup> x 20,-CHF = 1930,-CHF/month x 76 months = 146'680,-€

3. Parking space garage 100,-€ x 24 months = 2'400,-€

then renouncement of car, because no confirmation of residence

---

total 474'090,-€

### 4. Punitive damages:

How high the punitive damages should be, depends also on how this Court decides on the Free City of Danzig.

Will a constitution be passed under the supervision of the United States, according to which the Federal Republic will remain what it should be - the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig?

Or will territories be separated from the Federal Republic of Germany and form the legal successor to the Free City of Danzig, with a legal successor to the German Reich within limits yet to be determined?

Or will the provisions of the Peace Treaty of Versailles become effective again and a legal successor of the German Reich or the German Reich, within the borders of Dec. 31, 1990, be re-established?

The fact that the European Convention on Extradition between Switzerland and the Federal Republic of Germany is violated is not a judicial error. The fact that Article 54 of the Prohibition of Double Jeopardy is violated is not a judicial error. That the warrant for the arrest of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is upheld, although a complaint has also been filed to verify the criminal charges.

Thus, there is in fact the incitement of the Agreement on Extradition between the EU and the US to extradite the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER.

This would already execute an announced prison sentence of several years for the Plaintiff.

This is to prevent the Plaintiff from being able to claim her rights.

The criminal prosecution has open demands for reparations in the background. These are also estimated by German historians at 7'500'000'000'000,-€.

It must be made clear that one does not eliminate one's debts by putting creditors in prison. From this point of view, the Punitive damages must be determined.

Proposal for a Punitive damages

Trade balance surplus of the Federal Republic of Germany

2019: 1,328 billion euros

1,105 billion euros

223 billion, of which 10% = 22.3 billion euros

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 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 ) Case No.: 1:19-cv-03529-CJN  
13 Plaintiff(s), )  
14 vs. ) *Title of Document:*  
15 ) [PROPOSED] ORDER  
16 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, et )  
17 al., ) MOTION for JOINDER of PARTIES  
18 Defendant(s). ) for FURTHER DEFENDANT UNITED  
19 STATES OF AMERICA

18 [PROPOSED] ORDER

19 The Plaintiffs have brought an action and request that the United States of America be admitted  
20 as a further Defendant under Rules 18-21 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

21 The Court has jurisdiction to review the law of the United States of America. United States law  
22 includes the Treaties of the United States of America.

23 The Court shall have jurisdiction to determine which treaties with the United States of America  
24 are complied with and are therefore binding on the United States of America and which are not.

25 The Plaintiffs prove that the 2 (German Democratic Republic and Federal Republic of Germany)  
26 + 4 (United States of America and Soviet Union and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
27 Northern Ireland and the Republic of France) Treaty is not implemented.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: proposed order joinder of parties USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN



1 The Plaintiffs have proven that German prosecutors act in accordance with instructions. The  
2 Plaintiffs prove that the Bavarian Judges and Public Prosecutors Act of 2005 placed judges and  
3 public prosecutors under the disciplinary law for soldiers.

4 The Plaintiffs prove that Mr. Lückemann, Attorney General of the Bamberg Higher Regional  
5 Court, was appointed President of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court. Mr Lückemann is thus  
6 the disciplinary superior of the judges of the Bamberg Higher Regional Court. The judges no  
7 longer act independently.

8 The appeal body for decisions of the Coburg Regional Court is the Bamberg Higher Regional  
9 Court. The Plaintiffs prove that Mr. Lohneis, Chief Senior Public Prosecutor of the Coburg  
10 Regional Court, was appointed President of the Coburg Regional Court. Thus, these judges no  
11 longer act independently.

12 The Plaintiffs make the bill of indictment of the Coburg Public Prosecutor's Office, Case  
13 Number 1 KLS 123 Js 3979/11, the subject of the proceedings. This bill of indictment came  
14 about during the extradition of the Plaintiff BEOWULF VON PRINCE from Switzerland to the  
15 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY on Dec. 21, 2012- Oct. 18, 2013. Mr. Lohneis had  
16 requested the extradition on the instructions of Attorney General Lückemann, who acted on the  
17 instructions of a political official.

18 Article 97 of the Basic Law for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, independence of  
19 judges, has been violated. It is a criminal offence according to § 92 of the German Penal Code,  
20 Constitutional High Treason.

21 The Swiss Federal Office of Justice responsible for these proceedings, indictment 1 KLS 123 Js  
22 3979/11, has condemned these proceedings as political persecution.

23 The Government of the United States of America is obviously not aware that the 2 + 4 Treaty is  
24 not being complied with.

25  
26 The Government of the United States of America is obviously not informed that the Basic Law  
27 for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY is not being observed in essential provisions.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: proposed order joinder of parties USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

1 The Government of the United States of America is obviously not informed that they again have  
2 the direct power of government in Bavaria/ FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

3 Although the Plaintiffs have filed this action on the grounds that they are facing this Court  
4 because this Court fulfils the procedural guarantees for due process of law promised under  
5 international law, the arrest warrant against the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is upheld.

6 If the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER enters the country, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA must,  
7 according to the Agreement on Extradition between the EUROPEAN UNION and the UNITED  
8 STATES OF AMERICA, execute an extradition request without examination against the  
9 Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER.

10 This would put the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA under joint liability in the prosecution of  
11 innocent people.

12 Obviously, the annulment of the arrest warrant of the Coburg Regional Court can only be  
13 achieved if damages are paid for the unlawful prosecution of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER.

14 The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are still the administrators of reparation claims. The  
15 administration of reparations was transferred to the FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

16 The basis for the transfer of this administration is the Basic Law for the FEDERAL REPUBLIC  
17 OF GERMANY. This Basic Law is essentially no longer observed.

18  
19 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED,

20 a. that the court has jurisdiction

21 b. that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA be admitted as a Defendant, since the  
22 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA has jurisdiction to settle reparation matters and to ensure  
23 compliance with the 2 + 4 Treaty, or an alternative arrangement.

24 c. that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA have the direct power of government in  
25 Bavaria/ FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY.

26 d. that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA are the direct administrators of reparation  
27 claims.

28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: proposed order joinder of parties USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

- 1 e. that the procedure, indictment 1 KLs 123 Js 3979/11 is illegal.
- 2 f. that an arrest warrant and an extradition request against the Plaintiffs may not be  
3 executed
- 4 g. that the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER is entitled to damages from the proceedings 1 KLs 123  
5 Js 3979/11
- 6 h. that a partial claim of the plaintiff KARIN LEFFER in the amount of 474'090,-€
- 7 i. that the partial claim of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER against the gold of the FEDERAL  
8 REPUBLIC OF GERMANY stored with the FED in the amount of the demanded partial sum is  
9 to be transferred into the property of the Plaintiff KARIN LEFFER.

10  
11  
12 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Hon. Carl J. Nichols  
United States District Judge

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 TITLE OF DOCUMENT: proposed order joinder of parties USA CASE NO.: 19-cv-3529-CJN

PAGE NO. \_\_\_ OF 4 [JDC TEMPLATE]