Lawyer Wilfried Schmitz

# Sample template

# for a civil action against BioNTech

## according to German law,

## but based on facts which are true worldwide

## - Hints, ideas, suggestions -

1st edition 2024


Cover design: Wilfried Schmitz



Publisher:
Tredition GmbH
Halenreie 40-44
22359 Hamburg

ISBN Softcover: 978-3-384-28192-0



Biographical information of the German National Library:
The German National Library lists this publication in the German National Bibliography; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

May this book contribute to clarification and help all Covid-19 injection victims to assert their claims for compensation for pain and suffering and damages.

The actual reappraisal can now, May/June 2024, be regarded as largely complete. This lays the foundations for a comprehensive legal and, in particular, criminal investigation into the events of recent years.

Social peace is only possible when people can finally recognize that they are heard and that everyone is equal before the law, including before the Criminal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure.

The sources referred to in this book can be found in full text on my homepage under the link "Books"

https://www.anwalt-schmitz.eu/buecher/

Selfkant, 18.9.2024 (Upgrade)

Wilfried Schmitz
Lawyer

**Comments on this book:**

Prof. Dr. Werner Bergholz:

"The book is a treasure chest :-). Dear Wilfried, your book is not a labor of love, but an accomplished Herculean task - amazing!!!"

Prof. Dr. Jörg Matysik: "I am very impressed by your thick work. Very impressive."

Dr. Michael Palmer: "This statement of claim is just as comprehensive as Philipp Kruse's -- a milestone, I would say."

From the "**Gospel of Peace of the Essenes**"

(**quote**) "[...] They sat around Jesus and asked him: "Master, what are the laws of life? Stay with us longer and teach us. We want to listen to your words so that we may be healed and made righteous."

And Jesus answered, "Do not look for the law in your holy scriptures, for the law is life, but the scriptures are dead. Truly I tell you, Moses did not receive his laws from God in writing, but through the living word. The law is the living word of the living God to living prophets for living people. The law is written in everything that lives. You will find it in the grass, in the tree, in the river, in the mountains, in the birds of the air, in the fish of the sea; but above all look for it in yourselves. For truly, I tell you, everything that lives is closer to God than the Scriptures, which are without life. God created life and all living things so that they might teach man the laws of the true Godhead through the eternal living word. God did not write the laws in the pages of books, but in your heart and in your spirit. They are in your breath, your blood, your bones, your flesh, your intestines, your eyes, your ears, and in every tiny particle of your body. They are omnipresent in the air, in the water, in the earth, in the plants, in the sun's rays, in the depths and in the heights. They all speak to you so that you may understand the word and will of the living Godhead. But you close your eyes so that you do not see, and you close your ears so that you do not hear. Truly I tell you, the Scriptures are the work of men, but life and all its hosts are the work of our God. Why do you not listen to the words of God written in his works? And why do you study the dead Scriptures, which are the work of men's hands?" [...]" (**end of quote**)

Source:

Writings of the Essenes / The Gospel of Peace of the Essenes: Writings of the Essenes - Book 1, ISBN-10: 3890601278, ISBN-13: 978-3890601274):

Has anyone told you that no one - not even God - will come to liberate us, humanity?

How does he know that? Did God tell him that?

"Paving the way for the human factor
This is the task of all professions, especially lawyers,
because laws are not written on parchment,
but written on sensitive human skin.
A straight path leads from legal fetishism
On the concentration camps of Ausschwitz and Buchenwald."

Fritz Bauer, 1955

"...that our federal republic on the
recognition of human rights."

Fritz Bauer, 1964

Source: Irmtrud Wojak: "Fritz Bauer - A Biography", page 9

Fritz Bauer was Attorney General in Hesse from 1956 to 1968 and his name is associated with the abduction of Adolf Eichmann to Israel and the Frankfurt Ausschwitz trials.

Short form of Radbruch's formula: "Extreme injustice is not a right"

*"The conflict between justice and legal certainty should be resolved in such a way that the positive law, secured by statute and power, has priority even if it is unjust and inexpedient in content, unless the contradiction of the positive law to justice reaches such an intolerable degree that the law as 'incorrect law' has to give way to justice. It is impossible to draw a sharper line between the cases of legal injustice and the laws that are nevertheless valid despite their incorrect content; however, another boundary can be drawn with all sharpness: where justice is not even striven for, where equality, which constitutes the core of justice, has been consciously denied in the establishment of positive law, the law is not merely 'incorrect' law, rather it lacks the nature of law at all. For law, even positive law, cannot be defined in any other way than as an order and statute that is intended to serve justice."*
- Gustav Radbruch: Legal injustice and supra-legal right. SJZ 1946, 105 (107).

*"Where therefore [...] justice is not even striven for, the decrees thus created can only be sentences of power, never sentences of law [...]; thus the law that denies human rights to certain people is not a sentence of law. Here, then, there is a sharp boundary between law and non-law, whereas, as has been shown above, the boundary between legal injustice and valid law is only a dimensional boundary [...]."*
- Gustav Radbruch: Vorschule der Rechtsphilosophie. 2nd edition, Göttingen 1959, p. 34.

Source: Krimpedia (on the term Radbruch's formula)

Gustav Radbruch was a German legal philosopher, criminal law reformer and criminal politician.

# Text of the model complaint:

To the
Regional Court ..... .....
..... .....

**beA**

**AZ: .../2024** (3/5/157-/297-) Selfkant, 18.9.2024

**Application for legal aid and draft claim**

**In the matter**

**the woman ....**

- **Applicant -**

**Attorney at law: Wilfried Schmitz, contact details as stated on the letterhead**

**against BioNTech Manufacturing GmbH, An der Goldgrube 12, 55131 Mainz, represented by the Executive Board Prof. Dr. Ugur Sahin, CEO, Sean Marett, CBO & CCO, Dr. Sierk Petting, COO, Prof. Dr. Özlem Türeci, CMO, Ryan Richards, CSO, Jens Hollstein, CFO, Dr. James Ryan, CLO and the Managing Directors Dr. Sierk Poetting, Dr. Oliver Hennig, Martin Lang and Lynn Miriam Voigt**

- **Defendant -**

**Counsel: White & Case LLP, Bockenheimer Landstraße 20, 60323 Frankfurt am Main, Germany**

**for compensation for pain and suffering and damages**

Provisional amount in dispute: € 150,000.00

**is requested,**

**1.**

**to grant the applicant legal aid for the first instance, with the undersigned acting as counsel,**

**2.**

**to arrange for the opponent to be notified of the PKH application irrespective of the prospects of success.**

**Justification:**

1.

As the plaintiff is not in a position to pay the costs of the intended legal dispute due to her personal and financial circumstances.

There is no disposable income within the meaning of Section 115 (1) ZPO, which means that she cannot contribute to the costs through monthly installments.

She also has no assets of her own.

In this respect, reference is made to the applicant's declaration on her personal and financial circumstances, which, together with the necessary supporting documents, is available as

**Enclosure Declaration on PKH application**

is presented.

The intended action has a reasonable prospect of success and is also not willful.

Please refer to the following draft complaint. The action should only be brought to the extent that PKH has been granted.

2.

The aim of the application under no. 2 is to suspend the limitation period in any case, even if the court should deny the prospects of success. This presupposes the announcement of the PKH application (see Section 204 (1) No. 14 BGB, BGH NJW 2008, 1939).

3.

As a precautionary measure, the case law of the Federal Constitutional Court on the standard of review when assessing the prospects of success in PKH proceedings is recalled at the outset so that the requirements for the granting of PKH are not overstretched to the detriment of the applicant.

This standard of review is specified as follows in the decision of the Federal Constitutional Court of 28.10.2019 - 2 BvR 1813/18 (**quote**):

"a) The right to effective and equal legal protection requires a far-reaching equalization of the situation of the well-off and the poor in the implementation of legal protection (see BVerfGE 10, 264 <270>; 22, 83 <87>; 51, 295 <302>; 63, 380 <394>; 67, 245 <248>; 78, 104 <117 f.>; 81, 347 <357>; BVerfG, Order of the 3rd Chamber of the Second Senate of July 8, 2016 - 2 BvR 2231/13 -, para. 10; Order of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate

of December 5, 2018 - 2 BvR 1122/18, 2 BvR 1222/18, 2 BvR 1583/18 -, para. 10). This follows from the principle of the rule of law generally enshrined in Article 20(3) of the Basic Law, which has found a special form for legal protection against acts of public authority in Article 19(4) of the Basic Law, in conjunction with the general principle of equality in Article 3(1) of the Basic Law. However, the person without means must only be treated in the same way as a person with means who reasonably weighs up his or her litigation prospects and also takes into account the cost risk (see BVerfGE 9, 124 <130 f.>; 81, 347 <357>; BVerfGK 6, 53 <55>; BVerfG, decision of the 3rd Chamber of the Second Senate of 1 January 2014; BVerfG, decision of the 3rd Chamber of the Second Senate of 1 January 2014). Chamber of the Second Senate of April 1, 2015 - 2 BvR 3058/14 -, para. 19; decision of the Second Chamber of the First Senate of November 21, 2018 - 1 BvR 1653/18, 1 BvR 1888/18, 1 BvR 1889/18, 1 BvR 1890/18, 1 BvR 2381/18 -, para. 8; established case law).

25

The interpretation and application of Section 114 (1) sentence 1 ZPO is generally a matter for the specialist courts. The Federal Constitutional Court can only intervene in this respect if constitutional law is violated and the challenged decision reveals errors that are based on a fundamentally incorrect view of the importance of the equality of legal protection guaranteed by the Basic Law (see BVerfGE 56, 139 <144>; BVerfG, decision of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of December 4, 2018 - 2 BvR 2726/17 -, para. 12). The specialist courts only exceed the scope for decision-making to which they are entitled if they apply a standard of interpretation that makes it disproportionately difficult for an impecunious party to pursue or defend a legal action compared to a well-off party. This is the case, in particular, if the specialist court overstretches the requirements for the likelihood of success of the intended legal prosecution or legal defense and thereby clearly fails to achieve the purpose of legal aid, which is to enable the impecunious party to have largely the same access to court as the well-off party (see BVerfGE 81, 347 <358>; BVerfG, order of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of 22 August 2018 - 2 BvR 26. August 2018 - 2 BvR 2647/17 -, para. 14; decision of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of October 23, 2018 - 2 BvR 1050/17 -, para. 14; decision of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of December 4, 2018 - 2 BvR 2726/17 -, para. 13; decision of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of December 5, 2018 - 2 BvR 1122/18, 2 BvR 1222/18, 2 BvR 1583/18 -, para. 12; decision of the 1st Chamber of the First Senate of April 16, 2019 - 1 BvR 2111/17 -, para. 22).

26

The examination of the prospects of success does not serve to shift the prosecution or legal defense itself to the ancillary legal aid proceedings, in which only a summary examination takes place, and to allow these to take the place of the main proceedings (see BVerfG, order of the 2nd Chamber of the First Senate of March 11, 2010 - 1 BvR 365/09 -, para. 17; order of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of August 22, 2018 - 2 BvR 2647/17 - para. 14; order of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of October 23, 2018 - 2 BvR 1050/17 - para. 14; order of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of August 2018 - 2 BvR 2647/17 -, para. 14; Order of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of October 23, 2018 - 2 BvR 1050/17 -, para. 14; Order of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of December 4, 2018 - 2 BvR 2726/17 -, para. 13; Order of the 1st Chamber of the Second Senate of December 5, 2018 - 2 BvR 2257/17 -, para. 14; Order of the 1st Chamber of the First Senate of April 16, 2019 - 1 BvR 2111/17 -, para. 22). In principle, no disputed questions of law or fact may be clarified in legal aid proceedings (see BVerfG, order of the 3rd Chamber of the First Senate of October 14, 2003 - 1 BvR 901/03 -, NVwZ 2004, p. 334 <335>; Order of the 2nd Chamber of the First Senate of February 19, 2008 - 1 BvR 1807/07 -, para. 23; Order of the 3rd Chamber of the First Senate of August 28, 2014 - 1 BvR 3001/11 -, para. 13).

27

However, the refusal of legal aid does not raise any constitutional concerns if success on the merits of the case is not ruled out outright, but the chance of success is only remote (see

BVerfG, decision of the 3rd Chamber of the First Senate of August 28, 2014 - 1 BvR 3001/11 -, para. 12; decision of the 3rd Chamber of the Second Senate of April 1, 2015 - 2 BvR 3058/14 -, para. 20). Therefore, anticipation of evidence in legal aid proceedings is also permissible to a limited extent. In these cases, the constitutional court's review is limited to whether there are concrete and comprehensible indications that a taking of evidence on the disputed facts would very likely be detrimental to the complainant (BVerfG, decision of the First Chamber of the First Senate of September 3, 2013 - 1 BvR 1419/13 -, para. 23). However, if the taking of evidence is seriously considered and there are no concrete and comprehensible indications that the taking of evidence would very likely be to the disadvantage of the complainant, it is contrary to the principle of equal legal protection to refuse legal aid to the person without means due to the lack of prospects of success of their legal protection request (cf. BVerfG, Order of the 1st Chamber of the First Senate of February 20, 2002 - 1 BvR 1450/00 -, NJW-RR 2002, p. 1069; Order of the 3rd Chamber of the First Senate of November 21, 2008 - 1 BvR 2504/06 -, para. 13; Order of the 3rd Chamber of the First Senate of July 1, 2009 - 1 BvR 560/08 -, para. 13; Order of the 3rd Chamber of the First Senate of April 25, 2012 - 1 BvR 2869/11 -, para. 18; established case law)..." (**end of quote**)

And the decision of the Federal Constitutional Court of 29.11.2019 on 1 BvR 2666/18 in an action for damages for pain and suffering states (**quote)**:

"aa) According to the prevailing opinion in case law and literature on Section 114 sentence 1 ZPO, a request for legal protection in the context of a quantified claim for damages for pain and suffering generally has sufficient prospect of success if the amount demanded still appears reasonable (cf. February 2011 - 4 W 108/10 -, juris, para. 17; OLG Düsseldorf, decision of November 3, 2011 - 1 W 32/11 -, juris, para. 3; Fischer, in: Musielak/Voit, 16th ed. 2019, ZPO Section 114 para. 29; Kießling, in: Saenger, ZPO, 8th ed. 2019, Section 114 para. 21; Slizyk, in: IMM-DAT Kommentierung, 15th ed. 2019, para. 484). In legal aid proceedings, an imaginary framework must therefore be formed within which the judicial discretion can be exercised in the specific case. Only if the claim for which legal aid is sought exceeds this framework do the proceedings have no prospect of success. Only then does legal aid not have to be granted. However, the final decision as to which circumstances are of significance for the assessment of the compensation for pain and suffering, how these circumstances are to be assessed and how the court exercises its discretion in this regard are only to be decided in the main proceedings.
16
Such an interpretation follows the requirement of equal legal protection under Article 3 (1) in conjunction with Article 20 (3) of the Basic Law. In the event of an application that is not only remotely promising, those without legal means must be given the opportunity to have it examined in proceedings on the merits with the support of a lawyer and with the possible involvement of witnesses and experts. Proceedings on the merits of the case provide both the unsupported parties and the opponents of the respective action with far better opportunities to develop and present both the facts and their own legal position. This is particularly the case if those without funds are not yet represented by a lawyer in the legal aid proceedings, but are still seeking legal support. Only the in-depth discussion in the main proceedings also opens up the opportunity to reconsider the legal opinion that a court initially develops. In addition, depending on the type of proceedings, it is only with proceedings on the merits that there are opportunities to obtain a favorable decision on the legal issue by a court of higher instance (see BVerfGE 81, 347 <359>)..." (**end of quote**)

Against this backdrop, the court should not overstretch the requirements for the granting of PKH.

Schmitz
Lawyer

(This pleading has a qualified electronic signature)

**Draft complaint:**

**In the name of and with the authorization of the plaintiff, I am filing this action and will request a ruling at the hearing:**

**1.**

**The defendant is ordered to pay the plaintiff reasonable compensation for pain and suffering plus 5 percentage points above the base interest rate since May 27, 2024,**

**2.**

**The defendant is ordered to pay the plaintiff an (arrears) pension (for her loss of earnings) in the total amount of € .... plus interest thereon at a rate of 5 percentage points above the prime rate from 9....**

**3.**

**The defendant is ordered to pay the plaintiff from ... to ... a monthly pension (for her loss of earnings) in the amount of ... €, payable quarterly in advance on January 1, April 1, July 1 and October 1 of each year.**

**4.**

**It is established that the defendant is (furthermore) obliged to compensate the plaintiff for all further material and immaterial damage, which cannot yet be quantified, which the plaintiff has already suffered and will suffer in the future as a result of the act of damage (the manufacture and distribution of the Covid-19 injection Comirnaty), insofar as the claim has not been transferred to a social insurance institution or other third parties.**

**5.**

**The defendant is obliged to indemnify the plaintiff against the extrajudicial costs of its legal action in the amount of € 3,020.34.**

**6.**

**The defendant is obliged to indemnify the plaintiff against the costs incurred out of court for the expert opinion of Dr. Hans-Joachim Kremer for the assessment of the risk-benefit ratio within the meaning of Section 84 (1) sentence 2 no. 1 AMG in the amount of € 17,850.00.**

**7.**

**Orders the defendant to pay the costs.**

**8.**

**Furthermore, the following is requested,**

**if the legal requirements are met**

**(Partial) default judgment or (partial) acknowledgment judgment**

**to issue.**

**We expressly reserve the right to file further applications for information pursuant to Section 84 a AMG and Section 35 para. 1 GenTG.**

We do not agree to the dispute being decided by a single judge, as the case presents particular difficulties of a factual and legal nature and is also of fundamental importance.

**In view of the plaintiff's state of health, it is already requested pursuant to Section 128 a ZPO that the oral hearing be held as a video hearing and that the participation of the plaintiff and myself as the undersigned be permitted via video and audio transmission.**

# Table of contents

Annex 0: Declaration of personal and financial circumstances

Annex K 0: Expert opinion by Prof. Dr. Ulrike Kämmerer (as of 10.1.2024) on the "Evaluation of the suitability of the RT-qPCR technique for the detection of a possible infection and infectivity of persons with regard to SARS-CoV-2".

Annex K 1: Written submission by Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab to the Saxon OVG dated 4.2.2024

Appendix K 2: Dr. Michael Palmer et al: PDF of the eBook "Why mRNA vaccines are toxic"

Annex K 3 A, B, C: Criminal complaint by the Swiss law firm Kruse Law against Swissmedic dated 7.2.2024 (A: Summary / C: Criminal complaint / D: Evidence report)

Annex K 4: Expert opinion by Dr. Hans-Joachim Kremer on the negative risk-benefit ratio within the meaning of Section 84 (1) sentence 2 no. 1 AMG

Annex K 5: Written submission by Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab to the Federal Administrative Court dated 3.4.2023

Annex K 6: Written submission by Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab to the Federal Administrative Court dated 20.7.2022

Annex K 7A: Analysis by Prof. Dr. Ulrike Kämmerer entitled "DNA is not a toy"

Annex K 7B: Brief by RA DDR. Renate Holzeisen with grounds of appeal against the order of the European Court of Justice of 11.12.2023 to AZ. T-109/23

Annex K 8 My criminal complaint to the Leipzig StA dated 19.2.2024

Annex K 9: My submission to the BVerwG on BVerwG of 16.1.2024

Annex K 10: Expert opinion by Raimund Hagemann from 28.11.2023

Annex K 11: Criminal, unprofessional corona vaccine hunt" by Prof. Dr. Arne Burkhardt

Enclosures K 12: Copy of vaccination card

Appendix K 13: Medical reports and other evidence of injection damage

Appendix K 14 Pathology model by Dr. Andreas Bermpohl

Appendix K 15: Appendix 2.2: Cumulative and Interval Summary Tabulation of Serious and Non-Serious Adverse Reactions from Post-Marketing Data Sources

Annex K 16A1: Template for criminal complaint to the ICC from May 2021

Annex K 16A2: Templates for criminal complaint to the JCC from May 2021

Annex K 16B1 Advance Purchase Agreement between the EU and Pfizer dated 20.11.2020

Annex K 16B2 Adverse reactions to Comirnaty reported to WHO until 27.3.2021

Annex K 16B3 WHO statistics from 12.11.2021 on various medical products

Annex K 16B4 (is identical to Annex K 15, therefore not submitted again here)

Annex K 16B5 Report of the European Court of Auditors of 2022 (p. 33-34)

Annex K16B6 Statement of the EMA dated 18.10.2023

Annex K16B7 EU withdrawal of the medicinal product "Vaxzevria"/AstraZeneca dated 27.3.2024

Appendix K 17: BioNTech "Annual Report 2020"

Annex K 18: Evidence of material damage

Exhibit K 19 Extrajudicial letters to the defendant dated .....

Annex K 20: Extrajudicial letter from the defendant dated ....

Annex K 21: Invoice from the expert Dr. Hans-Joachim Kremer dated 23.5.2024

**The content of these annexes is hereby referred to in its entirety - insofar as this is not specifically done below - and is included in the statement of claim.**

This is the only way to convey all relevant facts and at the same time maintain the clarity of the statement of claim.

## A) Preliminary remarks

### I. Introductory remarks

The adjudicating court will only be able to deal with this action objectively and neutrally if it has first acquired a certain basic knowledge that reduces the defendant's knowledge advantage as far as possible and, in addition, has freed itself from any remaining misconceptions that have been induced in large parts of the population by years of systematic disinformation in the mass media serving a strategy of fear and shock.

I therefore take the liberty of making a few basic comments in order to provide the court of first instance with as good an introduction as possible and a quick overview of the complex factual issues that are of particular relevance to the decision in this case.

In the meantime, numerous studies, scientific articles and well-researched non-fiction books have been published that have reviewed the relevant aspects of the entire Covid-19 injection campaign - including the shock strategy associated with it - that were accessible at the time of publication.

In the following I will name a small selection of such sources and non-fiction books, some of which refer to hundreds of further sources.

Let me say in advance: Of these books, the court making the decision should in any case first read the book "**Die Corona-Verschwörung**" (**The Corona Conspiracy**) by Dr. Brigitte Röhrig, whose references include decades of experience with German and European pharmaceutical law. This book provides a very good overview of the most important basic knowledge that is important here.

What is written there could certainly also be compiled from countless contributions from numerous critical sources. But it should be a considerable relief for every judge if as many sources as possible are obtained from just one reference source in this brief.

Despite this flood of contributions inviting a comprehensive factual and legal reappraisal of the Covid-19 infection campaign, it has unfortunately only very rarely been apparent in recent years that the judiciary was interested in a serious, fact-based and unbiased legal reappraisal of the so-called anti-corona measures and the entire Covid-19 injection campaign. In light of the information that is now available, such an attitude can no longer be maintained.

In the interests of all people whose health has been damaged - often severely to the point of death - by Covid-19 injections since December 2020, it is urgently necessary for the criminal prosecution authorities in this country to finally begin a comprehensive criminal investigation into the entire Covid-19 injection campaign.

Rulings such as that of the Halle (Saale) District Court of 14.12.23 - 98 C 2116/21 against evidence-free mask requirements in schools have so far remained the absolute exception. Case law has regularly dispensed with the consultation of independent and critical experts and has therefore ultimately obscured more than it has illuminated.

An article on **netzwerkkrista.de** from April 2, 2023 (**quote**), among others, comments on the refusal of the judiciary to question the proportionality of so-called anti-corona measures:

"On March 10, 2023, the Neue Zeitschrift für Verwaltungsrecht (NVwZ) ... published a very readable and comprehensive two-part online article by lawyer Sebastian Lucenti entitled **No "Lex-COVID-19" for Corona Measures Part I and Part II.(1)** - In it, the author analyzes, among other things, the judicial proportionality assessment of corona measures.

It comes to the conclusion that the legislator has long exceeded its scope for state assessment and design - contrary to the decisions of the Federal Constitutional Court of 19.11.2021 ("Bundesnotbremse I and II"), of 10.2.2022 and of 27.4.2022 ("COVID-19 vaccination obligation I and II"). A large number of statutory provisions did not stand up to a proportionality test in a comprehensive assessment of the facts. This applies all the more in the case of a carefully conducted taking of evidence in court. He further states that legislators and the executive have made a large number of avoidable systemic errors in assessing the COVID-19 threat situation and in selecting the means by disregarding rational, differentiated basic considerations. He concludes that parts of the population should not be used as human shields for another part of the population, especially not children and young people.

The courts dealing with state corona measures are urgently called upon to independently determine the relevant facts and to critically examine the correctness of the recommendations and data of state institutions bound by instructions - in particular those of the Robert Koch Institute (RKI) and the Paul Ehrlich Institute (PEI), which also had a decisive influence on the legislation and ordinances to be reviewed by the courts. A judicial examination of the facts with open eyes had mostly failed to materialize. A rapid critical review of the Corona case law is necessary." (**End of quote, bold added**)

Links from Beck-Verlag to these articles by Sebastian Lucenti:

https://rsw.beck.de/docs/librariesprovider176/default-document-library/aufsätze-online/online-aufsatz-2-2023.pdf?sfvrsn=787bf02_1

https://rsw.beck.de/docs/librariesprovider176/default-document-library/aufsätze-online/online-aufsatz-3-2023.pdf?sfvrsn=18cc7684_1

The elements in Sebastian Lucenti's argumentation are not new, but are summarized here very stringently. There is no known attempt to refute them.

Apart from the former Weimar judge Christian Dettmar, almost no judge in this country has been prepared since March 2020 to investigate the relevant facts of the case and to critically scrutinize the accuracy of the recommendations and data from authorities such as the RKI and the PEI, which, as is well known, both belong to the portfolio of the Federal Ministry of Health, and to review them expertly by involving experts.

The fate of Judge Dettmar should be common knowledge. The commentary of critical judges and public prosecutors on the unspeakable judgment of the Erfurt Regional Court of 23.8.2023 was devastating, see:

https://netzwerkkrista.de/2023/12/15/nur-ein-schwaecheanfall-der-justiz-noch-einmal-das-urteil-des-landgerichts-erfurt-gegen-christian-dettmar/

Further criticism of this judgment can be found in an article by Frauke Rostalski / Elisa Hoven in NStZ 2024, pp. 65-70.

The conclusion of our colleague Sebastian Lucenti in his interview in the Epoch Times entitled "**The failure of the democratic constitutional state in the Corona crisis**", which is available in full text at this link, is correspondingly negative:

https://www.epochtimes.de/assets/uploads/2023/10/Interview_RA_Lucenti_Sebastian_Endfassung_20231027.pdf

His analysis also confirms that the judiciary has completely failed to provide effective legal protection during the coronavirus crisis, as it was unable to critically question the justification for the so-called anti-coronavirus measures and the various forms of coercion of people for Covid-19 injections.

It is high time to put an end to this practice if the administration of justice is not to suffer irreparable damage to its credibility. The judiciary must prove itself when it counts. In any case, politicians and the judiciary will not be able to resist the people's call for a reappraisal in the long term.

In the following, we have deliberately used sources that are accessible to everyone - and regularly free of charge. No one, especially no responsible person, should be able to say that they did not know any better.

**II. inapplicable narratives**

**What were the narratives on which all the so-called anti-corona measures were based and which nobody was supposed to question?**

I would just like to remind you of the following narratives, all of which were demonstrably based on inaccurate claims or brazen lies:

**1.**

**Impending overload in healthcare / intensive care? - a lie**

This can even be deduced from the press release of the Federal Statistical Office No. 445 of 22.9.21, which states (**quote**):

"...The corona pandemic had a significant impact on the number of inpatient treatment cases and operations in German hospitals in 2020: A total of 16.4 million patients were treated as inpatients in general hospitals. **According to the Federal Statistical Office (Destatis), this was 13% or almost 2.5 million fewer cases than in the previous year.** The decline was particularly sharp in the first coronavirus wave in April 2020, with over a third (-35%) fewer inpatient treatment cases than in the same month of the previous year. The number of operations in 2020 fell by 9.7% to 6.4 million compared to the previous year..." (**end of quote**)

Source.

https://www.destatis.de/DE/Presse/Pressemitteilungen/2021/09/PD21_445_231.html#:~:text=WIESBADEN%20-%20Die%20Corona%2DPandemie%20hatte,den%20allgemeinen%20Krankenhäusern%20stationär%20behandelt.

**2.**

**Possibility of infection from asymptomatic people? - a lie**

A pkt.at article from January 17, 2021 states (**quote**):

"On November 20, 2020, a broad-based study from China, in which 9,899,828 million inhabitants of the city of Wuhan (around 92.9% of the urban population) took part, caused a stir. In summary, the researchers from Wuhan came to the conclusion that there was no evidence that the asymptomatic cases identified posed a risk to the general population. Apparently, the viral load in healthy carriers of the coronavirus is so low that it is not sufficient to cause serious illness in other people..." (**end of quote**)

Source:

https://tkp.at/2021/01/17/keine-beweise-fuer-ansteckung-durch-asymptomatische-personen/

**3.**