E. Presentation of the Facts [58.] – [60.]

([IG_S04], [IG_S05]): An equally socially balanced, affordable and constitutional social legislation proves to be a party political overstrain in Germany. Even the previous versions of the “Law on Modernization of the Health Care - Health Modernization Act (GMG)”, the GRG 1988 and the GSG of 1992, had to be withdrawn in part due to unconstitutionality and the Constitutional Court of the Federal Republic of Germany (BVerfG) demanded a constitutional successor solution until March 31, 2002. The red-green government did not take long after taking office on October 27, 1998, to increase the deficits of social security funds exponentially due to inability (2001, 2002 and 2003: EUR 2, 3 or 9 billion).

In a joint circular from the health and pension insurance carriers (i.e. also the AOK Federal Executive Board), their lobbyists already announced on March 21, 2002 that they would see the contribution of “original capital payments”, i.e. savings of the insured persons, as a solution to the financial problem.

The idea of the SPD was to blur the boundaries between the 2nd Pillar (company pension scheme with company pensions) and the 3rd Pillar (private retirement provision) of the old-age insurance. It goes back to the SPD General Secretary at the time, the still the Federal Minister of Finance, the still chancellor candidate and self-proclaimed social expert Olaf Scholz, whose social expertise is currently being highlighted in all the media. For this purpose, the fact that politicians in earlier times promoted private savings (3rd Pillar) by flat-rate income tax for the savings contributions (as a measure against the constant decrease in the state old-age pension level). For this promotion, the politicians had required that appropriate endowment insurance (with simultaneous protection of the surviving dependents in the event of death) had to be taken out with the insurers through the employer. The fraudsters disguise these insurances as "direct insurance" (although only the framework contracts between employers and insurers are) because the company pension law (BetrAVG) also uses a so called "direct insurance" method. It is no coincidence that Chancellor Schröder moved “private retirement provision” (3rd Pillar) under “the umbrella of [company] old-age pension scheme” (2nd Pillar) in his government declaration on March 14, 2003.

The BVerfG's deadline for the successor solution was long over. In February and March 2003, some ministerials dealt with drafts for a GMG law without any ideas or concepts worth mentioning. In April 2003, the parties introduced different law drafts in the Bundestag, without these having even the slightest majority or consensus. In June 2003 there were lately 3 law drafts (SPD / Greens, CDU / CSU, FDP), which again were referred to the “Bundestag Committee for Health and Social Security”) and to other „opinion-giving" Bundestag Committees according to the “F” scheme (decided by the parliamentary group chairmen („Fraktionsvorsitzende“) long before the 1st reading of the law draft in the Bundestag.

According to the SPD plan, this time it should be completely different. After setting the course in 2002, the AOK lobbyist Franz Knieps had mutated from "Managing Director Politics in the AOK Federal Association" to head of a department in the BMGS at Ulla Schmidt on February 1, 2003, in order on the creation of the new GMG law to enforce the monopoly of the statutory health insurance companies (a lobbyist kindly writes his own law). A “condensed version of a draft” from May 8th, 2003 suddenly had a non-ministerial structure and, above all, ideas (e.g. 164 suggested changes for SGB V instead of the previous 1), also ideas for fundraising; the doubling of the contribution rate in § 248 SGB V alone should later bring 1.6 billion EUR additional income annually.

The BMGS under Ulla Schmidt organized a four-day hearing with abnormally 136 associations and 41 so-called "experts". The parliamentarians developed the desired feeling that they were completely overwhelmed, gave their passive consent to the waiver of their constitutional rights and obligations and “allowed” the legislation to be transferred to an “extra-parliamentary commission” without any legal authority. There were no protests against the overthrow of parliamentary democracy. The Schröder government had already practiced bypassing parliament elsewhere ([IG_S07]).

The negotiator of the CDU/CSU Seehofer required for participation in the extra-parliamentary "consensus talks" of the SPD, the Greens and the CDU/CSU (the FPD did not want to participate after the 1st day) on July 3rd. until 08/22/2003 that the talks did not take place on the basis of the SPD draft law but naively he left the organizational and design of the “new” draft law on the basis of the “consensus results” with the SPD. The evidence indicates that he later was inaugurated by Ulla Schmidt into the planned state-organized fraud to fill the coffers ([IG_S05] Chap. 9 c)).

A working version of the GMG draft of August 11, 2003 suddenly contained the ominous changes in § 229 SGB V, which were not decided by consensus. The members of the advisory “Bundestag Committee on Health and Social Security” did not notice this change because, after the 1st reading on 09.09.2003 and referral to their Committee, they again get busy by Ulla Schmidt with an absolutely pointless “expert”

hearing and its processing. "Opinion-giving" Bundestag Committees did not deal with the draft law either, because they did not even have meetings during the period in question. The 2nd and 3rd reading took place on September 26th, 2003, the GMG draft law, which was changed as a result of a hearing, was available to parliament on September 25th, 2003 at the earliest. No parliamentarian of the 15th Bundestag noticed what was built into the draft law, no parliamentarian had the time to notice it, but also no parliamentarian has defended himself against this ongoing breach of the constitution in the legislative process and the evasion of parliament. ((This paragraph is an extreme shortening of the actual processes [IG_S04], [IG_S05], which are meticulously worked out on the basis of, among other things, the legislative documents).

The GMG law came into the world with multiple breaches of the Gernan Constitution by the executive and the legislative (voluntarily endured elimination of parliament). And so in the GMG Introductory Act this strange wish of the health insurance lobbyists for the contribution of "original capital payments" remained ([IG_S04]; [IG_O-PP_105] Rationale, B. Special Part, Re number 143 (§ 229)), which would have been viewed in isolation just embarrassing and worthless.

([IG_S06]): But it wasn't, because the criminalization of the judiciary with the introduction of the GMG was part of the Schröder government plan with the active participation of the BMGS under Ulla Schmidt and, with preparation from 2002 to 2004 and with establishment from 2004 to 2006, led to a state-organized system to defraud approx. 6.3 million pensioners on the basis „bending the law“ and constitutional breach. Between mid-2002 and mid-2003, in close cooperation between the GKVen (statutory health insurance companies) and the BMGS under Ulla Schmidt, "criteria" were drawn up that (cannot) mean legal repeal between the 2nd and 3rd pillars, but which should promote the blurring of the boundaries in law-bending and unconstitutional application by the social justice system.

([IG_S08]): The lobbyists of the Statutory Health Insurance Companies (VdAK / AEV) already informed the General Association of the Insurance Industry (GDV) on November 5th, 2003 that "original capital payments" are now to be contributed to the social security system; at a time when the law was not yet in force ([IG_K-KK_001]). The fraudulent reinterpretation of endowment life insurances into company pension payments was easy for the insurers, because their "insurance certificates" and "quality-monitored" by the state (BAV / from 2002 Bafin and BMF) tripartite contracts have always been of such a low level quality that the economically strongest (insurer) could dictate whatever he wanted to the economically weakest (insured / employee). In addition, the state inspectors were “on the right side”, so that the insurers could be “convinced” that they were involved in state-organized fraud.

([IG_S06]): The unconstitutional law on the election of judges was used to provide legal support for state-organized fraud to establish an “unconditional” supporter of parties political interests in Hartwig Balzer, taking advantage of the age-related change in personnel at the top of the 12th Senate of the Federal Social Court (BSG). The BSG decision B 12 KR 1/06 R of 13.09.2006 is a detailed lesson in the derivation of a „bending the law“, in which the criteria invented in 2002/2003 by statutory health insurance companies and BMGS are used to justify the obligation to contribute to private savings from endowment life insurances is teeming with. This so-called “supreme court right” is the starting point for the self-referential system of breaking the law that has been continuously expanded over the years. In the intoxication of omnipotence through legal perversion secured by the state, the judges of the 12th Senate felt inspired to independently develop and apply additional right-perverting criteria to bend the law and to continually and presumptuously confirm the constitutionality of their criminal activities. „Bending the law“ (§ 339), „official acts without a corresponding office“ (§ 132 of the German Criminal Code) and breach of the Constitution have become the standard methods of the jurisprudence of the 12th Senate of the BSG since the end of 2004. Individual judges in social courts or social courts of the Federal States who comply with the law in accordance with the constitution end their careers prematurely and their "disobedient" verdict will anyway be cashed in the next instance. Only extremely few show moral courage and make statements about how it works. If the plaintiff enforces his right to an oral hearing at all, the negotiations are invariably a farce (the complainant has seen many or been told about them); the presiding judge shows or he says: just talk, we don't even listen and at the end of the day we decide according to the “highest court jurisprudence” oft he BSG; possibly with the imposition of "fault costs" due to court harassment.

([IG_S10]): Constitutional complaints are not accepted by the BVerfG with or without written reasons for the decision; the BVerfG only publishes them if it is in their own interest. This is strange: the BVerfG finds the grounds for the complaint to be insufficient for acceptance (in the event of compliance with the law, compliance with Art. 93 (1) No. 4a, 4b GG (Basic Law) and §§ 90-95 BVerfGG would be sufficient for acceptance), but would like to inform the world what important things it would have decided if it had found the complaint worth processing.

With the first extensive justification for a non-acceptance 1 BvR 1924/07 from April 7th, 2008 on the subject of "GMG, contribution law, contribution of private savings income", a chamber of the First Senate (chairman Hohmann-Dennhardt) also swung fully on the line of „bending the law“ and the constitutional breach of the BSG. The written reason is a "copying of first graders" from the first criminal judgment of the BSG B 12 KR 1/06 R, which is peppered with the criteria developed by the GKVen and the BMGS under Ulla Schmidt for the compulsory contribution of savings from private endowment life insurances (3rd Pillar) as redefined company pensions (2nd pillar) by „bending the law“. Ferdinand Kirchhof was also involved in this decision, in which even the BSG is allowed to operate retrospectively and which is garnished with a servile address of devotion to politics (the method "forms a suitable and necessary means to strengthen the financial basis of the statutory health insurance system). Thereafter, in his new career as "Vice President of the Federal Constitutional Court" and under his chairmanship, all further related constitutional complaints were not accepted during his entire term of office, with one exception (1 BvR 1660/08 see below).

The picture of the “independence” of the judiciary becomes very clear: In a letter dated April 19, 2017, the SPD parliamentarian of the Bundestag Lothar Binding from the BVerfG vice-president sent an "Inquiry into the state of affairs about constitutional complaints submitted on the question of the obligation to contribute to payments from <direct insurance>". The "Vice President of the Federal Constitutional Court" is under so much time pressure that he “normally has to leave such constitutional complaints lying around for 2 years”, but he can quickly “not accept those that have currently remained lying around for reporting” “without written justification”.

The whole effort with the „bendings the law“ and constitutional breaches in the First Senate to support the state-organized fraud were completely in vain, because according to the Federal Constitutional Court Act (BVerfGG) the First Senate is not responsible for processing these kind of constitutional complaints. Kirchhof & Co not only had the constitutional complaints "stolen", but also permanently broke the BVerfGG. Everything produced by the First Senate in this regard is just waste and to this day there has not been a single legally compliant decision by the BVerfG on the subject of “GMG, contribution law, contribution of private savings income”. It's worse; The yearly business planning of the First Senate of the BVerfG has been illegal since 2007 (already under President Papier) and all 16 judges, knowing this, have repeatedly approved in plenary.

Regarding the only exception to the non-assumptions, the decision 1 BvR 1660/08: In this, for a privately continued endowment insurance (without the employer as the 3rd party) after the insolvency of the employer, the downstream savings portion is classified as private, but the previously saved portion is released again for cash-in based on the unlawfull criteria for „bending the law“; two contradicting legal views in a resolution of the Constitutional Court, which has the task of creating legal clarity and not legal uncertainty. The more essential part of this desision, however, is the finding that three conditions must be met in order to contribute a one-off payment as severance payment for claims from a company pension: 1. Amendment of the employment contract to include the employer's company pension commitment, 2. Employer's company pension commitment, 3. Proof that the employer has paid the insurance premiums economically after the employee has increased his assets by waiving his salary accordingly.

In the so-called "press judgment", the 12th Senate of the BSG (B 12 KR 2 / 16R of 10.10.2017; [IG_K-ZG_101]) admits that it has created its own legal concept of "company pension scheme in the sense of statutory health insurance contributions" and "the Senate adheres to this independent contribution law consideration in principle [...], the decision of the BVerfG of September 28, 2010 (1 BvR 1660/08 [...]) has not changed anything". In other words, the BSG communicates: "What do we care about the laws, we make our own, what does the BVerfG interest us, we do what we want".

([IG_S11]): The federal politicians also share this view. With the „GKV company pension allowance law“, an allowance for company pensions was set from October 1st, 2020. It was less about making company pensioners happy than about imagining the politicians that the 6.3 million frauded people would finally give up if they were cheated a few euros less per month. Federal Ministers Heil and Spahn used the subsequent revision of the “paying agent registration procedure” to put a self-created legal definition of “company pension” into circulation.

([IG_S13]): For years, people who have been frauded, including the complainant, have processed the criminal offenses committed by those involved in state-organized fraud and has proven them in such a way that they have evidential value in court (https://www.ig-gmg-geschaedigte.de/). In 2021 we had to establish that the federal German (general-) public prosecutors as "political officials of the executive branch", who are bound by the instructions of the justice ministers of the federal and state governments, have the task of using their own „bending the law“ and „hindering legal prosecution in office“ (§ 258a German Criminal Code) for the members of the state institutions of the Federal Republic of Germany (and voluntary helpers

from the insurance industry and banks) to protect the perpretators in the state-organized mass fraud against 6.3 million German citizens. The protection takes place nationwide, consistently and without exception.

([IG_S12], [IG_S13]): Karl Jaspers warned of a coming parties oligarchy in the Federal Republic of Germany as early as 1966. The Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker has repeatedly pointed out over the years that the political parties are not subject to any control, that the party law is unconstitutional and that they handle the state as their prey. Today we can see that they have made significant progress; they have eliminated democracy and the rule of law. Once again (as in the Weimar Republic), German politicians, with the active support of state lawyers, have eliminated democracy and the rule of law. The state institutions of the Federal Republic of Germany are neither able nor willing to restore them.

Now it remains to be seen whether the ECHR has at least the will to provide European aid.

F. Indication of the alleged violation(s) of the Convention and / or Protocols and the reasons for the complaint
G. Compliance with the admissibility requirements under Article 35, paragraph 1, of the Convention

(F) Asserted Article [61], [62] /(G) Complaint [63]	**(F) Reason /(G) Indication of the appeal lodged and the date of the last decision**
Protocol Article 1 – Protection of Property „Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law and by the general principles of international law.	The alleged obligation to contribute the savings income from my 3 endowment insurance policies has no legal basis (ANL4, pp. 68-199). The savings proceeds from endowment life insurance (in the event of survival) are private property. With the payment of each insurance premium by whoever (employer or employee) it has irrevocably passed into the property of the insured and protected by Art. 14 GG. The social coffers emptied as a result of the inability of the responsible politicians (2003: - 9 billion EUR) produced no "public interest" with the expropriated private savings of 6.3 million pensioners to rescue these incapables from the financial misery. The raising of money also at the price of the criminalization of the judiciary as a result of the inability of the German politicians (here initially the Red-Green Government under Schröder) to equally social, affordable and constitutional social policy and also the greed for money of the following governments, which has become habitual because of the unexpected money blessing, is not a "public interest", but state-organized crime ([IG_S04], [IG_S05], [IG_S06]).
The preceding provisions shall not, however, in any way impair the right of a State to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest or to secure the payment of taxes or other contributions or penalties.“	The state has the right to apply existing laws regulating property, even if these laws clearly restrict the rights of the individual to his property. However, he does not have the right to use the property of individuals (here: a large social group of 6.3 million pensioners) without existing legal regulation, just because his representatives believe that those have no lobbyists and cannot defend themselves adequately. With the extension of Section 229 SGB V with the GMG Introductory Act (valid from 01.01.2004), according to the text of the law ([IG_O-PP_105]), it should no longer have any influence on the ability to contribute to social security when a severance payment through a one-off payment for claims from a company pension has been agreed. To conclude from this that every one-off payment of something is a "disguised" company pension (a "disguised" severance payment) depends on the claimant fraud (§ 263) or „bending the law“ (§ 339 of the German Criminal Code). The commissioned tinkering of "supreme court judgments" on the basis of the between politicians and lobbyists of the statutory health insurance companies in 2002-2003 decided "arguments" for „bending the law“ by the judges of the 12th Senate of the BSG, the judgment of the social justice system (with a few honorable exceptions) according to this “supreme court jurisdiction” is „bending the law“ and constitutional breach according to Art. 20 (3), 97 (1) GG and the approval of this practice by the Federal Constitutional Court is a state abuse of the judiciary. That is the elimination of democracy and the rule of law in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is only logical that this also leads to the disregard of the European Convention on Human Rights ([IG_S01] to [IG_S13]).

The issue here are the legal breaches in connection with the "Law for the Modernization of the Health System (GMG)", but the "subordination" of the "Health Fund" to the "Central Association of Health Insurance Funds" and its quasi legislative competence with its simultaneous direct control by the BMG with the GKV-WSG of 2006 is nothing other than state theft (§§ 242, 243 „Strafgesetzbuch“ = StGB, the German criminal code) of the property of those with statutory health and care insurance ([IG_S11]; p. 910 ff).

Article 6 – Right to a fair trial - paragraph 1 clause 1
„1. In the determination of his civil rights and obligations [… or of any criminal charge against him],
everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law.“

The state-organized fraud in the individual is initialized by the fraudulent endowment insurer; here Allianz Lebensversicherungs-AG (pp. 68-199).

In "contribution notices" (my financial loss: approx. 20,000 EUR after 10 years) or in its "grounds for objection, the statutory health insurance company AOK Bavaria either refers to the “highest court jurisprudence” oft he BSG, which represents a self-created and self-referential system of injustice, or (in the last years more and more common) only provides a list of lies. The AOK sees social courts as its outsourced service providers who has to „bend the laws“ according to their wishes (p. 576-648).

The 3 judges of the 2nd Chamber of the Social Court Munich have in the proceedings and with their judgment of 06.07.2017 (ANL5, p. 200-311) intentionally 4 times „bended the law“ (§ 339 of the German Criminal Code) and committed constitutional breach immediately in accordance with Art. 20 (3), 97 (1), 103 (1) and indirectly according to Art. 3 (1), 2 (1), 14 (1) GG. They never contradicted the statement of fact that was personally sent to them (pp. 307-311); these are accepted by them according to the rule of law. The relatively small number of proven criminal offenses results only from my then still little knowledge of the unlawful machinations of the judges in the legal dispute.

(P. 312-453; [IG_S10] p. 826 ff) The 1st Chamber of the First Senate (Vice-President Kirchhof, Schluckebier, Ott) of the Federal Constitutional Court has with its decision to reject my constitutional complaint and the related press release on April 13, 2017 intentionally committed breach of the §§ 13, 14, 19 BVerfGG, „bending the law“ (§ 339 StGB) and coercion (§ 240 StGB) and the constitutional breach directly according to Art. 20 (3), 97 (1), 103 (1) and indirectly according to Art. 3 (1), 2 (1), 14 (1) GG. The President Vosskuhle of the BVerfG was informed from the start. The annual business planning of the First Senate has been illegal since 2007 at the latest, so all decisions of the First Senate have been illegal since then. The President, Vice-President and the other 14 judges never contradicted the personally sent statement of fact of criminal offenses that was personally sent to them (pp. 307-311); these are accepted by them according to the rule of law.

The 5 judges of the 4th Senate of the Bavarian Regional Social Court have in the appeal process and with their judgment of 21.11.2019 (ANL7, p. 454-570) intentionally committed 39 so called precedural erros (breaches of SGG and ZPO), 1 coercion (§ 240 StGB), 115 „bending the law“ (§ 339 StGB) and committed constitutional breach immediately in accordance with Art. 20 (3), 97 (1), 103 (1) and indirectly according to Art. 3 (1), 2 (1), 14 (1) GG. The presiding judge tried to make the factual statement personally sent to all judges (p. 539 ff) "harmless" with trickery, also with the support of the 12th Senate of the BSG, but this failed miserably. These factual findings are therefore accepted according to the rule of law.

The OStA Heidenreich of the Munich I public prosecutor's office has refused to process my legally compliant criminal complaint against those responsible for the fraud at AOK Bayern (p. 650-669). The same "4-step standard procedure of the German public prosecutors to protect the perpetrators in the state-organized fraud" (see complaint to Art 13) was used a) in the „processing“ of my criminal complaint and b) in the „processing“ of other criminal complaints or complaints about their non-processing about. The result was 3 breaches of the StPO („Strafprozessordnung“ = StPO, German code of criminal procedure; §§ 152, 158-177, 160), 3 „bending the law“ (§ 339 StGB), at least 130 „hindering legal prosecution in office“ (§ 258a StGB) for "predicate offenses" by employees of the AOK Bavaria, the social court in Munich and the Bavarian Regional Social Court and 3 direct constitutional breaches (Art. 20 (3), 97 (1), 103 (1) GG), thus also the denial of the law like basic rights under Art. 103 (1) GG. The complaint, however, was rejected by the GenStA Munich (Bavarian Public Prosecutor's Office) on June 8th, 2021 ([IG_K-JU_2306]; p. 680-683).

In the Federal Republic of Germany there can no longer be asserted existence of independent and impartial courts based on law and of fair trials if the state wants to steal their private assets from its citizens despite the lack of a legal basis. In this case, he disregards the rule of law, criminalizes the judiciary and ignores all obstructive laws.

The documents on the IG homepage under [IG_O-BG_xxxx], [IG_O-ZG-xxx] and [IG_O_VG_xxxx] (see ANL2, p. 20) prove that the violation of Art. 6 of the EMK against the complainant by the judiciary of Federal Republic of Germany is not an isolated case.

Of the approximately 6.3 million German citizens (usually of retirement age), the overwhelming majority do not bring an action in court because of their own inability, lack of money for unwilling or incompetent lawyers, nervous resilience reduced due to age, etc. This does not change the fact that otherwise they could only sue before dependent and partisan courts not based on law (SG, LSG, BSG, BVerfG, criminal courts), i.e. they would not be able to enforce their right to a fair trial ([IG_S04], [IG_S06], [IG_S10], [IG_S12], [IG_S13]). The completed criminalization of the federal German social courts on all levels on the subject of "contribution law", the disregard of law by the Federal Constitutional Court and the prevention of any legal prosecution by the (general) public prosecutors as political officials of the executive branch on the instructions of the justice ministers of the federal and state governments are a proven reality.

Article 13 – Right to an effective remedy
„Everyone whose rights and freedoms as set forth in this Convention are violated shall have an effective remedy before a national authority notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity.

(p. 670-714; [IG_S13] pp. 1092) The complainant lodged a complaint (§ 172 StPO) with the Bavarian Public Prosecutor's Office in Munich against the refusal to process the criminal complaint against AOK employees. Its processing was refused by the OStA Schuhmaier with the same illegal methods as they are used in the „processing“ of other criminal applications or in the „processing“ of complaints about non-processing. The methods are so uniform that it can be assumed that the German public prosecutors are acting in a controlled manner on behalf of the federal and state justice ministers who are authorized to issue instructions to them.

The core is the "4-step standard procedure of the German public prosecutors to protect the perpetrators in the state-organized fraud": 1. Refusal of criminal complaints (breach of §§ 158 - 177, especially § 160 StPO); 2. Absolute unwillingness to recognize an so called „initial suspicion“ even if there are strong evidences; 3. The criminal offenses from the criminal complaints are designated as conforming to the law („hindering legal prosecution in office“, § 258a StGB); 4. All further visible criminal offenses are ignored (breach of § 152 StPO and § 258a StGB, thus further „hindering legal prosecution in office“).

These "political officials of the executive" ((general) public prosecutors) thus have the state-controlled task through additional own „bending the law“ and masses of „hindering legal prosecution in office“ for the members of the state institutions of the Federal Republic of Germany (and voluntary helpers from the insurance industry and banks) to protect the perpretators in the state-organized mass fraud against 6.3 million German citizens The protection takes place nationwide, consistently and without exception.

With one exception (1 BvR 1660/08), all constitutional complaints from chambers around Vice President Kirchhof have not been accepted by breaching of the BVerfGG and constitutional breach of the GG. In this single case, after being referred back to the BSG, the defrauded was shown that rebelling against the unjust justice would not do anything ([IG_O-BG_0610], [IG_O-VG_0610], [IG_S10] Chap. 9; pp. 858-862).

Since private lawsuits after denial of the criminal comlaints by the (general) public prosecutors are not possible, so §§ 258a, 339 StGB and all other criminal code regulations, which are constantly being broken on behalf of the state, are nullified, and Article 34 of the GG is also just wasted.

The rigorous disregard of Art 13 of the ECHR is the decisive point why the offenders at the insurers, the social courts, the Federal Constitutional Court, the public prosecutor's offices etc. etc. react so calmly to the investigation of their criminal offenses.

The right to an effective remedy of arbitrary state justice has been abolished in the case of the illegal state fundraising in the Federal Republic of Germany.