

Wilfried Schmitz

**Rechtsanwalt**

RA Wilfried Schmitz, Mitglied der RA-Kammer Köln

An das

Bundesverwaltungsgericht  
Geschäftsstelle 1. Wehrdienstsenat

schmitz.de

04107 Leipzig

**Zustellung über das beA**

**Büro in 52538 Selfkant:**

**De-Plevitz-Str. 2**

**Telefon: 02456-5085590**

**Telefax: 02456-5085591**

**Mobil: 01578-7035614**

**Mobile Festnetz-Nr.:**

**02456-9539054**

**Email:**

info@rechtsanwalt-wilfried-

**Homepage abrufbar unter:**

Rechtsanwalt-Wilfried-Schmitz.de

**beA:**

Schmitz, Wilfried (52538 Selfkant)

**Steuernummer: 210/5145/1944**

**USt.-IdNr.: DE268254583**

**Bei Zahlungen bitte stets angeben:**

**Rechn.-Nr.:**

**Bei Antworten bitte stets angeben:**

**Aktenzeichen: 37 + 58 / 2022**

Selfkant, den 15.5.2022

**In the military appeal proceedings**

**of the Mr ...**

**AZ.**

**and**

**of the Mr ...**

**AZ. ...**

is kindly reminded to send the minutes of the hearing on the 1st day of the hearing on 2.5.2022.

We will respond to the respondent's brief dated 11.5.2022, if appropriate, in a timely manner before the next date of hearing.

However, we do not have to and will not replicate the smokescreens in the first session, such as why Prof. Dr. Burkhardt did not publish his findings in a scientific journal. No one would even think of reproaching a forensic pathologist for having to publish his autopsy results in a scientific journal before they can be used in criminal proceedings (in court or in public). Anyone wishing to dispute the findings of a forensic pathologist in a trial would request a counter-opinion.

But this is exactly what the respondent was and is not interested in. Of the representatives of the Federal Armed Forces who were present on 2.5.2022, probably none has ever performed an autopsy himself, precisely because this does not correspond to their training and competence. And the offer made by Prof. Dr. Burkhardt at the meeting of 2.5.2022,

that representatives of the respondent could check the results of his work at any time, was clearly met with complete disinterest there.

The reasons for this lack of interest are obvious.

The statement of the respondent that he is considerably behind in the evaluation of his data on pharmacovigilance because the data were recorded in paper form is tantamount to an oath of disclosure.

The respondent could have - if it had wanted to - set up an effective electronic reporting and information system within the scope of its technical possibilities even before the start of the coronavirus protection "vaccination" campaign - also in cooperation with the RKI (cf. § 14 para. 1 IfSG) and the PEI (on this subject, a separate submission will be made) - and should have can and must commission an IT service provider with the technical implementation so that any vaccination complications among the "vaccinated" soldiers - in terms of type, frequency and severity - and thus also the effects of this "vaccination" campaign on the operational capability of the Bundeswehr can be recorded currently, completely and clearly. This is all the more true since the representatives of the respondent have emphasized that they care so much about the lives of each and every soldier and the operational capability of the Bundeswehr.

With so much nobility of spirit, effective pharmacovigilance would have been the most natural thing in the world to ask hundreds of thousands of soldiers to participate in these injections of completely novel mRNA "vaccines".

At some point it will have to be clarified what the reasons and who the responsible parties are for this momentous failure.

Such inconceivable omissions are likely to fuel the suspicion that those in charge of the Bundeswehr were not at all interested in effective pharmacovigilance, possibly in order to avoid even the appearance that they wanted to challenge the political narrative of "we vaccinate everyone, come what may".

The most likely devastating consequences of these gross violations of duty for life and health of many soldiers will not be excused with the argument that due to the considerable delays in the evaluation of paper-based data, it was only possible to recognize so late or too late what catastrophic consequences these Corona protection "vaccinations" had and still have on life and health of many soldiers.

This is precisely the reason for the breach of duty: if an effective reporting and information system had been set up and used, then it could and should have been recognised at a very early stage that this "vaccination" campaign had to be stopped immediately.

Schmitz  
Lawyer