Rogert&Ulbrich | Hammer Street 26 | D-40219 Dusseldorf

Federal Administrative Court
Simonplatz 1
04107 Leipzig

lawyers in partnership mbB
AG Essen PR no. 1801

Managing partners:

dr Marco Rogert
Lawyer and specialist lawyer for banking and capital market law, transport and forwarding law

Tobias Ulbrich
Lawyer and specialist lawyer for transport and forwarding law

Employed lawyers:

Sinan Bocek
Burcu Gulcan
Laura Heinzen
Julia Huth
Christian Peusser
Emine Sezer
Jessica Steinberg

Our sign	office		date
00315/22TU/TU	Saniye Saree	sari@ru.law	08/16/2022
Attorney Ulbrich		0211 81977 - 611	

In the related military complaints procedure

.....

....
the application made will not only be maintained by all the judges deciding the main issue, including Colonel iG Mielke and Lieutenant Colonel iG Suchord, but will also be extended to the main issue.

Reason
The complainants have the advice of Dr. Henke of August 15, 2022. A reduction of the motion to reject only the full-time members of the Senate due to concerns about bias is ruled out from the start.

The core of the allegation lies in the conduct of the main matter and the events from July 6th, 2022 to July 7th, 2022.

In this regard, despite the request of attorney Wilfried Schmitz and the undersigned, the judges attached, Colonel Mielke and Lieutenant Colonel Suchord, have not made any official statement. Either they have violated the secrecy of deliberations themselves or they may be covering for another member of the Senate. Both weigh equally heavily in terms of concerns about bias.

The hearing procedure ultimately presents itself as a kind of "interim procedure" which will result in the resumption of the main issue.

Pursuant to § 152a VwGO, the proceedings are to be continued on reprimand by a party adversely affected by a court decision.

The special feature here is that the main reason why the procedure is not yet over is that there are no reasons for the decision (not even after 6 weeks!), although the chairman of the first military service senate, Dr. Häußler, but according to the press release of the Federal Administrative Court clearly expressed the content of his decision.

The complainants compare the text of the press release with the content of the proceedings in short and concise italics.

The press release reads as follows:

"The law expects that every soldier contributes to his personal operational capability and thus to the functionality of the Bundeswehr (Art. 87a GG) as a whole by tolerating vaccinations. The maintenance of one's own operational capability is a central duty in the sovereign relationship of service and loyalty of the soldier (Art. 33 Para. 4 GG)."

It was precisely for this reason that the complainants had argued and demonstrated that the injections with the gene therapy, especially in the Air Force, did not serve to maintain operational capability, but rather to destroy the military. It was stated that

- the immune system is irreparably damaged and soldiers are then unprotected and exposed to all other pathogens;
- the spike proteins synthesized in the Wuhan laboratory, which are now supposed to produce the human body's own cells, are toxic and cause substantial damage in the

cause harm to the human body and the damage is ongoing, permanent and not limited in time. The CDC has now taken the information from the net that the production of the spike proteins is only temporary;

- the unauthorized lipid nanoparticles also cause substantial cell damage and trigger allergic reactions;
- Occurrence of impaired consciousness and cognitive dysfunction, strokes, thrombosis, heart attacks, myocarditis and pericarditis, inflammation of the joints, pain throughout the body, fatigue exhaustion;
- furthermore, that the injection is not so infrequently fatal.

Simply not surrendering to the injection with this gene therapy serves to maintain the operational capability.

“The legal form of the obligation to tolerate also satisfies the constitutional requirement that the legislature make all essential decisions itself. Because it has defined the scope of the encroachment on the fundamental right to physical integrity in a general manner with sufficient clarity and limited it to reasonable encroachments. He was able to leave it up to the employer to determine the precise vaccinations to be taken and the vaccines to be used, because the servicewomen and men need different vaccinations depending on where they are deployed at home and abroad. In addition, the emergence of new pathogens or the discovery of new side effects of vaccines require flexible and quick decision-making.”

The perfidious thing is that all the serious damage caused by the vaccine, including death and the destruction of the immune system, all existed before the order on the toleration obligation was issued on November 24th, 2021, i.e. there was just complete knowledge of the side effects that - assuming flexible and quick decision-making - must never include a decision in favor of the infirmity and death of soldiers.

"When introducing the obligation to tolerate in November 2021, the Federal Ministry of Defense did not exceed the discretion granted to it. At that time, the delta variant of the SARS-CoV-2 virus was extremely dangerous. The existing vaccines could only reduce the risk of infection and transmission, but they reduced the risk of severe cases by 90%. In its decision on facility-related compulsory vaccination, the Federal Constitutional Court confirmed the existence of an aggravating pandemic situation in winter 2021 and explained in more detail that, according to the predominantly professional assessment at the time, it was assumed that the Covid-19 vaccination would significantly reduce the risk of infection and transmission (BVerfG , Decision of April 27, 2022 - 1 BvR 2649/21 - Rn. 157 ff., 173 f.)"

The complainants had explained and proved that the factual prerequisites for an obligation to tolerate according to § 17a SG were already not met, i.e. the question of weighing up and the exercise of discretion did not arise.

The soldier does not have to tolerate any injections with experimental gene therapy drugs that pose a concrete risk to life and limb after the injection, cf. Section 17a, Paragraph 4 of the Soldiers' Act.

Literally, the standard says:**!A medical measure that involves a significant risk to life or health is not reasonable.**

There is nothing about discretion, that the Federal Ministry of Defense still has discretion to be allowed to carry out experiments on soldiers that endanger life and limb.

The Federal Ministry of Defense also expressly has no authority to restrict the right to life. This is not possible because, according to the citation requirement, the restriction of fundamental rights should have been included in the law. But there is nothing about restricting the fundamental right to life. It is therefore completely clear that in the case of the deliberate forced administration of experimental substances, the limit must be drawn where there is a danger to life.

Recently, the Federal Minister of Health has admitted in an explanatory video that the injection can lead to death.

Moreover, the result of the taking of evidence and the complainants' submissions revealed exactly the opposite of the assertion that injections could reduce severe courses, which was already completely absurd in relation to the group of soldiers to be considered, because they were fundamentally wrong from the start were never exposed to the risk of severe courses. The lecture and the result of the proof were ignored.

It was already clear in November 2021 that the injection would not reduce the risk of infection and transmission.

But the Senate also ignored the Nuremberg Code. The Senate has completely refused the examination because it could not have disproved that these Covid-19 gene therapy drugs are experimental and that the soldiers could not effectively consent to these injections due to massive coercion and a lack of adequate information.

"Following the expert hearing it conducted, the 1st Military Service Senate also agreed that the vaccination compared to the Omicron variant that is now predominant still has a

relevant protective effect in terms of reducing infection and transmission (BVerfG loc. cit. para. 184 f.). In addition, it reduces the risk of a severe course over a longer period of time, especially after a booster vaccination, so that the positive effect of the vaccination clearly outweighs the risk associated with it. According to the current recommendations of the Robert Koch Institute, this also applies to the group of 18 to 59 year olds, who make up the majority of military personnel. The Federal Ministry of Defense was entitled to use the safety reports of the Paul Ehrlich Institute when assessing the vaccination risks, even if this specialist authority has not yet received the data from the Associations of Statutory Health Insurance Physicians, contrary to Section 13 (5) IfSG.

This preceding paragraph of the press release is ultimately the oath of disclosure of the Federal Administrative Court. As Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab explained in the justification of his hearing complaint that the information inverts the result of the evidence into its opposite.

The other constituent elements of Section 17a of the Soldiers' Act are also not dealt with at all.

The reasons for the decision that can be read in the press release raise the suspicion of perverting the law, which also explains why the Senate was not able to cast the few clear elements of the facts of Section 17a of the Soldiers' Act cleanly examined in reasons for the decision, which then correspond to the press release. It may also be that one or the other member of the Senate refuses to take part in the act of perverting the law. It may be that there is a majority right to vote and that the majority decision is also to be carried by the other Senate members. Certainly, however, a judge at the Federal Administrative Court does not have to participate in the violation of the law in the form of perverting the law.

It may also be that the assessors of this senate do not want to take part in the death of the comrades and the infirmity of all who are now being forced to use the experimental injection.

As an assessor, I would also make that clear. Because it is not a breach of the confidentiality of advice if one is not willing to cover up crimes, but remembers that one has taken an oath on the Basic Law and not on the executive or the Federal Administrative Court. The breach of the law was also evident to the lay judges. However, they did not take an official position, which is why they obviously support the reasons for the decision that are evident from the press release.

They are therefore equally in accordance with Section 152a (1) VwGO in the context of the continuation of the proceedings with the bad appearance that they could no longer objectively and neutrally continue this legal dispute - in the continuation after the hearing complaint.

It is precisely for this reason that the hearing procedure must also decide who is to continue to make decisions on the main issue. It is therefore irrelevant that they initially do not participate in the dependent hearing complaint proceedings. The complaint about the hearing remains part of the main issue as an annex and also leads back to it, which is why the concern about bias must also be decided overall.

Tobias Ulbrich
Lawyer