PRIMARY SOURCE DOCUMENTATION — ACTION REQUEST

The German Government, COVID Accountability, and the International Crisis

THE NUREMBERG CODE AND THE CASE OF REINER FÜLLMICH

JUNE 7, 2026 — ALL SOURCES LIVE AND LINKED INLINE

A documented analysis of German governance failures within their international context — the suppression of medical dissent, the imprisonment of accountability advocates, and a path forward for Germany, her citizens, and their friends.

Prepared with support from and subject to the review and approval of defense attorney Rechtsanwältin Katja Wörmer and Dr. jur. Rechtsanwalt Reiner Füllmich.

This document presents one core demand: that the United States Department of Justice transmit a formal legal inquiry to the German Federal Prosecution requesting the complete documentation of the October 2023 arrest operation against Dr. Reiner Füllmich — including the email in which a German state official described, in writing, a plan to lure a California-licensed attorney to a consulate under false pretenses and have him arrested there. The legal basis for this demand is established and documented: on July 6, 2023, the German prosecution formally invoked the government-to-government legal mechanism by writing to the US Department of Justice seeking cooperation in seizing Dr. Füllmich's California property. That correspondence is described in Dr. Füllmich's publicly available criminal complaint (icic.law). It establishes US standing to make a formal reciprocal inquiry. The full predicate, legal basis, and precise scope of this demand are set out in Part V.

June 7, 2026 — Primary Source Documentation — All Sources Live and Linked Inline

IN BRIEF

Dr. Reiner Füllmich — the German-American attorney who built the Corona Investigative Committee, one of the most significant independent COVID accountability investigations ever conducted — has been in pretrial detention in Germany for more than two and a half years. The case that put him there was twice closed by a senior prosecutor for lack of evidence, then reopened after the colleagues who filed it stood to gain financially. The proceeds of the house sale that would have repaid the loan at the center of the case went to one of those complainants. German state security was documented in the case from the outset. The financial-intelligence analysis of Füllmich was stamped *Staatsschutzrelevanz* — state-security relevance — and transmitted to the domestic intelligence service, the BfV. His defense later placed on the court record that the network behind the complaint is connected, through an organization its lead complainant built, to people who cooperate with the federal police and the German intelligence services. When Füllmich was beyond the reach of German warrants in Mexico, German officials chose not to seek lawful extradition. They lured him to a consulate by deception and had him deported — an operation a German official described in writing, using the words *lure* and *pretext*.

This document is the record behind a single demand, set out in full in Part V. Everything that follows — the standards violated, the international context, and the documented sequence of the case — has been assembled to establish why that demand is warranted and what gives the United States the standing to make it.

⚑ THREE KEY FINDINGS

These three findings are of exceptional evidentiary significance. Each is documented from publicly available primary sources. They are introduced here in order to alert the reader to key evidentiary findings that one can only evaluate in their proper context, which will take some time to present. Key Finding 1 is in Section 2.3; Key Findings 2 and 3 are in Section 3.3.

KEY FINDING 1 — GERMANY'S FEDERAL AND STATE COURTS BOTH RATIFIED A VIOLATION OF THE NUREMBERG CODE — IN THE STATE WHERE NUREMBERG IS LOCATED

Tragically, Germany — and the world — have forgotten the lessons of the 20th Century. Primary evidence provided by the German state itself now demonstrates that since 2021, German state and federal courts have continuously prosecuted physicians for protecting patients from state-mandated medical interventions. Those prosecutions continue today, and also include sympathetic lawyers and patients. Official data from five federal states — covering roughly 30% of the population — record 1,521 investigations and 408 convictions under §278 StGB between 2020 and 2024. Nationwide, the conservative projection approaches 5,000 investigations under that one statute. §278 can, by its text, only be committed by "a physician or other licensed medical person" (*als Arzt oder andere approbierte Medizinalperson*). The convictions are physician convictions; the physicians swept up nationwide number in the thousands. On September 10, 2025, the nation's highest court, the Federal Court of Justice (Bundesgerichtshof, BGH) upheld one such conviction. The Bavarian state supreme court (Bayerisches Oberstes Landesgericht) upheld another — in Munich, in the same state as Nuremberg, where the Doctors' Trial was held, and the Nuremberg Code written.

The statute — §278 StGB, was revised on November 24, 2021, just as the coercive 2G/3G restrictions took hold, and was then used to treat a physician's good-faith clinical judgment as criminal deception. The so-called "deception" was simply that the doctor might have known the patient would use the exemption to re-enter public life from which the unvaccinated had been barred by executive action, without a parliamentary mandate, and after the Bundestag had voted against compulsory vaccination 378–296 on April 7, 2022.

The patient's right to refuse state-mandated medical intervention was reframed by German law as the object of a fraud. One domestic law (§278 StGB) was used to criminalize obedience to another (Musterberufsordnung §2), which requires physicians to follow their conscience and refuse instructions incompatible with their duties. Germany's highest criminal court ratified this self-contradiction as permanent doctrine.

Here is the moral asymmetry at the center of this case. To convict a doctor, the state needed only to show he knew his signature *might* be used to evade a restriction — a near-strict-liability duty to foresee and prevent the misuse of a single certificate. Yet the state held *itself* to no such duty. It coerced millions toward a novel medical product whose safety, efficacy, and duration its own procurement contracts acknowledged in writing were *unknown* — and disclosed none of that uncertainty to the citizens it was pressuring. **The party with the most power, the most knowledge, and the most explicit obligation under a code written on its own soil bore no accountability. The doctor who signed one exemption, and the patient who used it, bore the criminal liability.** That inversion — a burden lifted from the powerful, with liability shifted onto the individuals who refused — is one of the precise wrongs the Nuremberg Code exists to forbid.

I take no pleasure in repeating that these crimes are occurring in the country where the Nuremberg Code was written. Its highest criminal court has now established

that violating it is legal. And the Bavarian court that ratified the violation sits in the state where Nuremberg is located.

And the world is silent. Why?

Because the same international standards were broken across jurisdictions. The coerced uptake of a product whose safety was contractually acknowledged as unknown, and the suppression of information needed for informed consent, were not Germany's failures alone. The problem humanity thought it had solved in 1947 appears to be getting worse instead.

See Part II, Section 2.3 for full documentation.

KEY FINDING 2 — THE MAN WHO FILED THE CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AGAINST FÜLLMICH RECEIVED THE MONEY THAT WOULD HAVE ENDED THE PROSECUTION

Dr. Reiner Füllmich — the German-American attorney who built the most internationally significant COVID accountability investigation — was convicted of misappropriating €700,000 in committee funds. He intended to repay this loan from the sale of his Göttingen house.

When the house sold for approximately €1.3 million, €1,158,000 went to Marcel Templin — one of the three lawyers who had filed the criminal complaint against Füllmich — through a Grundschuld (land charge) registered against the property in first priority position. Templin obtained this money without legal basis, as determined by the Grand Chamber for Economic Crimes at the Göttingen Regional Court in its judgment. He not only refused to return it, but also refused to pass it on to his two law-firm colleagues — co-managing partners Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer — to settle the alleged debt with the Vorschalt-gUG.

Defense counsel Katja Wörmer stated in open court, as reported across multiple independent publications: **"Das Geld, um das es geht, ist vorhanden, nur nicht beim Angeklagten, sondern beim Anzeigeerstatter Templin"** — the money exists, just not with the defendant, but with the complainant Templin, who refuses to return it.

The prosecution froze Füllmich's accounts and seized his assets at arrest. It did not freeze or seize the €1,158,000 in Templin's account. This has been independently reported and was never contested by the prosecution.

Füllmich therefore could not repay the loan. The prosecution proceeded. He was convicted at first instance. He remains in pretrial detention pending his non-final appeal.

The man who filed the complaint received the money that would have ended the case against Füllmich. The prosecution left that money untouched.

See Part III, Section 3.3 for full documentation.

KEY FINDING 3 — THE PROSECUTION'S LEAD COMPLAINANT IS PUBLICLY TIED, THROUGH THE ORGANIZATION HE BUILT, TO THE INTELLIGENCE-CONNECTED NETWORK

Marcel Templin — the lawyer who filed the criminal complaint against Füllmich and received €1,158,000 from the house sale — built the Good Governance Gewerkschaft (GGG) with his legal client Marcel Luthe, a former Berlin parliamentarian who sat on the body overseeing Berlin's domestic intelligence service.

In the trial proceedings, defense attorney Dr. Christof Miseré introduced a leaked security-services dossier on Füllmich and stated on the record — as carried in public trial reporting — that while Templin is not himself a registered V-person (confidential informant), he is connected through the GGG to Luthe, and that Templin operates in an environment of people who cooperate with the BKA and the intelligence services.

The dossier Miseré entered into the proceedings, dated August 24, 2021, recommended a coordinated response by the security authorities to suppress Füllmich's "political viability" — weighing, in its own words, necessary "constructions" and the recruitment of suitable third actors.

The finding does not rest on establishing any individual as an intelligence asset. It rests on what is publicly documented: the man who filed the complaint and took the money built an organization with a parliamentary intelligence-oversight figure, and the defense placed on the open record — supported by a leaked state dossier — that this network operates in direct proximity to German domestic and federal intelligence.

The defense has further represented that the court record contains a document — an official intelligence-service query introduced into the proceedings — that specifically identifies a person connected to the GGG as a registered confidential source (V-person) of the German intelligence services. That document is held in official custody. A formal inquiry of the kind set out in Part V could compel its production and establish the point conclusively, moving it from a representation on the record to documentary proof on the international record.

The lawyer who filed the complaint and received the money is tied, through the organization he built, to the German intelligence-connected world. This was placed on the record in open court by the defense and reported publicly.

See Part III, Section 3.3 for full documentation.

INTRODUCTION — THE SIGNIFICANCE OF REINER FÜLLMICH TO GERMAN AND WORLD HISTORY

Dr. Reiner Füllmich is a German-American attorney who, in July 2020, built the most internationally significant independent investigation of COVID governance failures ever conducted. Over two years (July 2020 to September 2022), the Corona Investigative Committee he co-founded recorded testimony from more than 150 scientists, physicians, whistleblowers, and legal experts across multiple countries. Robert F. Kennedy Jr. appeared as a witness before that committee. The committee's evidentiary record fed directly into the work that brought the German physician prosecutions to international attention.

Füllmich has been detained in Germany since October 2023. He is in pretrial detention: he was convicted at first instance on April 24, 2025 by the Göttingen Regional Court, but that judgment is not final (*nicht rechtskräftig*) — his *Revision* is pending before Germany's Federal Court of Justice (Bundesgerichtshof), and under German law he remains in detention pending that non-final appeal. He was not arrested pursuant to a proper extradition procedure. Germany held a valid national arrest warrant against him dated March 15, 2023 — and later a European Arrest Warrant — but neither instrument has any legal force in Mexico. Lawful arrest in Mexico required either a Mexican warrant or a formal extradition request. Germany obtained neither. Instead he was lured to a German consulate in Mexico under a false pretext and deported from Mexico to Germany under a Mexican migration provision that did not apply to him. He spent six months in solitary confinement. He was not permitted to attend his mother's funeral.

The case against him was filed by two co-founders of his own committee — co-directors who appeared as members during its first year but did almost none of its operational work, and who had stepped back from the committee's working life in August 2021 while remaining its formal co-directors. From that position they filed their criminal complaint on September 2, 2022 — days after Füllmich had sent an email documenting that he was in the process of repaying the loan that formed the basis of the prosecution. The senior prosecutor who had reviewed the evidence and formally closed the case for insufficient evidence in June 2022 was replaced by a junior probationary prosecutor brought in from Hanover, who maintained frequent substantive contact with the complainants throughout the investigation — contact described by multiple independent observers as "absolutely unusual." The complainant who filed the case received €1,158,000 from the property sale that would have repaid that loan. The prosecution froze Füllmich's accounts. It left the complainant's untouched.

This document exists because of a chain of work that connects Füllmich's committee to the ongoing international effort to hold COVID governance failures accountable.

The German physicians and patients who were prosecuted in connection with mask and vaccination exemptions — under §278 StGB, a statute revised with surgical precision just as the coercive 2G/3G restrictions were being implemented — needed someone to document what had happened to them and why it mattered internationally. Tom Lausen, a member of the German Bundestag's Corona study commission, together with the lawyers Sven Lausen and Ivan Künnemann, built the statistical and legal analysis of the criminal prosecution records — drawn from the public prosecutors' offices themselves — that established the scale of those cases in primary-source terms. The investigative work that connected that data to the international legal framework — the Nuremberg Code, the Geneva Conventions, the German Musterberufsordnung — and assembled it into a form that could reach the US government was conducted by the author of this document. That work supported the January 2026 letter from US Health Secretary Robert F. Kennedy Jr. to German Health Minister Nina Warken — the first time a US cabinet officer had formally challenged a NATO ally's domestic judicial conduct on medical freedom grounds and placed that challenge in the international record.

Warken's rebuttal was weak. The facts were strong. The citations to Germany's Federal Court of Justice (the Bundesgerichtshof, BGH) made her denial untenable.

The man whose committee built the underlying evidentiary record that made that letter possible — whose two years of testimony collection (July 2020 to September 2022) established the documented case that COVID governance had violated international medical ethics standards — is in pretrial detention in Bremervörden, Germany. The network that imprisoned him is the same network whose connections to German state security structures are documented in this report. The committee he built is functionally dead. He was not removed from it voluntarily — on September 2, 2022, Füllmich was kept away from a committee session by a false pretext: his co-founder Viviane Fischer told him the show was cancelled because the wife of committee manager Corvin Rabenstein was having her second child — a claim Füllmich's criminal complaint explicitly describes as false. Fischer used the session to launch a public smear campaign against him, together with Wolfgang Wodarg — a former SPD Bundestag member who had helped form the committee — simultaneously with the three complainant lawyers — partners at the Berlin law firm *Hafenanwälte* — filing the criminal complaint against him that would ultimately put him in detention.

This document is prepared to give the full documented record needed to act. The January 2026 letter and subsequent public attention mobilized Europe. This document provides the foundation for what comes next.

Germany's institutional conduct is examined here not as an attack on Germany but as the application of standards Germany itself helped write — in Nuremberg. The United States and the European Union participated in the same international institutional failure. That context is documented in Part II and in full in the appendices. It is not a mitigating factor for Germany. It is the frame that ensures accountability applies to everyone — and that no single country escapes by pointing at another.

This document proceeds *from here* in four movements:

1. The standard violated — the Nuremberg Code, the Declaration of Geneva, the Geneva Conventions, and the German Musterberufsordnung: what they require, why they exist, and why Germany's obligations are more explicit than those of any other state.
2. The international context — the US and EU in summary, Germany in full: Germany did not act alone.
3. The German accountability crisis — the Corona Investigative Committee, its destruction from within, the documented state security operation against Füllmich, his removal from Mexico by deception in place of lawful extradition, and the engineered paralysis of the accountability movement.
4. Strategic recommendations — what the documented record supports, and the broader frame for holding all jurisdictions to the same standard.
5. The formal request — the one specific action the United States Department of Justice can take now: a single formal legal inquiry to Germany, set in the broader frame of holding all jurisdictions — US, EU, and Germany — to the same standard so that no country escapes by pointing at another. The request is set out in full in Part V.

Full documentation on the United States and European Union is in Appendix A and Appendix B.

PART I — THE STANDARD: WHAT THE WORLD AGREED TO AFTER 1945

1.1 The Nuremberg Code

The Nuremberg Code of 1947 was not an abstraction. It was the direct product of *United States v. Karl Brandt et al.* — the Doctors' Trial — in which 23 German physicians were prosecuted for conducting medical experiments on concentration camp prisoners without their consent. The Code established ten binding principles for permissible medical intervention on human beings. Its first principle is absolute:

> *"The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved*

should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion."

Source: BMJ 1996;313(7070):1448. Full text also available at cirp.org and Britannica.

The Code was established by an American tribunal, on German soil, in direct response to crimes committed by German physicians — but its authority is universal. It was the world's answer to what medicine becomes when it serves the state rather than the patient. Every signatory nation, every medical association, every physician who took the oath that followed accepted its terms.

1.2 The Declaration of Geneva

The World Medical Association's Declaration of Geneva (1948, revised most recently in 2017) operationalized the Code's principles into the binding professional oath of the global medical profession. The 2017 revision added an explicit pledge on patient autonomy and strengthened the prohibition on using medical knowledge as an instrument of state power:

"THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF MY PATIENT will be my first consideration."

"I WILL RESPECT the autonomy and dignity of my patient."

"I WILL NOT USE my medical knowledge to violate human rights and civil liberties, even under threat."

Source: WMA Declaration of Geneva, 2017. Also published in African Health Sciences 2017;17(4), NCBI PMC5870282.

1.3 The Geneva Conventions

Additional Protocol I, Article 15 and Additional Protocol II, Article 9 to the Geneva Conventions establish a categorical protection for medical personnel that has been recognized as binding customary international law:

"Civilian medical personnel shall be respected and protected."

"They shall not be compelled to carry out tasks which are not compatible with their humanitarian mission."

Source: OHCHR Additional Protocol I and Additional Protocol II.

Unlike the Nuremberg Code — whose application to population-wide health mandates requires an interpretive step on scope — the Geneva Convention prohibition is categorical and unqualified. It applies to medical personnel. It contains no experimental research qualifier. A physician's humanitarian mission is defined by the Declaration of Geneva: patient welfare and autonomy above all. Compelling physicians, on pain of criminal prosecution, to enforce state health mandates or refrain from issuing clinically warranted exemptions is precisely compelling them to carry out tasks incompatible with their humanitarian mission. There is no interpretive gap to exploit.

1.4 The German Musterberufsordnung — Domestic Law That Mirrors the International Standard

This instrument is the most legally precise of all for the German case, because it is not international law. It is German domestic law.

The Musterberufsordnung für die in Deutschland tätigen Ärztinnen und Ärzte (MBO-Ä) — the Model Professional Code for physicians practicing in Germany — is adopted by the Bundesärztekammer (German Medical Association) and given binding legal force through state chamber statutes in every German federal state. Its most recent version was adopted at the 128. Deutschen Ärztetag on May 9, 2024, in Mainz.

The MBO-Ä opens with the Declaration of Geneva printed in full — described as the "offizielle deutsche Übersetzung der Deklaration von Genf, autorisiert durch den Weltärztebund" — the official German translation authorized by the World Medical Association. Every German physician swears this oath as a condition of professional licensing. It is not aspirational. It is a legal instrument of the German medical guild.

The oath states in binding German domestic law:

"Ich werde, selbst unter Bedrohung, mein medizinisches Wissen nicht zur Verletzung von Menschenrechten und bürgerlichen Freiheiten anwenden."

("I will not use my medical knowledge to violate human rights and civil liberties, even under threat.")

Beyond the oath, §2 of the MBO-Ä — the section on general professional duties — states:

"Ärztinnen und Ärzte üben ihren Beruf nach ihrem Gewissen, den Geboten der ärztlichen Ethik und der Menschlichkeit aus. Sie dürfen keine Grundsätze anerkennen und keine Vorschriften oder Anweisungen beachten, die mit ihren Aufgaben nicht vereinbar sind oder deren Befolgung sie nicht verantworten können."

("Physicians practice their profession according to their conscience, the precepts of medical ethics and humanity. They may not recognize principles or observe regulations or instructions that are incompatible with their duties or whose compliance they cannot be responsible for.")

Source: MBO-Ä, Fassung des Beschlusses des 128. Deutschen Ärztetages vom 9. Mai 2024 in Mainz. Bundesärztekammer. Published in Deutsches Ärzteblatt.

This is binding German law — not an international aspiration — stating explicitly that German physicians may not follow instructions incompatible with their duties. The §278 StGB prosecutions criminalized exactly that refusal. The German state used one domestic law to criminalize compliance with another domestic law that the same state formally recognizes as binding.

That is not a clash between German and international standards. That is the German state contradicting itself — and its highest criminal court ratifying the contradiction.

The four instruments together — a framework with no exit:

The violation operates simultaneously on four independently documented levels:

1. **The Nuremberg Code (1947)** — founding international standard; strong moral and historical resonance, particularly in Germany; its application to population-wide mandates is a strong documented argument rather than settled law, but in the German context its moral authority is non-negotiable
2. **The Geneva Conventions AP I Art. 15 and AP II Art. 9** — categorical, no scope problem, no interpretive step required; medical personnel shall not be compelled to carry out tasks incompatible with their humanitarian mission
3. **The WMA Declaration of Geneva (2017)** — the international physician oath binding all WMA member associations; physicians shall not use medical knowledge to violate human rights even under threat
4. **The German Musterberufsordnung §2 and embedded Declaration of Geneva** — binding German domestic law, adopted May 2024; physicians may not follow instructions incompatible with their duties

Level 4 closes every remaining exit. The German state prosecuted physicians for adhering to the professional code that is itself German domestic law. The courts that convicted them under §278 StGB operate in the same legal system that recognizes §2 MBO-Ä as binding. This is not an international instrument Germany can argue has limited domestic application. It is their own chamber statute — published by the Bundesärztekammer, adopted by every state Ärztekammer, sworn by every licensed physician.

The state used one domestic law to criminalize compliance with another domestic law — then had its highest criminal court ratify the result as doctrine. In Bavaria. Where Nuremberg is.

These four instruments together define the non-negotiable floor of medical ethics and patient rights that the international community — and Germany itself — established after 1945. They were not aspirational. They were binding — on every signatory state, in every jurisdiction, including during declared public health emergencies.

PART II — THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT: GERMANY DID NOT ACT ALONE

The COVID pandemic produced documented institutional failures across every major Western government. Germany is the primary subject of this document — but isolating Germany would repeat a historical pattern that allowed every other actor to escape accountability by pointing at Germany. The international context is established here in summary. Full documentation — operator profiles, financial architecture, institutional networks, and primary sources — is in Appendix A (United States) and Appendix B (European Union).

2.1 The United States — Summary

The United States suppressed COVID origins evidence at the highest levels of its scientific and intelligence institutions while simultaneously building a coercive mandate architecture on a foundation of concealed safety data.

The financial pre-positioning was documented before COVID emerged: the Gates Foundation invested $55 million in BioNTech in August 2019 with a pandemic response clause, then co-founded CEPI, introduced NIH to BioNTech in February 2020, and exited its stake in November 2021 with approximately $260 million profit — largely untaxed through the foundation structure. The same foundation funded the WHO whose pandemic declaration activated the manufacturer's emergency procurement.

Operation Warp Speed was managed not by public health agencies but by the US military, with roughly sixty military officials — including at least four generals — in its leadership. Civilian health agencies were significantly less involved than in any previous national vaccination effort.

Vaccine manufacturers were legally immunised from adverse event liability through the PREP Act. The FDA attempted to suppress the Pfizer 5.3.6 post-marketing report — which documented 1,291 adverse event categories in the first 90 days of deployment — for 75 years. A federal court blocked that suppression. Citizens were mandated under federal employee, military, OSHA, and healthcare worker mandates to take a product whose safety was suppressed, whose origin was actively concealed by intelligence agencies, and whose manufacturers could not be sued for harm.

Origins suppression is documented from sworn congressional testimony: CIA officer James Erdman testified before HSGAC on May 13, 2026 that 6 of 7 technical experts assessed lab leak before management overrode their assessment at 1:53am; that analysts supporting lab leak faced retaliation while managers supporting natural origin were promoted; and that the CIA illegally monitored investigators. Senior NIAID official David Morens was federally indicted April 16, 2026 for conspiracy and destruction of federal records. Adrienne Keen — simultaneously a State Department official and WHO consultant — actively discredited lab leak evidence being presented to Secretary Pompeo before being promoted to direct the NIC's 90-day COVID origins review. She has never testified under oath.

Full US documentation — financial architecture, operator profiles, CFR network, Dark Winter-to-Warp Speed pipeline — is in Appendix A.

2.2 The European Union — Summary

All 27 EU member states signed contracts with Pfizer and Moderna explicitly acknowledging — in the contractual text — that vaccine safety, efficacy, and duration of protection were unknown at the time of signing. They then communicated certainty to their citizens without disclosing that contractual acknowledgment. The EU also built, through CEPI and the WEF, the institutional infrastructure that pre-positioned pandemic vaccine development years before COVID emerged.

The €35 billion Pfizer contract was negotiated by European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen via private SMS with Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla — messages subsequently deleted and declared lost (EU General Court, Case T-252/21). The EPPO criminal investigation is ongoing. Von der Leyen's husband was appointed to a pharmaceutical executive role in September 2020, undisclosed, while she was negotiating the contracts. She and Bourla jointly received the Atlantic Council's Distinguished Leadership Award in November 2021 — while the contracts were being executed and the investigation was building. She was re-elected Commission President in July 2024 during the active criminal investigation.

French President Emmanuel Macron — former Rothschild & Cie banker whose first major deal was the Nestlé-Pfizer $11.8 billion acquisition — was instrumental in installing Von der Leyen at the 2019 European Council. Germany's Angela Merkel co-founded CEPI in 2017 and provided €375 million directly to BioNTech in 2020, creating a direct state financial interest in the vaccine whose uptake the German government then coerced by executive action after parliament explicitly refused to authorise a mandate.

CEPI — co-founded by the Gates Foundation, Wellcome Trust, and the governments of Germany, Norway, Japan, and India — launched at Davos in January 2017 explicitly naming mRNA platforms and "Disease X" as targets. The WEF co-hosted Event 201 in October 2019 — a coronavirus pandemic simulation. WEF CEO Børge Brende resigned in February 2026 after the DOJ Epstein files revealed his documented close ties to Epstein. Schwab himself resigned as WEF Chairman in April 2025 under separate misconduct allegations.

The WHO is the trigger mechanism connecting the US and EU stories — and Germany's. Its single pandemic declaration simultaneously activated: EU vaccine contracts (€35 billion Pfizer); US Operation Warp Speed procurement; CEPI emergency funding; and the $195.84 million World Bank Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility payout. Jeremy Farrar — who organised the February 1, 2020 origins suppression teleconference, took a burner phone on MI5 advice, and admitted the virus "looked like an engineered virus" — is now WHO Chief Scientist. Adrienne Keen simultaneously consulted for the WHO while suppressing lab leak evidence at the US State Department. One institution. One declaration. Every financial instrument triggered simultaneously.

Full EU documentation — contract texts, operator profiles, Rothschild-Macron-VdL chain, CEPI/WEF/Event 201 architecture, WHO trigger mechanism — is in Appendix B.

2.3 Germany — The Primary Subject, Within Its International Context

Germany is not an exceptional case in the sense of acting alone or uniquely. It is a documented instance of the same international institutional failure documented above — with the critical distinction that Germany's obligations under the Nuremberg framework are more explicit than those of any other state. The US suppressed safety information. The EU signed contracts acknowledging unknown risks while mandating uptake. Germany did both of those things, and then went further: it prosecuted the physicians who tried to protect patients from the consequences, and its highest court ratified those prosecutions as doctrine. In Bavaria. Where Nuremberg is.

The specific German violations:

- **Bundestag voted against a vaccine mandate 378–296 on April 7, 2022.** The German parliament explicitly rejected compulsory vaccination
- **The Merkel government then implemented 2G/3G restrictions by executive action** — barring unvaccinated citizens from employment, restaurants, transit, and public life without parliamentary mandate. This is coercion without democratic authorization, implemented after the democratic authorization was explicitly refused
- **Physicians and patients were criminally prosecuted at scale** for issuing or using mask and vaccination exemptions based on clinical judgment — not under fraud statutes as Health Minister Warken claimed in January 2026, but under **§278 StGB** (issuing incorrect health certificates) and §279 (using them). Official data from five federal states (≈30% of the population) document 1,521 investigations and 408 convictions under §278 alone for 2020–2024, implying a conservative nationwide order of magnitude near 5,000 §278 investigations. As documented below, the statute was applied to treat clinical dissent from state health policy as criminal deception — and the 2021

revision of §278 had specifically expanded and sharpened the statute just as the 2G/3G restrictions were being imposed

---

⚠ *THE CRITICAL VIOLATION — FOR THE RECORD*

Germany's highest criminal courts upheld these prosecutions — at both the federal and the Bavarian state level:

- **BGH 5 StR 335/25** — *the Bundesgerichtshof (BGH), Germany's Federal Court of Justice and the country's highest court for criminal matters, 5th Criminal Senate: §278 conviction upheld for mask exemption certificates issued on clinical judgment*
- **BayObLG 206 StRR 76/23** — *the Bayerisches Oberstes Landesgericht (BayObLG), the highest ordinary court of the Free State of Bavaria: §278 conviction upheld on the same basis.* **The BayObLG sits in Munich. Bavaria is the federal state in which the city of Nuremberg is located — the city where the Doctors' Trial was held, where the Code was written, and where the standard being violated here was established.**

Why this is an unambiguous violation of the Nuremberg Code:

The Nuremberg Code Principle 1 prohibits "force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion" in medical decisions. Germany's 2G/3G restrictions — barring unvaccinated citizens from employment, restaurants, transit, and public life — constitute coercion by any legal or plain-language definition. Physicians who issued exemptions were protecting their patients from that coercion, fulfilling their oath under the Declaration of Geneva.

The chain of violation is fourfold and each step compounds the last:

1. *The state coerced a medical decision — violating Nuremberg Principle 1*
2. *Physicians protected patients from that coercion — fulfilling their Hippocratic duty*
3. *The state criminalized that protection under §278 StGB — compounding the violation*
4. **Germany's highest criminal courts — federal and Bavarian — upheld those criminal convictions, ratifying the violation as permanent domestic legal doctrine**

Step 4 is what makes this irreversible in a way that executive overreach is not. Emergency measures can be walked back. A BGH ruling establishing that criminalizing Hippocratic duty is consistent with

German law cannot be quietly reversed. It is now doctrine.

The Nuremberg Code was written in this country, in this city, to prevent exactly this sequence of events. *The Federal Republic of Germany has now established, through its highest criminal courts, that a physician who protects a patient's right to refuse a state-mandated medical intervention is a criminal. That finding — not the emergency measures, not the mandates, not the political decisions — is the documented, judicially ratified violation of the Nuremberg Code. It is primary source. It is on the record. It cannot be denied.*

A note on the statute's precise mechanism — bureaucratic architecture of the violation:

---

§278 StGB formally requires an element of knowing deception — "zur Täuschung im Rechtsverkehr" (for the purpose of deception in legal transactions). The deception element in these prosecutions was not the physician deceiving the patient about their health. The deception the state prosecuted was the physician's awareness that the certificate would be used to circumvent a state restriction — the 2G/3G exclusion from public life. In other words: a physician who issued a good-faith clinical exemption to help a patient exercise their right to refuse coerced vaccination was prosecuted for "deception" because the physician knew the patient would use that exemption to re-enter society.

The patient's right to refuse coercion was reframed by the state as the object of a fraud.

This mechanism was enabled by a revision to §278 StGB passed November 24, 2021 — precisely as the 2G/3G restrictions were being implemented — which expanded the statute's scope and lowered its intent threshold.

And the reach extended past the physicians, to the patients themselves. *Two provisions worked in tandem. §278 targets the issuer — the doctor who writes the certificate, and, by the statute's own terms, only a licensed physician can be its principal offender. §279 targets the user — the patient who presents such a certificate. In addition, German law punishes incitement (§26 StGB): prosecutors took the position that a patient who asked a doctor for an exemption had "incited" the doctor's §278 offense, and could be charged accordingly — provided the patient knew the issuance was unlawful. After a single practice in Leverkusen was raided in 2022 over allegedly thousands of vaccination-exemption certificates, the prosecution opened proceedings not only against the doctor but against the patients. The documented figures bear out the scale on the patient side: alongside the §278 cases, the same five states recorded 2,887 investigations and 966 convictions under §279 — patients prosecuted for producing a mask or vaccination exemption at a shop, a school, on public transit, or when stopped by police.*

Consider what that means against the standard Germany itself wrote. The Nuremberg Code exists to protect the individual's absolute right to refuse a medical intervention they do not consent to. A patient

who obtained a clinical exemption was doing precisely what the Code guarantees: declining a state-pressured medical procedure. Germany prosecuted that person as a criminal — and, through the incitement theory, treated the very act of asking a doctor for protection as a punishable offense. The "fraud" was not financial and the "victim" was not deceived. The only injured party was the state's own coercion program, which the exemption allowed a citizen to escape. A legal framework built to shield people who refuse coerced medicine was turned into an instrument for punishing them for refusing.

And the shotgun was loaded and aimed right before the coercive measures were put in place, before most physicians understood what was even happening.

Source for the prosecution figures: the official responses of five state public prosecutors' offices, compiled and analyzed by Tom Lausen (member of the Bundestag's Corona study commission), Sven Lausen, and Ivan Künnemann, and published with the full underlying correspondence — Doctors of Conscience, "Official Figures"; the complete 12-page January 16, 2026 letter to Secretary Kennedy, with the prosecutors' email responses attached, is at doctors-of-conscience.org. The underlying state-prosecutor responses were originally requested by Welt am Sonntag in October 2024. On the statute itself — that §278's principal offender can only be a licensed physician, and that patients were pursued on an incitement theory under §26 StGB — see the text of §278 StGB and legal commentary at dejure.org.

The standard the state imposed on the doctor — and the standard the state held itself to.

Hold the two halves of this together, because the contrast is the whole point.

To convict a physician under §278, the German state did not need to prove the patient was harmed, deceived, or even examined incorrectly. After the November 2021 revision, it was enough that the doctor knew the exemption *might* be used to step around a state restriction. A signature given in good conscience, to protect a patient from a coerced medical procedure, became a crime on a near-strict-liability theory: you should have foreseen the misuse; that foresight is your guilt. This is one of the most demanding standards of care the criminal law knows — a duty to anticipate and prevent downstream consequences you do not control.

Now apply that same standard to the state itself.

The German government did not sign a mask exemption. It pressed an entire population toward a novel medical product — through 2G/3G rules that excluded the unvaccinated from work, commerce, transit, and public life. And the contracts under which that product was procured, signed by all 27 EU member states including Germany, acknowledged in their own text that the product's safety, efficacy, and duration of protection were *unknown* at the time of signing. The state communicated certainty to its citizens while holding, in writing, an acknowledgment of uncertainty. The information a citizen would have needed to give or withhold genuine informed consent — the very thing the Nuremberg

Code was written to guarantee — was the information the state did not disclose.

So the demand ran one way only. A doctor was held to a duty to foresee and prevent every downstream misuse of a single signature. The government that coerced an entire population toward a product it had formally acknowledged it could not vouch for was held to no duty of disclosure at all — and then prosecuted the doctors and patients who took the precaution the state itself had declined to take. Nuremberg places the burden of securing free and informed consent on the powerful party administering the intervention. Germany reversed that polarity at the level of criminal law: a framework built to protect the individual from the state became an instrument the state turned against the individual.

The strategic importance of keeping this in an international context:

Germany has been isolated before — in ways that allowed other parties to escape accountability by pointing at Germany as the uniquely problematic actor. But the EU contracts were signed by all 27 member states. The WHO declaration that triggered financial instruments held by parties with undisclosed conflicts of interest was not a German decision. The origins suppression operated across US, UK, and allied intelligence services. Germany participated in an international institutional failure. Holding Germany accountable in isolation absolves everyone else and, paradoxically, makes the German case easier to dismiss as anti-German bias rather than universal standard enforcement.

PART III — THE GERMAN ACCOUNTABILITY CRISIS: FÜLLMICH, THE COMMITTEE, AND THE STATE

The international standards documented in Part I were violated simultaneously across the US, EU, and Germany as documented in Part II. The physician prosecutions established that Germany's highest criminal court would ratify violations of the Nuremberg Code as domestic doctrine — in Bavaria, where the Code was written. The man who most systematically documented those violations across two years of international expert testimony is now in pretrial detention in Bremervörden, Germany.

Dr. Reiner Füllmich's Corona Investigative Committee built one of the most comprehensive independent evidentiary records of COVID governance failures assembled anywhere. Robert F. Kennedy Jr. appeared as a witness before it. The committee's work fed directly into the data research of Tom and Sven Lausen, whose findings reached the US government and formed the documented basis of the January 2026 letter to German Health Minister Nina Warken. The committee is now functionally dead. Füllmich is in pretrial detention. His closest collaborator became a cooperating witness for the prosecution. The two co-founders who

had done almost none of the committee's actual work filed the criminal complaint that reopened the case a senior prosecutor had already closed for insufficient evidence.

Part III documents how that happened — in precise, sourced sequence. What the public record establishes. Who the actors were. How the committee's own internal structure was used as the instrument of its destruction. And why the accountability movement built around that work is now paralyzed by divisions engineered by the same network. Key Findings 2 and 3 are fully documented here.

3.1 Who Füllmich Was and What He Built

Dr. Reiner Füllmich is a German-American attorney, licensed in both Germany and California, known before COVID for successful consumer protection litigation against Deutsche Bank and Volkswagen. In July 2020, he co-founded the *Stiftung Corona-Ausschuss* — the Corona Investigative Committee — with three co-founders: **Viviane Fischer** (born Rike Feurstein), a Berlin-based lawyer and economist, formerly an in-house bank lawyer; **Dr. Justus Hoffmann**, a Berlin medical law specialist; and **Antonia Fischer**, also a Berlin medical law specialist — both Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer partners at **Hafenanwälte** — a Berlin medical and criminal law firm — Tempelhofer Damm 228, Berlin.

The committee's stated purpose was to examine the scientific and legal basis of government COVID measures through expert testimony. It was donation-funded and publicly committed to transparency. The entity managing donations was the *Stiftung Corona-Ausschuss Vorschalt gUG (haftungsbeschränkt)* — a nonprofit limited liability company whose founding documents explicitly prohibited personal enrichment of members (§2 Abs. 3 Satzung: *"Die Gesellschafter erhalten keine Zuwendung aus Mitteln der Gesellschaft"*).

The ownership and management structure — documented from the company's own founding documents: The share capital was €500, divided equally: Antonia Fischer 25% (€125), Viviane Fischer 25% (€125), Hoffmann 25% (€125), and Füllmich 25% (€125) — confirmed from the founding articles (Satzung, via 2020news.de). All four were simultaneously appointed as managing directors (*Geschäftsführer*) with power of representation. All work was explicitly to be unpaid. Since 2020, more than three million euros in donations flowed into the company's accounts. The founding articles (§4.2) provided that the shareholder meeting *could* grant individual managing directors exemption from §181 BGB — the self-dealing prohibition — but this required an active shareholder resolution. The prosecution's initial charge rested on the assertion that Füllmich lacked this exemption; when the defense demonstrated a shareholder resolution confirming the exemption had been granted, the court shifted to characterising the loans as "fake" instead. Critically, the company was founded in August 2020 with the intention of converting it into a registered charitable foundation — but that registration never happened. By December 2021 it had ceased to exist as a gUG and could only have functioned as a *GbR* (civil law partnership). *[Sources: Satzung der Stiftung Corona-Ausschuss Vorschalt gUG, via 2020news.de; Viviane Fischer public statement, 2020news.de; manova.news.]*

What the committee actually built: Over two years (July 2020 to September 2022), Füllmich and Viviane Fischer together operated most of the sessions. Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer did little of that work and ceased to participate in 2021. During that time, the committee recorded testimony from more than 150 scientists, physicians, whistleblowers, and legal experts across multiple countries. Robert F. Kennedy Jr. appeared as a witness. The committee built one of the most comprehensive independent evidentiary records of COVID governance failures assembled anywhere. That record fed directly into the data work of Tom and Sven Lausen, whose statistical analysis of the criminal prosecution records reached the US government and became the documented basis of the January 2026 letter to German Health Minister Nina Warken — the letter that placed Germany on the international accountability record for the first time.

What the public record establishes about Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer: Both were present in the committee as members during its first year. They appeared in the weekly Friday sessions — Hoffmann into roughly spring 2021, Antonia Fischer somewhat longer, into the summer — though not in every show, and they did little of the behind-the-scenes operational work. As Viviane Fischer later wrote publicly: *"Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer did not concern themselves at all with the affairs of the committee behind the scenes."* They were visible to the audience as members and formally responsible as co-directors for everything that happened financially, but performed almost none of the organizational work that sustained the committee. They ceased active involvement in the committee's working life in **August 2021** — the expulsion dated to that month in Füllmich's ***Strafanzeige***, the criminal complaint he later filed against the prosecutors and judges in his case (published in full at icic.law, and the single most important primary source behind this report) — while remaining formal co-directors of the UG, the position from which they would themselves file a *Strafanzeige* against Füllmich on September 2, 2022 and, in December 2022, consolidate control of the shell company. Two criminal complaints sit at the center of this story: the one filed *against* Füllmich, which began the prosecution, and the one Füllmich filed in his own defense, which documents how the first came to be. Where this report cites "Füllmich's *Strafanzeige*," it means the latter.

State surveillance began immediately. Four German banks filed suspicious transaction reports on Füllmich between July 2020 and February 2022: M.M. Warburg, Commerzbank, Deutsche Bank, and Deutsche Kreditbank. The FIU (Zentralstelle für Finanztransaktionsuntersuchungen) compiled these into an analysis report dated February 15, 2022, stamped **STAATSSCHUTZRELEVANZ** — state security relevance — and simultaneously transmitted it to the **Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (BfV)**. A separate LKA Niedersachsen routing document dated October 16, 2022, stamped **"Corona-Bezug!"** (Corona connection), explicitly classified the Füllmich financial investigation as politically relevant. These are primary source documents. The state connected Füllmich's financial activity to his COVID-critical work in its own words, in its own files.

Sources: Dr. Füllmich's publicly available criminal complaint — Füllmich, Strafanzeige gegen Richter, Staatsanwälte und Justizakteure, icic.law, August 1, 2025 — and defense counsel Wörmer's publicly reported closing argument. FIU analysis report

February 15, 2022 and LKA Corona-Bezug document October 16, 2022 — as described in the same published complaint. Viviane Fischer public statement, 2020news.de.

3.2 How the Committee Was Destroyed — The Documented Sequence

This is not a story of an external attack. It is the story of how people already inside the committee — connected through a pre-existing network whose relationship to state security structures is documented — were used to transform an internal financial dispute into a criminal prosecution that a senior prosecutor had already closed for insufficient evidence. The sequence matters. Every step is documented.

The financial arrangement — what the public record establishes:

Donations flowed in substantial volume. The prosecution's documented financial allegations center on two transactions. First, Füllmich allegedly directed twenty transfers of €10,000 each from the committee's Commerzbank donation account to an account in his wife Inka Renate Füllmich-Schönbohm's name — funds the prosecution says were consumed privately. Second, on May 27, 2021, Füllmich transferred €500,000 from the committee's GLS account to his own law firm account, labeled "Darlehen" (loan). Additionally, approximately €951,000 was transferred to precious metals dealer ESG Edelmetall-Service GmbH — a decision to hold committee reserves in gold rather than bank accounts.

The defense position, documented in written signed contracts: both Füllmich (€700,000) and Viviane Fischer (€100,000) took personal loans from committee funds, with the explicit agreement that funds were being protected from anticipated state seizure. Both arrangements were recorded in the committee's accounts. Committee accountant **Jens Kuhn** had full knowledge of the record. The committee delivered its work throughout — Reinecke's own June 2022 closing memo acknowledged this.

June 14, 2022 — Reinecke closes the case:

Senior Göttingen prosecutor **Oberstaatsanwältin Reinecke** reviewed the FIU analysis, the bank records, and the committee's activities. She formally closed the case under §170 Abs. 2 StPO — insufficient grounds for fraud charges. Her reasoning, in the primary source closure document: the committee delivered real work; donors were not deceived; paying oneself from donations is not automatically fraud; the evidence established neither *Betrug* (fraud, §263 StGB) nor *Untreue* (breach of trust, §266 StGB). The conclusion was not a close call. It was a considered legal judgment by a senior prosecutor that the evidence did not support criminal charges.

The case was closed. Under normal circumstances it would have stayed closed.

Summer 2022 — the moves that preceded the attack:

The internal tensions were real. Viviane Fischer's own public account acknowledges a serious dispute over financial transparency and the handling of the liquidity reserves. What is documented beyond the dispute itself:

In **August 2022**, Viviane Fischer fired committee accountant **Jens Kuhn** — the person with full documented knowledge of the loan arrangements and their basis. The defense record describes this as a violation of company law. The effect was to remove the person best positioned to establish the legitimate basis of the financial arrangements.

Who was behind the plot to destroy Füllmich?

The documented sequence establishes what happened. What it does not fully establish is who orchestrated it. The criminal complaint was filed by the Hafenanwälte. The public expulsion was executed by Viviane Fischer. The prosecution was carried by John. But none of these actors had the institutional connections, the pre-existing relationships with all parties, and the documented pattern of initiating the committee's key moves that **Wolfgang Wodarg** and **Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab** had.

Both men were present at the formation of the entire network — not just the committee. The trial record from Day 3 establishes — from Hoffmann's own courtroom testimony — that Füllmich, Hoffmann, Antonia Fischer, and Schwab all met and worked together in Transparency International's Justice Working Group. Füllmich's own criminal complaint confirms and deepens this: he describes himself as **head of the Justice Working Group** at TI, states that he knew Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer from that role, and that he brought them into the committee hoping they would — with Schwab's support — be up to the work. He also knew Wodarg from his TI work — it was Wodarg who recommended Viviane Fischer to Füllmich when the committee was forming. Füllmich adds a pointed note in the complaint: TI itself, he now believes, "is corruptly connected to the pharmaceutical industry at the top." The network that would later destroy Füllmich was built, in its essentials, inside Transparency International — years before COVID existed. *[Sources: Füllmich, Strafanzeige, icic.law, August 1, 2025; Jiota trial report Day 3, truthsummit.substack.com.]*

When Wodarg came under attack from Transparency International's board in early 2020 for his COVID skepticism, Schwab immediately wrote a 182-page defense of him — published from his university homepage. The two men were documented allies before the committee existed, during it, and through its destruction.

Wodarg introduced Füllmich to Viviane Fischer when the committee was forming — he was the architect of the founding group. He had known Fischer "for a long time" before COVID, by Fischer's

own account. The Hafenanwälte — Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer — were original committee founders whom Wodarg and Schwab both knew from their shared TI history. When Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer went inactive in August 2021 and were effectively removed from committee involvement, Wodarg and Viviane Fischer remained — while Schwab maintained his connections through Hoffmann from outside.

Then, in August 2022 — one month before the complaint against Füllmich was filed — Füllmich's published criminal complaint documents explicitly that Viviane Fischer contacted the Hafenanwälte **at Wodarg's instigation** — meaning Wodarg initiated the move. This is not inference. It is Füllmich's own documented account in his published criminal complaint. His complaint further states that Fischer's moves in August 2022 — contacting the complainants, providing them with Füllmich's August 26 email confirming the imminent loan repayment, and initiating the coordinated campaign — were made suddenly and at Wodarg's instigation. Füllmich himself acknowledges in his complaint that Wodarg's full role "remains unclear" — but he names him as the initiator of Fischer's moves against him. *[Source: Füllmich, Strafanzeige, icic.law, August 1, 2025.]*

We do not know precisely what passed between them. What is established in Füllmich's published account is that Wodarg instructed Viviane Fischer to meet with the Hafenanwälte in August 2022 — he himself was not necessarily present at that meeting. His intentions are not fully established by the available record. What is established is the pattern: the man who initiated the original group, who held relationships with every key actor, and who had the institutional connections to understand the political stakes — directed the active co-founder to make contact with the complainants one month before they filed the complaint that destroyed the committee he had helped create. Whether that is coincidence or coordination, the documented record does not resolve. But Wodarg's role as the committee's original architect, and his documented direction of that contact immediately before the attack, makes him the figure whose intentions most require examination.

Wodarg is a former SPD Bundestag member, former Council of Europe Health Committee chairman, and former head of Transparency International Germany's Health Working Group — a figure with documented institutional connections in precisely the space where public health policy, parliamentary oversight, and intelligence-adjacent networks intersect.

September 2, 2022 — Laying the Trap and The Peace Offer:

On **August 26, 2022** — seven days before the attack — Füllmich sent an email to Viviane Fischer. It was a peace proposal: he suggested they continue the committee together, with him returning to the United States and participating via Zoom, each pursuing their own parallel projects. The email also documented that he was in the process of repaying the loan. It is now Exhibit 3 in his published criminal complaint. Fischer took that private communication — a proposal for reconciliation from her colleague and mentor — and handed it to the Hafenanwälte, who attached it to their complaint against Füllmich as documentary evidence. Füllmich's complaint states explicitly that the loan was the only available basis for a criminal construction against him, and that its imminent repayment would have permanently closed the prosecution window. The Hafenanwälte's connections to state security structures are documented in full in Section 3.3 below — Antonia Fischer's Staatsschutz Referendariat, Templin's network with Luthe and the GGG, and the defense's on-the-record placement of that network in proximity to German intelligence — which is why Füllmich characterizes the handover of that email as the moment the state security apparatus learned the window was closing. The complaint was filed less than a week later — before the repayment could complete. There was a plan. The plan was to close the prosecution window before Füllmich could repay his way out of it.

September 2, 2022 — The Public Execution and Simultaneous Attack:

The Hafenanwälte filed their criminal complaint — headed **"EILIG! VERDUNKELUNGSGEFAHR! FLUCHTGEFAHR!"** (Urgent! Risk of evidence tampering! Flight risk!) — sent by urgent fax to the Göttingen Staatsanwaltschaft on September 2, 2022. The complaint was filed by:

1. **Dr. Justus Hoffmann** — Hafenanwälte, Tempelhofer Damm 228, Berlin
2. **Antonia Fischer** — Hafenanwälte, same address
3. **Marcel Templin** — Hafenanwälte, same address

Viviane Fischer did not file the complaint. Hoffmann informed her that the complaint had been filed on September 23, 2022 — three weeks after its submission. Whether she knew in advance is not resolved by the documents. But she had handed over the August 26 email before it was filed — the document that became Exhibit 3 in the complaint. The documents do not establish prior knowledge of the prosecution. They do establish prior cooperation.

The Public Execution — September 2, 2022.

On the same day the Hafenanwälte filed their *Strafanzeige* against him, Füllmich did not attend the session that ended his committee. He was not there because he had been told there was no session. According to his own *Strafanzeige*, Fischer called him that day with a reason he had no cause to doubt: the show was cancelled because the wife of committee manager Corvin Rabenstein was having her second child. A domestic detail. Plausible. Human. False — Füllmich's complaint explicitly describes this claim as "contrary to the truth." Whether Rabenstein's wife was pregnant, whether a birth occurred around that time, or whether the detail was invented entirely is not established in the available record. What is established is that Fischer used it as a pretext, and it worked.

Rabenstein was the committee's manager — responsible for the organization, but **not** its managing director (*Geschäftsführer*); had he been a managing director he would have been personally liable, and he was not. According to Füllmich's *Strafanzeige*, Füllmich brought him in — installing "a professional management under the leadership of Corvin Rabenstein," alongside a professional bookkeeper (Jens Kuhn) — to handle the operational side of an organization that was, by then, receiving an enormous volume of donations and correspondence. He was a recipient of Füllmich's internal email explaining the villa-sale and loan-repayment plan, in the same group as Schwab, Wodarg, and Fischer. That is the extent of what Füllmich's complaint establishes about him.

When the committee split in September 2022, Rabenstein did not follow Füllmich into the new committee. He aligned with Viviane Fischer's side, and he cut off Füllmich's IT and committee-internal accounts — so that from September 2, 2022 onward, Füllmich had no access to the committee infrastructure he had built. The man Fischer named in her false pretext that morning was, by the time of the split, on her side of it.

While Füllmich was kept away on this pretext, Fischer — together with Wodarg — used the live session to launch what Füllmich's *Strafanzeige* describes as a public smear and defamation campaign against him, charging on camera that he was responsible for the committee's financial difficulties. The same morning, Fischer had used the birth of manager Corvin Rabenstein's child as the false pretext to keep Füllmich away from this very session. The further, more inflammatory accusation — that Füllmich was responsible for the children of the committee's own staff going hungry — was not made during the September 2 session; Viviane Fischer made it in a separate statement a few weeks later.

There was a partial truth in the accusation. The committee was genuinely in financial difficulty by mid-2022 — though it was not insolvent or bankrupt. But the full picture is this: the financial difficulty was the direct result of protective measures both Fischer and Füllmich had agreed to — moving funds into gold and personal loan arrangements specifically because four German banks had filed suspicious transaction reports on the committee, the FIU had stamped the file STAATSSCHUTZRELEVANZ, and the BfV had been simultaneously notified. The state had been surveilling the committee's finances from the beginning, and the founders had moved funds in rational response to the documented threat of state seizure. Fischer had taken €100,000 under identical arrangements to Füllmich's €700,000. The state created the conditions that produced the financial difficulty. Fischer then weaponized it — attributing sole blame to Füllmich while omitting her own identical loan — as the emotional centerpiece of a public attack designed to destroy his credibility before the criminal complaint landed.

The man who had built the committee, who had appeared before international scientists and lawyers and given two years of his life to the work, was attacked in absentia by the people he had trusted — on a platform he had built — while he sat at home believing there was no session that day. In the weeks that followed, the campaign escalated to the accusation that he had starved the children of the committee's own staff.

Since that day, in Füllmich's own characterisation, Fischer "has been waging a private war against her mentor." *[Source: Füllmich, Strafanzeige, icic.law, August 1, 2025.]*

The Schwab connection — placement, betrayal, and the lure:

Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab placed the Hafenanwälte inside the committee. He was the connective tissue between all three complainants and Füllmich's network — going back to Transparency International. **Hoffmann** was Schwab's doctoral student. **Templin** had been Schwab's student research assistant at FU Berlin, documented from a jointly authored family law teaching document published as "Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab / stud. iur. Marcel Templin" on the FU Berlin law faculty website. Without Schwab, the Hafenanwälte had no presence inside the committee. Without the Hafenanwälte, there was no complaint.

Schwab presented himself as a supporter throughout — appearing nearly 20 times in committee sessions and publishing a 182-page defense of Wolfgang Wodarg from his university homepage. While doing so, he was involved in a severance settlement — an *Abfindungsvergleich* — through which Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer, by then departed members, sought at the end of December 2021 to obtain half of all the committee's donations, then approaching €2 million, as the price of their exit. Füllmich's *Strafanzeige* attributes the drafting of that document to Schwab and characterizes the demand as an attempted extortion (*Erpressungsversuch*), because paying donor funds out in this way would have violated the committee's own statutes, which bound the donations exclusively to its purpose. Füllmich and Viviane Fischer refused, regarding the demand as fraudulent. The refusal did not end the matter — it is the point from which the conflict escalated, ending with the house-sale proceeds going to Templin.

After Füllmich moved to Mexico, the location intelligence that fed the tracking operation came from the Hafenanwälte: the publicly available record attributes to **Justus Hoffmann** a May 22, 2023 email to prosecutor John mapping flight routes near Füllmich's suspected whereabouts and reporting his planned attendance at the Better Way Conference, and documents **Antonia Fischer** forwarding Füllmich's own emails to John. The sham settlement negotiations of early 2023 — negotiations the trial established were never intended to produce a resolution, but to keep Füllmich engaged and draw him toward the trap — were essentially led by **Antonia Fischer**, who forwarded all of the negotiation emails to the public prosecutor's office. **Schwab** was only marginally involved in those negotiations. He may have been informed of everything; the exact details are not established. What the record does establish about Schwab's role in this period is distinct: Schwab was initially supposed to receive a power of attorney from Füllmich to retrieve the committee's gold holdings from Degussa — where they were by then officially stored — together with Viviane Fischer. Schwab then suddenly broke off contact with Füllmich and refused any further assistance. He may have known about the involvement of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution (BfV), or that the apparatus "wanted to lure Füllmich into a trap" — but this is a possibility the record raises, not an established fact.

His connections to the state security network through Templin, Luthe, and the GGG are documented in full in Section 3.3 below.

Reinecke reviews the complaint — and is removed:

The Hafenanwälte complaint went back to **Reinecke** — the same prosecutor who had closed the case three months earlier. Since nothing had changed in the underlying facts since June 14, she ordered resubmission of the file she had set aside, to examine whether any new facts justified opening proceedings. In the course of that review, she appears to have reached the same conclusion — the complaint contained, in Füllmich's characterisation, "blatantly false allegations."

Reinecke was replaced.

She was not replaced for incompetence. She was replaced because she had reviewed the evidence twice and found no case both times — and someone needed a prosecutor who would find one. Her replacement was **Staatsanwalt Simon Philipp John** — described in Füllmich's *Strafanzeige* as a young probationary prosecutor brought in from Hanover specifically for this case. Not a specialist in financial crime. Not a senior fraud prosecutor. A junior brought in from outside the jurisdiction, after the file had been stamped STAATSSCHUTZRELEVANZ and simultaneously transmitted to the BfV from the beginning of the investigation.

Who made the decision to replace Reinecke, what the formal authorization was, and whether John was specifically selected for his inexperience are not established in the available record. What is established is the pattern: an experienced senior prosecutor who twice found insufficient evidence was removed, and replaced by a junior who then proceeded to work in documented close coordination with the very people who had filed the complaint — maintaining contact described by multiple independent observers as "absolutely unusual," not interviewing the complainants as ordered, and pursuing asset seizure in California at their instigation. The state security apparatus had been involved in this file since February 2022. The replacement produced the outcome that apparatus required.

Viviane Fischer's deal — the price of freedom:

Viviane Fischer was herself a named suspect in case 504 Js 35904/22 — facing identical *Untreue* charges for her own €100,000 loan taken under the same arrangements as Füllmich's €700,000. She was represented by her own defense counsel, the former prosecutor **Willanzheimer**, and she became a cooperating witness. The documented price of her freedom:

- **Cooperation with the prosecution:** As a cooperating witness, she was in contact with prosecutor John during the period the prosecution was locating Füllmich in Baja California Sur. The specific Mexico location intelligence — identifying that he was likely near Los Cabos or La Paz — reached the prosecution through the Hafenanwälte channel, with Antonia Fischer as the primary contact; the precise division of who supplied which detail is not fully resolved in the public record
- **California ranch ownership — false information to the prosecution:** Viviane Fischer informed prosecutor John that Füllmich was the owner of a ranch in California. This information was false: the California property was owned by his wife, Inka Renate Füllmich-Schönbohm, not by Füllmich. It was on the basis of this information — provided by Fischer — that John wrote to the US DOJ on July 6, 2023 seeking seizure of the California property. The seizure attempt failed, at least in part because the property was not in Füllmich's name
- **The €95,000 anomaly:** Füllmich's *Strafanzeige* notes that approximately €95,000 was transferred from the committee's donation account to Fischer's own 2020news account — and that this transfer was **never investigated and never explained**. It is documented in his complaint as an unresolved discrepancy
- **Her Berlin Sparkasse account was never cancelled** — unlike every account Füllmich held, which were closed by the banks under suspicious transaction pressure. Her account remained open and untouched throughout

---

The investigation against Viviane Fischer was formally closed by prosecutor John on **April 19, 2023**, on the stated ground that she had repaid in time — a closure the publicly available record shows was accepted without challenge. The same proceedings that resulted in Füllmich's conviction produced a dropped investigation for Fischer. She was not a free agent making independent choices. She was a co-suspect who had been handed a path out — and took it.

The Bath Conference tip — May 2023:

One of the most specific documented instances of Hafenanwälte operational intelligence feeding the prosecution: Hoffmann informed prosecutor John that Füllmich was likely to attend the **"Better Way Conference"** in Bath, UK, June 1-4, 2023, as a speaker. This intelligence triggered the preparation of a **European Arrest Warrant** — submitted urgently to the investigating magistrate on **May 23, 2023**. A co-founder of the committee was monitoring Füllmich's conference schedule and feeding that information to the prosecutor in real time. This is established in the public record.

The documented cooperation between John and the complainants:

As recounted in Dr. Füllmich's publicly available criminal complaint and in public trial reporting, the record shows direct substantive communication between the Hafenanwälte and prosecutor John throughout the investigation:

- **May 11, 2023:** Antonia Fischer's letter to John requesting access to the bank records of **Tobias Weissenborn** — a lawyer and co-accused who had initially held the committee's donation account — directly from the prosecution, rather than through normal discovery channels. Unusual for a complainant
- **June 29, 2023:** Hoffmann's email to John sharing investigative analysis, referencing consultation with Viviane Fischer on what was "usable"
- **July 6, 2023:** John's letter to the US DOJ seeking cooperation for asset seizure of a California ranch — initiated after Viviane Fischer informed John that Füllmich owned the property. The property was in fact owned by his wife, Inka Renate Füllmich-Schönbohm

That last item deserves its own moment. A German junior probationary prosecutor, acting on information provided by Viviane Fischer — who told him that Füllmich owned a ranch in California — formally wrote to the US Department of Justice requesting cooperation in seizing that property. The property was in fact owned by Füllmich's wife, not by Füllmich. This was the basis on which Germany reached into United States territory: intelligence from a cooperating witness, factually false as to ownership, used to trigger a formal government-to-government seizure request against a California-licensed attorney who was living in Mexico, beyond the reach of German warrants, having never been convicted of anything. The California ranch was not seized. Whether the DOJ responded at all is not documented in available records. But the letter exists. A German prosecutor reached into the United States at the direction of someone who had gotten the ownership wrong, to strip Füllmich of assets that were not legally his to strip.

John's frequency of email and telephone contact with the Hafenanwälte was described across multiple independent trial reports as "absolut unüblich" — absolutely unusual. The telephone calls between John and the complainants are not even documented in the case files — itself a violation of the duty to document (*Dokumentationspflicht*). Police investigator **Spörhase** had explicitly ordered John to question the Hafenanwälte and Viviane Fischer as witnesses. John did not do so — as reported in public trial coverage. The prosecutor who was supposed to investigate the complainants was instead working with them.

December 2022 — the management consolidation:

The public expulsion and the criminal complaint on September 2 were the visible instruments of a sequence that completed itself three months later. In **December 2022**, with Füllmich already living in Mexico and Fischer now a cooperating witness, Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer removed Viviane Fischer from management of the company — leaving themselves in sole control of the inactive, unregistered shell. The two co-founders who had done almost none of the committee's operational work — and who had been out of it since August 2021 — now held the company. The first German arrest warrant would not be issued until March 2023.

The Mexico operation — September to October 2023:

By mid-2023 Füllmich was living near Todos Santos in Baja California Sur. The **BKA** (Bundeskriminalamt — Germany's Federal Criminal Police Office, equivalent to the FBI) Mexico City liaison had tracked his movements through immigration records — fed in part by location intelligence from the Hafenanwälte side, which Antonia Fischer maintained as the primary contact with the prosecution.

As recounted in Füllmich's *Strafanzeige*, a BKA liaison officer informed the Göttingen prosecution in writing, in the late-August 2023 exchange CC'd to prosecutor John, that an arrest of the wanted man in Mexico was possible only on the basis of a Mexican national arrest warrant — failing which, formal extradition papers from Germany to Mexico would be required.

The BKA knew the legal requirement. A formal extradition request through proper channels was the required procedure. They chose a different path.

According to Füllmich's *Strafanzeige*, on September 1, 2023, LKA officer Roggatz wrote to prosecutor John that the plan, as it then stood, was to lure Füllmich into the consulate under the pretext that he needed to correct or provide a signature on his passport, and to have the immigration authority arrest him there.

The operative words are the German state's own, as reproduced in the public filing: **locken** (lure) and **Vorwand** (pretext) — a state official describing a deception operation in writing to the prosecuting attorney.

Note the construction: *"es ist geplant"* — **it is planned**. Not "I am planning." Not "we propose." The passive voice is not bureaucratic accident. It means the operation had already been authorized — by someone above Roggatz — and Roggatz was transmitting that authorization to John as operational instruction. Roggatz signs the email. His superiors do not appear in it. The people who authorized a deception operation against a California Bar member on Mexican sovereign territory left no paper trail. Two relatively junior officials — Roggatz and John — put the plan in writing. Their superiors did not.

This is precisely why the DOJ inquiry matters. Germany must either produce the full authorization chain — who planned this, who approved it, at what level of the Interior Ministry or prosecutorial hierarchy — or formally decline to do so. The email establishes that the authorization exists. It does not establish who gave it. That answer is in files Germany has not produced.

The operation was executed. Füllmich was lured to the German consulate in Tijuana on **October 11, 2023** on the false pretext of a passport issue. Mexican immigration authorities — acting under pressure from the German embassy — arrested him. The Mexican deportation order cited Article 144, Fraction I of Mexico's Migration Law, requiring illegal entry or criminal activity in Mexico. Neither applied to Füllmich.

Germany paid for the flights of all three passengers — Füllmich and two Mexican immigration officers. This is documented in Füllmich's *Strafanzeige* and reflected in the BMI file material discussed below.

Both the head of the Tijuana immigration office and German honorary consul **Carlos Enkerlin** subsequently apologized to Füllmich and his wife, stating they had been pressured from Mexico City — meaning the German embassy — and did not know what the matter concerned.

Füllmich was flown to Mexico City, held overnight, then flown to Frankfurt on Lufthansa flight LH 499. He was arrested at Frankfurt Airport on **October 13, 2023**, on the basis of a German national arrest warrant dated **March 15, 2023** — a warrant valid in Germany.

That warrant is the heart of the problem, but not in the way one might assume. A German national arrest warrant — and even the inflated European Arrest Warrant subsequently obtained — has no legal force in Mexico. As Füllmich's own *Strafanzeige* argues, neither the German nor the European warrant was worth anything there. Lawful arrest there required one of exactly two things: a Mexican national warrant, or a formal extradition request from Germany to Mexico. Germany had neither. There was an Interpol Red Notice in circulation — but a Red Notice is not legal authority to arrest; it is only authorization to locate a wanted person. Germany thus held warrants that could not lawfully reach Füllmich where he was, and declined to pursue the one procedure — extradition — that could have. Instead, German officials engineered a consular deception and a baseless deportation, transporting him to German soil where the March 15 warrant *could* be executed. The warrant was real and predated the arrest. What was missing was any lawful means of taking him into custody in Mexico — and rather than obtain it, Germany manufactured a substitute.

This is not a technicality. It goes to the heart of why the operation was conducted the way it was — and why the authorization chain matters so much.

The German government has now confirmed the core of this account in its own words. In April 2026, the Bundesinnenministerium (BMI) released an official letter — dated April 30, 2026, sent by post to journalist and broadcaster Roger Bittel in response to his formal file-access request, produced to answer a written question in the Bundestag. The letter quotes internal BKA correspondence verbatim. It is among the cleanest sources in this entire record: the government's own words, produced through a formal parliamentary accountability process, with no dependence on any non-public material — a point the government itself concedes in the same letter, noting that the events are already documented online through the file access obtained by Füllmich's counsel.

The letter contains two admissions of exceptional significance.

The first confirms that deportation was consciously substituted for extradition. Internal BKA/BMI correspondence reproduced in the letter states that the BKA liaison acted within the framework of a criminal investigation and in close coordination with the Göttingen prosecution as the investigation-leading authority — "even though there was no extradition procedure here but rather a deportation by the Mexican authorities." This is not inference drawn from the Roggatz email or from Füllmich's complaint. It is the apparatus describing its own conduct internally: a criminal-investigation operation, directed by the Göttingen prosecution, that used deportation precisely because there was no extradition.

The second is that the operational record has been destroyed. The BKA informed the BMI on February 13, 2026 that regarding the underlying operation behind the international search for Füllmich, no information remains available — "because the operation has, in the meantime, been deleted in accordance with the applicable data-protection provisions." Answering the Bundestag, the government concedes it destroyed the operational record of the very operation at the center of this matter. Records destruction does not weaken the case for an inquiry — it sharpens it. A government that has erased its own operational file has every incentive to leave the surviving authorization chain unexamined, and only an external inquiry can now compel an accounting of what was not deleted.

The same letter supplies further confirmed detail. The German Embassy informed the BKA liaison that Füllmich had applied for a German passport at the honorary consul in Tijuana, after which the BKA liaison activated the Mexican immigration authority (INM) — the police-side confirmation that the passport application was the trigger and that the BKA itself set the immigration action in motion. On the day of removal, October 12, 2023, an emergency travel document (*Reisedokument als Passersatz*) was issued to enable Füllmich's deportation, while — in the letter's own terms — no request for consular care of the affected person was documented, and the BKA confirms it was never informed of any such wish. The consular network that exists to protect German citizens abroad functioned here only to enable a removal. That detail bears directly on the wrongful-detention dimension and the WGAD submission defense counsel Wörmer filed on March 25, 2025.

The file itself is now identifiable: the matter is held under Aktenzeichen ÖS I 4 52013/67#1, captioned *"Überstellung Reiner Füllmich 2023,"* in the BMI's Referat ÖS I 4 — the department for Interpol, international legal assistance, and international criminal law — with a 20-year retention period. The operation was thus handled not through ordinary criminal enforcement but through the federal ministry's international legal-assistance apparatus.

The matter is now live in the Bundestag. On February 10, 2026, AfD member of the Bundestag Dr. Rainer Rothfuß submitted a written question asking which state organs were involved and why documentation had been withheld from Füllmich's counsel — invoking the Copenhagen Criteria, EU Directive 2012/13/EU on the right to information in criminal proceedings, and Art. 15 GDPR. The government's response declined to address subordinate agencies and cited a narrow data-protection exemption to withhold the operational file. Even a sitting parliamentarian, invoking EU law, received only the residual administrative entry while the operational file was reported deleted. (One internal inconsistency in the government's own account is worth noting in passing: the BKA's file describes the conviction as *Betrug* — fraud — when the actual first-instance conviction was for *Untreue* — breach of trust. The government mischaracterizes the charge in the case it ran.)

Sources for this subsection: the BMI letter of April 30, 2026 and the BKA correspondence it reproduces were published and analyzed by journalist Roger Bittel — Bittel TV, "BMI Akte" update, June 1, 2026; bittel.tv. The same questions — BKA coordination with Mexican authorities, payment for the deportation flights, and the consular-duty omission — have been formally pursued through Germany's official freedom-of-information portal, where the requests and the government's handling of them are publicly logged — FragDenStaat, "Überstellung von Reiner Füllmich aus Mexiko".

Why did Germany choose a deception operation over lawful extradition? The established facts point to a single answer. The facts are these: the loan was the only legal basis for the prosecution; that loan was on the verge of being repaid; Füllmich — a figure of enormous public following with a worldwide donor base — was demonstrably capable of raising the money, which is precisely why the network worked so hard to intercept the repayment through Templin; and formal extradition takes months, during which a Mexican or US court would have examined the case in a neutral forum. From those facts, the motive is not difficult to infer, and the inference is this: **Germany could not afford extradition because extradition would have outlasted its own case.**

This is the heart of it. The two obvious explanations — that extradition was too slow, and that extradition would have exposed the operation — are not alternatives to choose between. They are the same mechanism. The passage of time would simultaneously have collapsed the prosecution (the loan

repaid, the predicate gone) *and* exposed, before a court with no stake in the outcome, that it was collapsing: the Hafenanwälte complaint, the Reinecke closure, the complainants' financial interest in the property sale, the intelligence connection, the documented coordination between the prosecutor and the people who filed the complaint — all of it subject to neutral scrutiny. Lawful process was not merely inconvenient. Lawful process was fatal to the case.

So the charge, stated at full weight, is not that Germany skipped a procedural step. It is that **a NATO government, knowing its case could not survive the time a lawful forum would take, chose to seize a man from a third country through deception rather than allow the legal process to reach its natural — and exculpatory — conclusion.** They did not lure Füllmich to a consulate because extradition was slow in some abstract bureaucratic sense. They did it because, given a little more time, the law would have cleared him. The window was closing; they took the moment; they believed they had gotten away with it. The purpose of this report is to establish that they did not.

This is interpretation, and it is marked as such — the subjective intent of named officials is not something a document can prove. But it is the interpretation the established facts most economically support, and no innocent reading accounts for all of them at once: the closed-and-reopened case, the replaced prosecutor, the intercepted repayment, the acknowledged-but-skipped extradition, the deception described in a state official's own words.

This is why the circumvention of extradition anchors the case for the DOJ inquiry. If the arrest was lawful, Germany produces the authorization chain and the inquiry closes. No problem. But if Germany produces the full documentation — who ordered the luring operation, who approved bypassing extradition, who authorized substituting a Mexican deportation for a procedure Germany's own officials knew was legally required — it establishes on the international record that the prosecution could not have survived the scrutiny a neutral forum would have applied. That is the foundation for a wrongful detention finding, a WGAD opinion, and a bilateral legal crisis with a NATO ally whose Health Secretary has personal knowledge of the case and the man at the center of it.

If Germany refuses to produce the files — that refusal is itself on the record.

And while the legal arguments are still unresolved, the man remains in a cell.

Dr. jur. Reiner Füllmich — Rechtsanwalt, formerly of the California Bar, license number 165532, doctoral degree in law from the Georg-August-Universität Göttingen — was taken to **Justizvollzugsanstalt Rosdorf**. He spent approximately six months in solitary confinement. He was not permitted to attend his mother's funeral during this period. He was subsequently transferred to **JVA Bremervörden**, where he remains.

The trial and verdict:

The trial ran for 54 trial days (*Verhandlungstage*) before the Göttingen Regional Court's economic crimes chamber. Defense counsel Katja Wörmer represented Füllmich throughout; Miseré and Siemund joined the defense later.

When the defense demonstrated that the original accusation — that Füllmich had no authority to take a personal loan without other members' consent — was erroneous, the court shifted to a new accusation: that the loan agreements were forged and merely sham contracts. On the court's characterization, Füllmich was not permitted to spend the loan money on personal purchases; he was required to keep the funds liquid at all times in a separate account, so that he could return them within a few days at any time. Defense lawyer Siemund presented evidence, including images, that Antonia Fischer and Hoffmann were allegedly operating under false online identities conducting harassment campaigns against defense lawyers and supporters. These allegations were formally presented to the court.

On **April 24, 2025**, the court convicted Füllmich of *Untreue* (breach of trust) in 18 counts and sentenced him to **3 years and 9 months** imprisonment. The appeal to the Bundesgerichtshof (BGH), Germany's Federal Court of Justice, is pending. Defense counsel Wörmer filed a UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention submission on **March 25, 2025** — opinion not yet issued.

The documented summary — what the sequence establishes:

The conclusion in primary source terms: Reinecke found no case. Hafenanwälte created one. Viviane Fischer fed it. John prosecuted it. Füllmich went into detention. The committee that was building one of the most comprehensive independent records of COVID governance failures assembled anywhere is now functionally dead.

That is not an allegation. It is what the public record shows.

The committee after Füllmich:

Wodarg continues to participate in sessions under Fischer's foundation — nominally. Session 268, titled "Verdichtung," was originally scheduled for March 27, 2026, postponed to April 3, and eventually ran on that date after Fischer cited engine trouble and other delays. The Telegram channel documents the recurring pattern in Fischer's own words: session after session postponed, with repeated apologies and promises to resume "next week in the usual weekly rhythm." A May 1, 2026 session did not run. The next scheduled session at time of writing is June 12, 2026. Wodarg himself rarely appears. The committee that expelled Füllmich ostensibly to protect its work and integrity is not doing the work.

This is the evidentiary record that the takedown of Füllmich did not serve the movement. Under Füllmich and Fischer together, the committee produced two years of internationally significant testimony from more than 150 experts, built the evidentiary record that reached the US Health Secretary, and became the documented basis of the January 2026 Warken letter — the first formal international challenge to Germany's physician prosecutions. Since Füllmich's removal, none of that has continued. The international reach is gone. The expert testimony has stopped. The evidentiary output that made the committee matter has ceased entirely.

The stated justification for destroying Füllmich was that his financial conduct endangered the committee and its mission. The committee's conduct since his removal proves that argument false. Hoffmann, Antonia Fischer, and Templin — the three Hafenanwälte who did almost none of the committee's actual work, filed the complaint that led to Füllmich's detention. Templin diverted €1,158,000 from the Göttingen property to prevent the repayment that would have ended the prosecution entirely. The mechanism is documented in Füllmich's *Strafanzeige*: the Hafenanwälte located the buyer of Füllmich's Göttingen property and pressured him. The purchase contract specified that the proceeds were to be paid to Füllmich's wife, Inka Renate Füllmich-Schönbohm. Notary **Dr. Kleinjohann** — described in the complaint as "informed about everything in precise detail, but apparently corrupt" — instructed the buyer to redirect the funds at closing.

The purchase contract required payment to Füllmich's wife. The notary diverted it to Templin. The repayment that would have ended the prosecution was thereby prevented.

The notary who redirected the funds has not been charged. Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer have since filed a €4.5 million lawsuit against Viviane Fischer, which she has publicly described as a coordinated effort to destroy her economically. What that litigation signifies — and whether it reflects genuine adversity among the former committee principals — is not established by the available record. *[Source: corona-ausschuss.de Telegram; corona-ausschuss.de.]*

Primary sources (all publicly available): the Roggatz email of September 1, 2023, the BKA acknowledgment of late August 2023, the Mexican deportation order of October 11, 2023, and the Enkerlin statement — all described and quoted in Füllmich, Strafanzeige gegen Richter, Staatsanwälte und Justizakteure, icic.law, August 1, 2025. Füllmich, "Actions Speak Louder Than Words," drreinerfuellmich.substack.com, July 2025. Wörmer closing argument as reported by Laufpass, Fassadenkratzer, rationalgalerie.de, uncutnews.ch, freidenker.org. globalresearch.ca. europereloaded.com.

3.3 The Role of the German Secret Services — Documented Connections and Private Sector Cutouts

The operation against Füllmich did not require the Verfassungsschutz to appear in any document with its own name. What the documented record establishes is something more precise and more damning:

every layer of the operation had documented connections to the state security apparatus. The complainants who filed the case. The lawyer who connected them to the committee. The organization they built together. The parliamentary figure who bridged their private network to institutional oversight of the intelligence services. And the training history of one of the three complainants herself.

This is what a cutout architecture looks like from the outside. Private actors. Deniable relationships. State security connections at every node. No single document showing direction from above — because that document, if it exists, is in files Germany has not produced.

The cutout architecture — Schwab, Templin, Luthe:

Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab is the bridge established in Section 3.2 — the academic who placed Hoffmann and Templin inside the committee and is named in Füllmich's *Strafanzeige* as the originator of the severance settlement (*Abfindungsvergleich*) by which the departed Hafenanwälte sought half the committee's donations. He was only marginally involved in the sham settlement negotiations of early 2023 — which were essentially led by Antonia Fischer — though he may have been informed of them; the exact details are not established. His connections to the state security world run through Templin.

Marcel Templin — Schwab's student, licensed Berlin attorney since 2011 — is the financial beneficiary of the prosecution and the organizational link to the intelligence-connected network. Templin served as Schwab's student and academic research assistant at FU Berlin, documented from a jointly authored family law teaching document published as "Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab / stud. iur. Marcel Templin" on the FU Berlin law faculty website. Through Templin, the Hafenanwälte connect to **Marcel Luthe** and through Luthe to the institutional world of parliamentary Verfassungsschutz oversight. Templin and Luthe built the Good Governance Gewerkschaft together — the organization through which, as the defense placed on the record in the proceedings and as publicly reported, Templin is connected to the intelligence-adjacent network. The basis for this is set out below.

Marcel Luthe — former FDP Berlin Abgeordnetenhaus member, the FDP's internal security spokesman, member of the Innenausschuss (the primary parliamentary oversight body for Berlin's Landesverfassungsschutz), participant in the Breitscheidplatz terrorism inquiry which investigated Verfassungsschutz failures — was Templin's legal client, documented in Tagesspiegel reporting and the martinlejeune.de investigation. Luthe filed an Organklage against Berlin's COVID lockdown ordinance in April 2020 — the same month the committee was forming. He was expelled from the FDP faction in July 2020 — the same month the committee launched. He befriended Antonia Fischer and worked with her on the Berlin election challenge — documented in Fischer's own LinkedIn post, cited in martinlejeune.de. Luthe discussed the Füllmich case with Fischer immediately before her testimony — confirmed in her witness testimony in open court on trial Day 10, April 3, 2024, as reported in truthsummit.substack.com.

In the trial proceedings, defense counsel Miseré addressed the GGG's intelligence proximity on the record, stating — as publicly reported — that Templin is connected through the GGG to Luthe and operates in an environment of people who cooperate with the BKA and the German intelligence services. The full basis, and the leaked state dossier Miseré entered into evidence, are documented in the subsection on Templin below. The point does not depend on identifying any individual as an asset: the shared organizational vehicle of Templin and Luthe is publicly tied, on the court record, to the German intelligence-connected world.

Luthe is the connecting node between the Verfassungsschutz parliamentary oversight world and the Hafenanwälte.

MARCEL TEMPLIN — FINANCIAL BENEFICIARY

The financial mechanism — documented from public court reporting:

Füllmich took a €700,000 loan from committee funds in late 2020 and early 2021, intending to repay it from the sale of his Göttingen house. When the house sold for approximately €1.3 million, €1,158,000 went to Marcel Templin — the man who filed the criminal complaint against Füllmich — through a Grundschuld (land charge) registered against the property in first priority. This was a diversion of the proceeds from the sale of the Göttingen property: the sum with which Füllmich intended to repay the loans he had taken out was obtained by Templin from the sale proceeds **without legal basis — as determined by the Grand Chamber for Economic Crimes at the Göttingen Regional Court in its judgment** — and this ultimately prevented Füllmich from being able to repay the loan amount.

Templin not only refused to return the money he had obtained without legal basis; he also refused to pass it on to his two law-firm colleagues, co-managing partners Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer, and thereby settle the alleged debt with the Vorschalt-gUG.

Wörmer stated in open court, as reported across multiple independent outlets: **"Das Geld, um das es geht, ist vorhanden, nur nicht beim Angeklagten, sondern beim Anzeigeerstatter Templin"** — the money exists, just not with the defendant but with complainant Templin, who refuses to return it.

The Laufpass investigation (January 2024) established: while Füllmich's accounts were frozen and assets seized at arrest, the prosecution did not freeze or seize the €1,158,000 in Templin's account. The notary who handled the house sale testified at trial — as reported in 2020news.de — that a Grundschuld in Templin's favour appeared in first priority on the property. Multiple public trial reports document that prosecutor John exchanged numerous emails with the Hafenanwälte complainants and telephoned them frequently — described as "absolut unüblich" — and that the telephone calls are not even documented in the files, a violation of the duty to document.

Dr. Christof Miseré — defense attorney for Dr. Reiner Füllmich — stated in a BittelTV interview, as reported across multiple public outlets:

> *"Man muss eben bei der Durchführung dann eben sehen, dass — man wegen der Staatsanwältin, die nicht mitgemacht hat — musste man dann wieder ein bisschen umdisponieren. Und dann gab es eben diesen Hausverkauf, und der ist so gehandhabt worden — und das riecht natürlich — dass dieses Geld jetzt weg ist. Man hat zwei Fliegen mit einer Klappe geschlagen. Das Geld hat Dr. Fuellmich dadurch nicht... Und der Corona-Ausschuss kriegt auch kein Geld. Dann haben aber Templin und andere das Geld... und Templin ist eben in einer Umgebung, wo es eben auch Leute tatsächlich gibt, die eben entweder vom BKA oder mit dem BND zusammenarbeiten."*

Translation: "One had to readjust a bit in the execution — because of the prosecutor who didn't go along. And then there was the house sale, and it was handled in a way that — naturally it smells — so that the money is now gone. Two birds with one stone. Dr. Füllmich doesn't get the money. And the Corona Ausschuss also gets no money. And then Templin and others have the money that was actually intended by Reiner Füllmich to repay his loan. And Templin operates in an environment where there are actually people who work with the BKA or the BND."

The "prosecutor who didn't go along" is Reinecke. The "house sale" is the Göttingen property diversion to Templin's account. Neither Füllmich nor the Corona Ausschuss could access the money. One operation. Two targets neutralized.

Sources for this subsection: Wörmer's open-court statement and the "absolut unüblich" trial reporting — rationalgalerie.de, freidenker.org, manova.news, radio qfm. Notary testimony: 2020news.de. Asset-seizure asymmetry: Laufpass. Miseré BittelTV interview: rationalgalerie.de, nrhz.de, fassadenkratzer.de.

⚑ KEY FINDING 2 — DOCUMENTED HERE

The man who filed the criminal complaint against Füllmich received €1,158,000 from the sale of the house that would have repaid the loan underlying the prosecution. The prosecution froze Füllmich's assets at arrest. It left Templin's account untouched. Defense counsel Wörmer stated this in open court. It has been independently reported across multiple publications and was never contested by the prosecution. **The complainant holds the money. The defendant is in pretrial detention.**

The Good Governance Gewerkschaft — the documented organizational link between Templin and Luthe:

Templin and Luthe built the Good Governance Gewerkschaft (GGG), founded February 2022, with Luthe as chairman and Templin as legal advisor — documented in 1bis19 magazine and martinlejeune.de. The GGG address — Tempelhofer Damm 228, Berlin — is Templin's law firm address, as documented by martinlejeune.de.

This is the same address as the Hafenanwälte law firm — Tempelhofer Damm 228, Berlin — the firm that filed the criminal complaint against Füllmich. The law firm that filed the complaint and the union connecting Templin to parliamentary intelligence oversight are not merely run by the same person. They occupy the same address. Two organizationally separate vehicles — one a law firm, one a union recruiting among police officers and Interior Ministry employees — operating from a single location. This is the classic cutout structure: functional separation on paper, no actual separation in person or place. The complaint comes from the law firm. The intelligence-adjacent network runs through the union. The address is the same. The GGG recruited among serving Berlin police officers, criminal investigation personnel, and Interior Ministry employees, documented in Wikipedia's Marcel Luthe entry.

In the trial proceedings, defense attorney Dr. Christof Miseré introduced a leaked security-services dossier on Füllmich (dated August 24, 2021) and addressed Templin's intelligence proximity on the record. As carried in public trial reporting, Miseré stated that Templin is not himself a registered V-person, but is connected through the Good Governance Gewerkschaft to Luthe — and that Templin operates in an environment of people who cooperate with the BKA and the German intelligence services. The dossier itself, whose full text has been published, recommended a coordinated response by the security authorities to suppress Füllmich's "political viability," weighing necessary "constructions" and the recruitment of suitable third actors. The decisive point is established without identifying any individual as an asset: the man who filed the complaint and received the house-sale proceeds built the GGG with a parliamentary intelligence-oversight figure, and the defense placed that network's proximity to German intelligence on the open record, supported by a leaked state dossier entered into evidence.

Sources: Miseré's statements in the trial proceedings and the leaked authorities dossier (August 24, 2021) entered into evidence, as reported in public trial coverage — freidenker.org, uncutnews.ch, nrhz.de; full dossier text published at fassadenkratzer.de. GGG co-founding and structure: 1bis19 magazine, martinlejeune.de, Wikipedia on Luthe's GGG chairmanship. Day 9 proceedings: wirfuerduesseldorf.de.

⚑ *KEY FINDING 3 — THE CONVERGENCE POINT*

Templin — the financial beneficiary of the prosecution — built the GGG with Luthe, who sat on the body overseeing Berlin's domestic intelligence service. Defense counsel Miseré placed that connection on the court record, supported by a leaked state dossier, and stated publicly that Templin operates in an environment of people who cooperate with the BKA and the intelligence services. The finding requires establishing no one as an asset. But there is a document in official custody that would establish it conclusively.

The defense has represented that the court record holds an official intelligence-service query, entered into the proceedings, that identifies a person connected to the GGG as a registered confidential source of the German intelligence services. *That document sits in official custody. A formal US inquiry of the kind set out in Part V can compel its production — moving this finding from a representation on the record to documentary proof the Secretary's request would place beyond dispute.*

ANTONIA FISCHER — THE STAATSSCHUTZ REFERENDARIAT

Antonia Fischer's professional biography, published on her own firm's website (hafenanwaelte.de — now offline after the April 24, 2025 conviction) and documented in the martinlejeune.de investigation, contained the following entry in her Referendariat career history:

"Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin (Staatsschutz)"

This is her own published professional disclosure. She rotated through the Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin's

Staatsschutz division — the state security prosecution unit handling terrorism, high treason, and crimes against the state — during her legal training. Both domains hosting her biography went offline after the conviction. The detail is preserved in the martinlejeune.de documentation.

One of the three complainants who filed the case against Füllmich trained specifically in the state security division of the prosecution service during her legal training — a documented detail from her own published professional disclosure.

On April 3, 2024 — Day 10 of the trial — Antonia Fischer was questioned as a witness, in open court, about the settlement negotiations that had taken place with Füllmich. (German law does not require witnesses to be sworn in order for their testimony to carry legal weight; a witness who gives false testimony without an oath remains criminally liable under §153 StGB for *uneidliche Falschaussage*.) She confirmed that those negotiations were never intended to produce a resolution. Asked about their purpose, she stated in open court:

> *"Wir wollten keine wirkliche Einigung, wir wollten Dich in den Knast bringen."*

"We wanted no real settlement. We wanted to put you in jail."

This was stated by one of the three complainants, as a witness, in open court, on the record.

The settlement negotiations she referred to were the ongoing communications between Füllmich and the Hafenanwälte that ran in parallel with — and after — the criminal complaint had already been filed on September 2, 2022. Ostensibly aimed at resolving the financial dispute over the loans and committee funds, they were the mechanism through which Füllmich believed he might negotiate his way out of the prosecution. He was trying to reach terms. He was, as his August 26 peace proposal to Viviane Fischer demonstrated, still attempting reconciliation even as the complaint was being prepared. The negotiations continued after the complaint landed — keeping him engaged, keeping him communicating, keeping him providing information — while the prosecution machinery advanced and the house sale was engineered to prevent the repayment that would have ended everything.

By Antonia Fischer's own admission in her courtroom testimony, they were a deliberate deception from the beginning. There was never any intention to settle. The negotiations existed to put him in jail. *[Source: truthsummit.substack.com, Day 10 Part 3; fassadenkratzer.de.]*

Sources: martinlejeune.de investigation citing Fischer's published CV. Füllmich Strafanzeige, icic.law, August 1, 2025.

THE MISERÉ INTELLIGENCE DOSSIER

To understand why Miseré matters — and why an intelligence file on him beginning in 2018 is significant — requires a brief account of who he was before the Füllmich trial.

Dr. Christof W. Miseré is a Cologne criminal defense attorney with over 25 years of practice, specializing in *Wirtschaftsstrafrecht* (white-collar criminal law), *Steuerstrafrecht* (tax criminal law), and compliance — a member of *Anwälte für Aufklärung* (Lawyers for Enlightenment). His publicly documented connection to Füllmich predates COVID by years. By 2018, Füllmich was running one of the most aggressive consumer protection litigation campaigns in modern German legal history: criminal complaints against Deutsche Bank executives for *Prozessbetrug* — court fraud — filed across thirteen parallel investigations in Oldenburg, Hamm, and Frankfurt, alleging systematic manipulation of contract-closing dates in at least 4,000 cases of overpriced *Schrottimmobilien* (junk real estate), with potential repayment liability of approximately €100,000 per affected person. By May 2018, Füllmich and co-counsel had expanded the allegations to claim Deutsche Bank was actively concealing its own insolvency — serious enough that the *Staatsanwaltschaft* had opened formal criminal proceedings. The litigation had attracted the attention of institutional creditors including Blackrock and Pimco. Miseré, as Füllmich's white-collar criminal specialist, was the attorney working that flank. *[Source: taz, "Betrugsvorwurf gegen die Deutsche Bank," March 16, 2017 and "Trickserei bei der Deutschen Bank," May 19, 2018.]*

This is the context for the intelligence file opened on Miseré in 2018 — with Füllmich named as his only client. It was not opened because of COVID accountability work, which did not exist yet. It was opened during active criminal litigation against one of Germany's most systemically important financial institutions, at the moment that litigation had grown large enough to threaten both criminal prosecution of bank executives and the bank's own financial stability. The German security apparatus takes an interest in people who threaten systemically important institutions. That interest, documented from 2018, preceded the committee by two years.

When Füllmich launched the Corona Investigative Committee in July 2020, he was not starting from scratch. He was applying a proven litigation strategy — criminal complaints, parallel proceedings, cross-jurisdictional pressure — to a much larger institutional target. The people who had been watching him since 2018 understood exactly what that meant. The 2021 state dossier Miseré would later enter into proceedings ordered not merely surveillance but the active construction of a criminal pretext — finding or fabricating a basis for prosecution before Füllmich's committee work could produce the same kind of legal traction his Deutsche Bank campaign had.

The dossier Miseré introduced came from a whistleblower, he stated, "from the circle around a German intelligence service." The most coherent reading of why such a source chose Miseré — rather than a journalist, a parliamentarian, or defense counsel Wörmer — is that Miseré was already a known quantity inside the apparatus. He had been in their file since 2018. Some people inside a security service distinguish between genuine threats to the state and legitimate accountability advocates operating through legal channels; some draw that line differently than their superiors. On this reading, someone who had watched Füllmich and Miseré for years concluded that the 2021 targeting order was the wrong use of the apparatus — and ensured the evidence reached the one person positioned to use it in a courtroom. This is inference, not established fact. But it is the inference the documented record most economically supports: a file opened in 2018 on a lawyer fighting Deutsche Bank, still active in 2024, with the subject's only named client now facing a prosecution the file's own contents describe as constructed. Its content was read publicly and reported across rationalgalerie.de and nrhz.de. Key language:

"Gegebenenfalls notwendige Konstruktionen sind abzuwägen und geeignete Drittakteure anzuwerben."

Any necessary **constructions** should be weighed and suitable **third-party actors recruited** — a document recommending fabrication of a criminal case using recruited external operatives.

The BKA stated in response to a court inquiry that the dossier's style did not match standard BKA language — but made no substantive denial of its contents, as reported in fassadenkratzer.de. Wörmer in her closing argument stated that a defense attorney who introduces such a document does not do so lightly, as reported in fassadenkratzer.de.

The BKA's stylistic denial is not an exoneration — it is precisely what one would expect from a cutout architecture. A document originating from or through a private-sector network like the GGG — the organization Templin and Luthe built together, which recruited among Interior Ministry and police personnel, and whose connection to the intelligence world the defense placed on the court record — would not carry BKA linguistic fingerprints by design. The dossier's language is consistent with the kind of intelligence-adjacent private network this section documents. The BKA saying "this doesn't sound like us" is entirely compatible with it having been produced through the cutout structure assembled around Templin, Luthe, and the GGG.

After presenting the dossier, Miseré received threats including photographs of his daughter — a specific intimidation technique conveying surveillance of his family. A journalist attending sessions reported the presiding judge had received "a visit from two persons" at the same time. Reported in kettner-edelmetalle.de and uncutnews.ch. At the July 10, 2024 session, Miseré revealed intelligence services had maintained a file on him since 2018 with Füllmich as his only named client — uncutnews.ch.

Sources: rationalgalerie.de, nrhz.de, fassadenkratzer.de, kettner-edelmetalle.de, uncutnews.ch.

The network — Wodarg, Viviane Fischer, Schwab, Templin, Antonia Fischer, Hoffmann — had pre-existing documented relationships before the committee was publicly conceived. They were all inside the room before the committee existed. The state security apparatus was documented as interested in the outcome from February 2022 — stamping the file STAATSSCHUTZRELEVANZ, notifying the BfV, classifying the financial investigation as politically relevant.

What followed is documented: the senior prosecutor who found no case twice was replaced. The private email in which Füllmich offered Fischer reconciliation — proposing to continue the committee together, documenting that the loan was about to be repaid — was handed by Fischer to the Hafenanwälte and attached to the criminal complaint as Exhibit 3. The settlement negotiations were admitted in court testimony to have been a deliberate deception from the beginning. The house sale proceeds went to the complainant. The defense attorney received photographs of his daughter. The judge received a visit. Intelligence services had maintained a file on Miseré since 2018 with Füllmich as his only named client.

The outcome the state security apparatus required was delivered. The man who built one of the most comprehensive independent records of COVID governance failures assembled anywhere is in JVA Bremervörden. The committee is dead. The money is gone. And the German government never faced extradition proceedings — because the "luring operation" conducted under false pretenses on Mexican soil, followed by deportation under a Mexican migration provision that did not apply to him, delivered Füllmich onto German soil where the existing national warrant could be executed, keeping the entire operation away from any neutral forum that might have examined it.

operation away from any neutral forum that might have examined it.

3.4 The Paralysis Between the Two Camps

The German COVID accountability movement is struggling to balance and support two detained figures and their support networks — their division serves no one except the institutional apparatus that prosecuted both.

On one side: Füllmich and his team, working from documented evidence of a state security operation against a political dissident.

On the other: Johanna Findeisen-Juskowiak and her support network — including her lawyer Martin Schwab — the same Schwab who is a documented antagonist of Füllmich.

People who move between both camps sometimes receive contradictory information about the structural conflict between the cases. Articles arguing Füllmich is guilty circulate through the same channels as advocacy for Findeisen-Juskowiak. As a result, the two cases are sometimes kept separate from each other and the prosecuted doctors cases because connecting them surfaces the Schwab problem described below.

This fragmentation is the optimal outcome for the institutions that must be held accountable in all these cases. A unified front presenting the documented international evidence is dangerous. Two or three separated camps managing competing credibility crises are containable.

3.5 The Q Contamination — How Unfalsifiable Belief Destroys Documentable Accountability

The German COVID accountability and Querdenker movement contains a substantial embedded belief in QAnon-derived narratives — including the existence of underground military bases (DUMBs) containing tortured children, elite pedophile networks operating through tunnels, and related apocalyptic frameworks. This is not a fringe element of the support network around the Findeisen-Juskowiak case. It is documented as central to the Patriotische Union's own internal operations: the group paid Swiss operatives €139,000 to locate evidence of underground tunnels, and Findeisen-Juskowiak herself was the contact person for those payments.

Martin Schwab's opening statement — demanding the prosecution search for the tunnels — was not experienced by the activist community as a tactical catastrophe. It was experienced as courage. The Alexander Wallasch platform, one of the primary alternative German media outlets covering the dissident movement sympathetically, published the opening statement in full and without criticism, framing the mainstream media's dismissal of the tunnel allegations as evidence of guilt: the defensive reflexes of institutions with something to hide.

Nobody in the movement said publicly: this opening statement just made international human rights advocacy for Johanna impossible.

That absence is the telling thing. It means the Q belief system is embedded deeply enough that the community cannot perceive the tactical damage it does to their own cause — and that there is no internal corrective mechanism, no voice within the support network able to say plainly: the tunnels argument is destroying the pre-trial detention case.

What Q contamination does to a serious accountability movement:

It is unfalsifiable. Every piece of counter-evidence becomes proof of the cover-up; every institution that denies the tunnels is thereby implicated in protecting them. The belief is self-sealing — and because unfalsifiable claims cannot be told apart from falsifiable ones by people inside the system, the documented findings (the BGH rulings, the EU contracts, the publicly reported Miseré dossier) get no special standing.

It is calibrated to discredit. The moment a serious human rights submission is associated with underground child-trafficking tunnels, the submission is over — not because the underlying facts are wrong, but because the association lets every institution being held accountable point at the tunnels instead of the evidence.

It absorbs investigative capacity. People who should be documenting §278 prosecutions, BGH rulings, and EU contract admissions are instead researching DUMBs. Rigorous primary-source work is slow; Q requires only belief and a search engine.

It marginalizes the rigorous. Those "awake enough" to believe the tunnels sit above those who aren't, so questioning the Q material reads as insufficient awakening — pushing the people most capable of careful evidentiary work to the margins of their own movement.

It is self-maintaining. It needs no handler and no upkeep: the community sustains it internally, which is what makes it so durable against correction. People working with the documented record find themselves having to disabuse movement members of Q narratives repeatedly.

The Schwab tunnel argument at the OLG Frankfurt opening lands differently in this context. Whether Schwab genuinely believes the tunnels — and has simply failed to understand that believing them publicly destroys his client's case — or whether the opening statement was a deliberate act of sabotage dressed as zealous advocacy, the effect is identical: Findeisen-Juskowiak's legitimate pre-trial detention grievance is permanently associated with QAnon child trafficking claims in every mainstream record of the trial.

The movement cannot see this because the Q framework prevents it from seeing it. That is either a remarkable coincidence or it is the point.

The operational implication:

Any serious international accountability work touching the German COVID dissident movement must explicitly separate itself from Q-derived narratives — not as a concession to the institutions being held accountable, but as a precondition for the documented evidence to be taken seriously by the United States of America, international human rights bodies, legal associations, and diplomatic channels that have the power to act on it.

This document contains no tunnel allegations. Every claim in it is sourced to a primary document, a sworn testimony, a published court ruling, or a contractual text. That is the only operational posture that keeps the documented work separable from the contamination that has been — whether deliberately or organically — embedded in the movement it emerged from.

PART IV — STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 The Core Principle

The documented facts are more powerful than any of the people carrying them. The BGH rulings exist regardless of Füllmich's financial irregularities. The EU contracts exist regardless of Findeisen-Juskowiak's group's beliefs. The Morens indictment stands regardless of any activist network's credibility. The Nuremberg Code applies to all jurisdictions equally.

The strategic imperative: separate the documented evidence from the credibility wars of the people associated with it, and present it through channels that cannot be contaminated by those wars.

The January 2026 Kennedy letter to Warken demonstrated this principle working correctly. It cited documented physician prosecutions without requiring association with any German activist network. Warken's rebuttal was weak because the facts were strong — and the BGH citations made her denial untenable in front of the international record. Take a look:

- **BGH 5 StR 335/25** (Federal Court of Justice, September 10, 2025) — Germany's highest criminal court upholding §278 StGB convictions of physicians for issuing exemptions based on clinical judgment, four months before the Warken letter was sent
- **BayObLG 206 StRR 76/23** (Bayerisches Oberstes Landesgericht, Bavaria's state supreme court) — the same ruling at state level, sitting in Munich, Bavaria — the state where Nuremberg is located

Warken could not credibly deny that Germany was prosecuting physicians for clinical judgment. Her own Federal Court of Justice had ratified it in writing.

4.2 The Evidentiary Arsenal — What Already Exists

The following documented instruments can travel independently of any network association:

- **BGH 5 StR 335/25 and BayObLG 206 StRR 76/23** — establishing that §278 StGB was applied to criminalize clinical judgment, directly contradicting Warken's fraud claim
- **The Nuremberg Code, Declaration of Geneva (2017), Geneva Conventions AP I Art. 15 and AP II Art. 9, and German Musterberufsordnung §2** — four independently binding instruments establishing the standards violated, assembled as a single reference document
- **The German Musterberufsordnung (MBO-Ä), 128. Deutschen Ärztetag, May 2024** — binding German domestic law establishing that physicians may not follow instructions incompatible with their duties; the state criminalized compliance with its own professional code
- **The EU vaccine contracts (Pfizer and Moderna, unredacted)** — establishing that safety, efficacy, and duration of protection were unknown when citizens were coerced into uptake. Pfizer contract via Good Law Project. Moderna contract via Good Law Project
- **The EMA letter, October 18, 2023** — confirming vaccines were not authorised for transmission prevention
- **The Füllmich case publicly documented record** — Füllmich's *Strafanzeige* (icic.law), Wörmer's publicly reported closing argument, and the Miseré dossier content as publicly reported, together with Miseré's on-the-record statements tying Templin through the GGG to the intelligence-connected network — establishing the documented pattern of a state security operation against a political dissident
- **The Lausen criminal prosecution data analysis** — official German prosecution figures from five state prosecutors' offices, establishing that 1,521 investigations and 408 convictions under §278 StGB were brought in states covering only ~30% of the German population — and that eleven states representing roughly 70% of the population have declined to disclose their figures, implying a conservative nationwide order of magnitude near 5,000 §278 investigations. Published and fully documented at doctors-of-conscience.org/official-figures
- **The Morens indictment** — establishing US origins suppression at the highest institutional level
- **The Pfizer 5.3.6 report and FDA 75-year suppression attempt** — establishing US safety data concealment

None of these require Füllmich to be innocent. None require Findeisen-Juskowiak to be innocent. None require resolution of any internal credibility war. They are primary source documents.

4.3 The Füllmich Case — Two Tracks

Track one: the BGH appeal. The appeal to Germany's Federal Court of Justice (BGH) is Wörmer's domain. International pressure through the UN WGAD submission is an appropriate parallel instrument. Amplification through the US Health Secretary's network, the European Parliament Patriots for Europe group, and international legal associations applies legitimate pressure without contaminating the legal process.

Track two: the documented state security operation. Füllmich's *Strafanzeige* of August 1, 2025 names specific actors and describes specific conduct. Wörmer's publicly reported closing argument characterizes the prosecution as politically motivated and documents the irregular sequence of events. The Miseré dossier — whose content is publicly reported — describes an operation to construct criminal proceedings using recruited third-party actors. Miseré further stated on the record, as publicly reported, that Templin is connected through the GGG to Luthe and operates in proximity to people who cooperate with the BKA and the intelligence services. The Schwab-Hafenanwälte network documentation — Antonia Fischer's Staatsschutz Referendariat from her own published CV, the Templin-Luthe-Fischer connections from public sources — is supporting evidence that the criminal complaint was filed by actors with documented state security connections. This evidence belongs in the WGAD submission and in international human rights forums.

4.4 The Overarching Frame That Breaks the Paralysis

The fragmentation dissolves when both German cases — and the broader suppression of COVID accountability — are placed within their actual context: an international institutional failure in which Germany participated, in which the US participated, in which the EU participated, and which violated the same international standards simultaneously across all jurisdictions.

In that frame:

- Füllmich's detention is state security apparatus neutralizing a political dissident who documented institutional crimes — one instance of a documented international pattern of accountability suppression
- The German physician prosecutions are criminal enforcement of coercive health mandates — one instance of the same coercive pattern documented across the EU and US

- Füllmich, Findeisen-Juskowiak, and Dr. Bianca Witzschel — a German physician in pretrial detention — are all detained without final verdict: a lawyer who documented institutional crimes, a doctor caught in the prosecution of medical conscience, and a woman swept up in the broader crackdown on COVID dissent. Three cases, one pattern.

The people caught in the operational crossfire — Katja Wörmer, Johanna Findeisen-Juskowiak, the prosecuted physicians, their lawyers, and supporting journalists — are not necessarily enemies of each other. They have been placed in a structure that can however make them appear to be, because the structure benefits from their division. That said, it is worth noting that they are enormously vulnerable to famous and high-profile lawyers like Martin Schwab, whose background, connections, and actions are questionable given the evidentiary record documented in this report. The strategy is to name that structure explicitly, refuse the isolation of any single country or cause, and offer a frame large enough to contain all of them — while remaining clear-eyed about who in that frame has documented reasons to be questioned.

PART V — THE FORMAL REQUEST

The Core Demand: A US DOJ Inquiry to Germany

The January 2026 Warken letter was the first time a US cabinet officer formally challenged a NATO ally's domestic judicial conduct on medical freedom grounds and placed that challenge in the international record. This document carries that opening forward with one demand, grounded not in diplomatic preference but in documented legal reciprocity.

The predicate:

On July 6, 2023, German prosecutor Simon Philipp John — a junior probationary prosecutor brought from Hanover to handle a case a senior prosecutor had already closed — wrote to the United States Department of Justice seeking cooperation in seizing a California property he believed belonged to Dr. Reiner Füllmich. The information that Füllmich owned the ranch had been provided to John by Viviane Fischer. It was false: the property was owned by Füllmich's wife, Inka Renate Füllmich-Schönbohm. Füllmich had not been convicted. He had not been extradited. He was living in Mexico, beyond the reach of German warrants. Germany nonetheless reached into the sovereign territory of the United States, through the formal government-to-government legal mechanism, to strip a man of property that was not even in his name — before he had been tried.

As described in Dr. Füllmich's publicly available criminal complaint (icic.law).

The documented crime that warrants the inquiry:

As set out in Dr. Füllmich's publicly available criminal complaint, on September 1, 2023, LKA Niedersachsen officer Lars Roggatz wrote to prosecutor John that the plan, as it then stood, was to lure Füllmich into the consulate under the pretext that he needed to correct or provide a signature on his passport, and to have the immigration authority arrest him there.

The German state's own words, as reproduced in that public filing: **lure**. **Pretext**. A documented deception operation, described in writing by a state official to the prosecuting attorney, executed against a man who:

- Had built the Corona Investigative Committee before which Robert F. Kennedy Jr. testified as a witness
- Was a licensed member of the California Bar
- Had never been extradited through lawful procedure — a procedure the BKA had explicitly acknowledged was legally required in its own August 24, 2023 email
- Was the subject of a federal ministry file — Aktenzeichen ÖS I 4 52013/67#1, held in the BMI's Referat ÖS I 4 (Interpol / international legal assistance / Völkerstrafrecht) — captioned *"Überstellung Reiner Füllmich 2023,"* with a 20-year retention period; the operation was not handled through ordinary criminal enforcement channels but through Germany's international legal-assistance apparatus at the federal ministry level
- Was arrested at Frankfurt Airport on October 13, 2023 on a German national arrest warrant dated March 15, 2023 — a warrant valid in Germany but, like the European Arrest Warrant later obtained, without any legal force in Mexico. Lawful arrest in Mexico required a Mexican warrant or a formal extradition request. Germany had neither, and an Interpol Red Notice is not legal authority to arrest. Rather than pursue the extradition its own officials acknowledged was required, Germany used a consular deception and a baseless deportation to deliver him onto German soil, where the existing warrant could be executed.
- Spent approximately six months in solitary confinement
- Was denied permission to attend his mother's funeral
- Was convicted on April 24, 2025 in proceedings his defense counsel has characterized as politically motivated — with the appeal pending before Germany's Federal Court of Justice

The circumvention of extradition is not a technicality. It reveals why the luring operation was a necessity rather than a shortcut — and why the authorization chain is the central ask. The full analysis is in Section 3.2. The conclusion it reaches: Germany knew this prosecution could not survive proper legal procedure in a neutral forum. Germany held a valid national warrant, but no lawful means to execute it in Mexico short of an extradition request that would have put the prosecution itself before a court Germany could not control. The luring operation kept it away from any such forum.

Germany must therefore either produce the full authorization chain — who ordered the operation, who approved bypassing extradition, who authorized substituting a baseless Mexican deportation for the extradition procedure its own officials acknowledged was required — or formally refuse. That demand is sharpened by the government's own admission, in its April 30, 2026 letter answering the Bundestag, that the operational file has been deleted: a state that has destroyed its own record of the operation cannot be left to be the sole arbiter of what that operation was. If Germany produces the surviving files, the documentation of the arrest operation enters the international legal record through a formal US government request. If Germany refuses, that refusal is itself on the record. Either answer serves the accountability record. Either answer is a consequence of the mechanism Germany opened on July 6, 2023, when it wrote to the US Department of Justice.

Germany Opened This Door. The United States Can Walk Through It.

Germany wrote to the US Department of Justice on July 6, 2023. A German prosecutor — acting on information from Viviane Fischer, who had incorrectly told him that Füllmich owned a California ranch that was in fact owned by Füllmich's wife — formally invoked the government-to-government legal mechanism to seek the seizure of that property from a California-licensed attorney who had not been convicted, extradited, or tried. Germany used the mechanism first. Having invoked it, Germany is poorly placed to object when the same mechanism is applied in reverse.

The record assembled in this report — the consular luring operation described in a state official's own words, the circumvention of extradition for a man Germany's warrants could not lawfully reach in Mexico, the BKA's acknowledgment that a Mexican warrant or formal extradition was legally required, Germany's payment for the flights, the replacement of the prosecutor who twice found no case — rests entirely on publicly available primary sources. It requires no new legislation. It requires no new authority. It requires only the will to use a channel Germany itself opened.

The mirror of that letter is now available. The US DOJ — which has indicted David Morens, debarred EcoHealth, and operates under an administration whose Health Secretary testified before Füllmich's committee — can issue a formal legal inquiry to the German prosecution: *What was the legal basis for the operation described in your own officer's email of September 1, 2023? Provide the full Roggatz/John communication chain. Provide the basis on which a Mexican deportation was used as a substitute for extradition. Provide the documentation of Germany's payment for the flights. Account for the deletion of the operational file your own government has confirmed, and produce whatever authorization records*

survive that deletion. That is not a diplomatic protest. It is a formal government-to-government legal inquiry — the same mechanism John used in reverse, now applied with the full weight of the US government behind it. Germany would have to respond or formally refuse. Either answer serves the accountability record.

One demand, one mechanism. The United States Department of Justice should transmit a formal legal inquiry to the Generalstaatsanwaltschaft of Lower Saxony and the Federal Ministry of Justice of the Federal Republic of Germany, requesting production of the following:

---

1. **The complete Roggatz/John communication chain** surrounding the email of September 1, 2023, in which a German state official described in writing a planned consular luring operation against a California-licensed attorney — including all prior and subsequent communications between LKA officer Lars Roggatz and prosecutor Simon Philipp John concerning the location and apprehension of Dr. Füllmich

2. **The legal basis and authorizing documentation** for the substitution of a Mexican immigration deportation order — citing Article 144, Fraction I of Mexico's Migration Law, which requires illegal entry or criminal activity in Mexico, neither of which applied to Dr. Füllmich — in place of a formal extradition procedure that Germany's own BKA had explicitly acknowledged in writing was legally required

3. **Documentation of the financial arrangements** for the flights of all three passengers — Dr. Füllmich and two Mexican immigration officers accompanying him — establishing the source and authorization of Germany's payment, and confirming that this was a German-initiated operation rather than a Mexican immigration enforcement action

4. **The formal authorization and basis** for the replacement of Oberstaatsanwältin Reinecke — who had reviewed the evidence and formally closed the case for insufficient grounds under §170 Abs. 2 StPO on June 14, 2022 — with Staatsanwalt Simon Philipp John, a junior probationary prosecutor brought from Hanover, including any documentation of the decision-making process and officials involved in that replacement

---

This is not a request for extradition. It is not a diplomatic protest. It is not a human rights

appeal.

It is a formal government-to-government legal inquiry — the same mechanism the German prosecution used when it wrote to the US DOJ on July 6, 2023 — now applied in reverse, with the full institutional weight of the United States behind it.

Why it has standing, and why it works either way:

The United States is not a bystander here. The subject of the operation was a member of the California Bar; Germany formally sought US DOJ cooperation in his prosecution before he was arrested or tried; the arrest was carried out through a deception a German official put in writing; and the man arrested had testified before a committee whose work reached the US Health Secretary and formed the documented basis of a formal cabinet-level challenge to German judicial conduct. Germany made the United States a party to this on July 6, 2023. This inquiry completes the circuit.

And it cannot fail to advance the record. Germany must either respond or formally decline. If it responds, the documentation of the arrest operation enters the international legal record through a formal US government request — a different evidentiary order than a defense filing or a press account. If it declines, the refusal is itself on the record: a NATO ally declining to account for a documented deception operation against a California Bar member, after seeking US help to seize that same man's American property. Either answer is a consequence of the door Germany opened.

CONCLUSION

The documented record supports the following conclusions. Where claims rest on primary source fact, they are stated as established. Where they involve legal characterization or analytical inference, they are stated as documented arguments.

Established from primary sources:

---

1. The Geneva Conventions Additional Protocols, the WMA Declaration of Geneva, and the German Musterberufsordnung §2 establish binding obligations — internationally and under German domestic law — that physicians shall not be compelled to carry out tasks incompatible with their humanitarian mission and shall not follow instructions incompatible with their duties.

2. Germany has criminally prosecuted physicians and patients under §278 StGB for issuing and using mask and vaccination exemptions based on clinical judgment — 1,521 investigations and 408 convictions documented across five states covering ~30% of the population, with a conservative nationwide projection near 5,000 §278 investigations. Germany's highest criminal courts upheld these convictions at both the federal and the Bavarian state level — the Federal Court of Justice (BGH 5 StR 335/25) and the Bavarian state supreme court (BayObLG 206 StRR 76/23). The BayObLG sits in Munich, Bavaria — the state where Nuremberg is located.

3. The §278 StGB statute was revised November 24, 2021 — precisely as 2G/3G restrictions were being implemented — expanding its scope and lowering its intent threshold. The state used one domestic law to criminalize compliance with another domestic law it formally recognizes as binding. Germany's highest criminal court ratified this contradiction as doctrine.

4. The United States suppressed COVID origins information at the highest institutional levels — documented from sworn congressional testimony (Erdman, HSGAC May 2026) and federal indictment (Morens, Case 8:26-cr-00138-PX). Safety data was concealed — documented from the Pfizer 5.3.6 report and the FDA's 75-year suppression attempt.

5. All 27 EU member states signed contracts acknowledging unknown vaccine safety, efficacy, and duration of protection — then communicated certainty to citizens without disclosing that contractual acknowledgment — established from unredacted primary source contracts. Pfizer contract. Moderna contract.

6. Füllmich was subjected to a documented state security operation established from publicly available primary sources — principally his own published criminal complaint (icic.law) and public trial reporting: the FIU analysis was stamped STAATSSCHUTZRELEVANZ and simultaneously transmitted to the BfV; the LKA classified the financial investigation as "Corona-Bezug!" (politically relevant); the senior prosecutor who found no case (Reinecke, June 14, 2022) was replaced after the Hafenanwälte filed their complaint roughly three months later, on September 2, 2022; LKA officer Roggatz described a consular luring operation in writing to the prosecuting attorney on September 1, 2023; the BKA acknowledged that proper extradition was legally required and chose not to pursue it; Füllmich was deported from Mexico under a false legal basis and arrested at Frankfurt Airport on October 13, 2023 on a German national warrant dated March 15, 2023 — valid in Germany but without force in Mexico, where lawful arrest required a Mexican warrant or formal extradition that Germany never obtained. The network that filed the criminal complaint has documented connections to state security structures: Antonia Fischer's Staatsschutz Referendariat from her own published CV; Templin's student-supervisor relationship with Schwab; and Templin's connection, through the GGG he built with Luthe, to the intelligence-adjacent network — placed on the court record by defense counsel Miseré and reported publicly, alongside the leaked state dossier Miseré entered into evidence. Named complainant Templin, who filed the case, also received €1,158,000 from the property sale that would have repaid the loan underlying the prosecution — while Füllmich's accounts were frozen and Templin's were left untouched.

Documented legal arguments — strong, supported by primary sources, involving legal characterization:

---

1. The physician prosecutions constitute violations of the Geneva Conventions AP I Art. 15 and AP II Art. 9 — compelling medical personnel to carry out tasks incompatible with their humanitarian mission. This is the strongest international legal argument because the text maps directly onto the

mission. This is the strongest international legal argument because the text maps directly onto the documented conduct with no interpretive gap.

2. The same prosecutions constitute a violation of the German Musterberufsordnung §2 — the state criminalizing compliance with its own binding professional code. This is the most domestically precise argument, requiring no appeal to international law.

3. The Nuremberg Code — established in Nuremberg, in Bavaria, to prevent exactly this structure — provides the historical and moral frame within which all of the above must be understood. Its strict legal application to population-wide mandates is a contested argument; its moral authority in this context is not.

4. The fragmentation between the Füllmich and Findeisen-Juskowiak accountability camps serves the institutional apparatus being held accountable and no one else. The path forward requires separating documented facts from credibility wars, holding all jurisdictions to the same standard simultaneously, and refusing to allow the isolation of any single country to absolve the others.

The instruments created to prevent the recurrence of medical crimes — international and domestic — were violated by the German state through bureaucratic architecture. One law was revised with surgical precision to criminalize compliance with another law the same state recognizes as binding. Germany's own Federal Court of Justice ratified the result. The High Court of the German State where Nuremberg is located did the same.

The implications are simply unavoidable. The world must know the facts so the public can weigh the evidence in open dialogue. An international legal inquiry will push over the first dominoes of accountability for which the world still clamors because the damage has been so severe.

The United States suppressed the information that would have enabled informed consent. The European Union signed contracts acknowledging unknown safety while mandating uptake. Germany prosecuted the physicians who tried to protect patients from the consequences.

The people who documented all of this are in detention, facing prosecution, or divided against each other by networks whose connections to state security are now on the record.

The January 2026 letter to Minister Warken established that a US cabinet official can formally challenge a NATO ally's domestic judicial conduct on medical freedom grounds and place that challenge in the international record. Warken's rebuttal was weak because the facts behind the letter were strong. The same approach — applied to the BGH rulings, the physician prosecutions, the Füllmich WGAD submission, and the documented state security operation — is available now.

The documented record assembled here was prepared in support of that effort and is presented for public review and action.

The core demand — for the record:

In July 2023, a German prosecutor wrote to the United States Department of Justice asking it to help seize the California property of a California-licensed attorney who had not been convicted, extradited, or tried. The attorney was Dr. Reiner Füllmich. He was subsequently lured to a consulate under false pretenses and deported under a Mexican migration provision that did not apply to him — because Germany's national arrest warrant, valid in Germany, had no force in Mexico, and Germany declined to pursue the extradition that lawful arrest there required. A German state official described this operation in writing — using the words *lure* and *pretext* — as set out in Dr. Füllmich's publicly available criminal complaint.

Robert F. Kennedy Jr. appeared before his committee. That committee's work reached the US government. Füllmich is in pretrial detention in Bremervörden.

Germany reached into the United States first. The law permits — and the record demands — that the United States answer.

All primary source documents referenced are publicly available. Prepared with the support and subject to the approval of defense attorney Rechtsanwältin Katja Wörmer. Current as of June 7, 2026.

APPENDIX A — THE UNITED STATES: FULL DOCUMENTATION

This appendix contains the full US documentation summarised in Section 2.1. It is provided for researchers, legal advocates, and policy analysts who require the complete evidentiary record.

A.1 The Pre-Positioning — Financial Architecture Built Before COVID

Bill Gates / Gates Foundation invested **$55 million in BioNTech in August 2019** — four months before COVID emerged publicly. The investment agreement (SEC filing EX-10.37) included a pandemic response clause, a worldwide perpetual royalty-free license to BioNTech's mRNA platform, and a Pfizer carve-out ensuring that when BioNTech partnered with Pfizer, the Foundation's access rights would not apply to the resulting vaccine. A Gates Foundation official introduced NIH's Barney

Graham to BioNTech CEO Ugur Sahin by email on February 2, 2020 — 13 days after the first US case, over a month before the WHO pandemic declaration. The Foundation subsequently co-founded CEPI, committed $1.75 billion to COVID response, and exited most of its BioNTech stake at approximately $300/share in November 2021. **Profit: approximately $260 million. Return: approximately 15x. Largely untaxed through the foundation structure.** The same foundation that held equity in the vaccine manufacturer also funded the WHO whose pandemic declaration activated that manufacturer's emergency procurement. *[Sources: SEC EX-10.37 — Gates/BioNTech Letter Agreement; ICAN FOIA litigation against NIH — Gates email February 2, 2020; BioNTech SEC filings; Gates Foundation tax records.]*

A.2 Operation Warp Speed — The Militarised Distribution System

Operation Warp Speed was not managed primarily by public health agencies. It was managed by the US military, the Department of Homeland Security, and the National Security Agency. A government chart obtained by *STAT News* in September 2020 showed roughly sixty military officials — including at least four generals — in Warp Speed leadership who had never worked in healthcare. A senior federal health official counted more than a hundred officials in Desert Storm fatigues walking through HHS headquarters. Civilian health agencies were significantly less involved than in any previous national vaccination effort and were reportedly barred from attending some Warp Speed meetings. *[Source: STAT News, September 28, 2020.]*

A.3 Palantir's Tiberius — The Surveillance-Allocation Engine

At the operational centre of Warp Speed sat **Palantir Technologies** — a company founded with CIA venture capital through In-Q-Tel as its sole initial funder, built to privatise the Pentagon's Total Information Awareness mass surveillance programme after Congress defunded it in 2003. Palantir was awarded the contract to manage COVID-19 vaccine allocation through a product called **Tiberius**, which determined how many doses each state received and where every allocated dose went. It collected data from government agencies, states, pharmaceutical firms, and distribution companies, running on Palantir's Gotham software — described by Palantir's own product manager as "honed over a decade of partnership with military, civil, and intelligence communities."

Palantir simultaneously held an active $92 million contract with Immigration and Customs Enforcement to build surveillance systems used in immigration raids — meaning the same company allocating experimental vaccines to priority populations was also building systems to identify and detain those populations. US senators raised "serious privacy concerns" in July 2020, noting that "neither HHS nor Palantir has publicly detailed what it plans to do with this protected health information."

Palantir now holds a $90 million blanket purchase agreement across all HHS agencies and a $443 million CDC contract. **Clark Minor** — 13-year Palantir veteran and its global head of cloud — became HHS Chief Information Officer on the day Kennedy was sworn in, while holding $1-5 million in

Palantir stock. The federal CIO is also a decade-long Palantir veteran. *[Sources: STAT News September 2020; FedScoop on HHS Palantir BPA; FedScoop on the CDC contract; Nextgov on Clark Minor appointment; CNBC November 2020; Senate letter to HHS July 2020.]*

A.4 The PREP Act — Liability Transferred to Citizens

The US government issued Emergency Use Authorizations under a legal architecture that effectively removed manufacturer liability for adverse events. The PREP Act provided near-complete immunity to vaccine manufacturers, with compensation routed through the Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program — so restrictive it compensated fewer than 1% of claims filed. Citizens were coerced into uptake through federal employee, military, OSHA, and healthcare worker mandates while simultaneously denied the ability to sue manufacturers for harm. The liability transfer was not disclosed in public communications promoting vaccine uptake. *[Source: PREP Act declarations, Federal Register; CICP claims data, HHS.]*

A.5 The Mandate Apparatus — Coercion Without Full Disclosure

The United States implemented vaccine mandates for federal employees, military personnel, healthcare workers, and — through OSHA — businesses with more than 100 employees, while simultaneously suppressing safety data material to informed consent. The Pfizer 5.3.6 post-marketing report documented 1,291 adverse event categories in the first 90 days; the FDA sought 75-year suppression, blocked by federal court. The DEFUSE proposal — EcoHealth Alliance's proposed furin cleavage site insertion at WIV, rejected by DARPA — was suppressed while the natural origin narrative was enforced. Citizens were mandated to take a product whose safety was concealed, whose origin was suppressed by intelligence agencies, and whose manufacturers were legally immunised.

A.6 The CFR Network — Institutional Capture Documented

The Council on Foreign Relations had, simultaneously on its board during the pandemic: **David Rubenstein** (Carlyle co-founder, Moderna Director, CFR Chairman); **Sylvia Burwell** (Gates Foundation first COO, then HHS Secretary — co-chair of the CFR task force "Improving Pandemic Preparedness: Lessons From COVID-19"); **Margaret Hamburg** (former FDA Commissioner, now on mRNA pharmaceutical boards); and **Vincent Mai** (AEA Investors CEO — AEA founded to invest for the Rockefeller, Mellon, and Harriman families — and Cranemere founder, whose CEO Jeff Zients ran Biden's vaccine rollout). Rubenstein personally moderated Zients's April 2024 Economic Club interview on vaccine procurement without disclosing his Moderna board seat. *[Sources: CFR biography Rubenstein; CFR biography Burwell; Fox News Digital, January 24, 2023.]*

A.7 The Dark Winter Lineage — Biowarfare Simulation to Warp Speed

The institutional lineage of Warp Speed runs through the post-9/11 biosecurity infrastructure built by the designers of **Dark Winter** — the June 2001 bioterrorism simulation that modelled a smallpox attack three months before 9/11 and preceded the anthrax attacks. Dark Winter's designers — including Robert Kadlec — subsequently built BARDA, the CBRN defence framework, and ultimately Warp Speed's industrial architecture. Kadlec has now been confirmed as Trump's Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Deterrence, Chemical, and Biological Defense Policy — running US WMD policy having never been examined in any COVID accountability proceeding. *[Sources: Max Jones, Unlimited Hangout, February 18, 2026; Whitney Webb, Unlimited Hangout, April 2020.]*

A.8 Financial Returns — Documented

Gates Foundation: approximately 15x return on BioNTech equity ($260 million profit). Pfizer: approximately $100 billion revenues from COVID vaccines 2021–2022. Moderna: approximately $18 billion in 2022 alone — having been pre-revenue in 2019. EcoHealth Alliance: formally debarred by HHS January 2025. *[Sources: Gates Foundation tax disclosures; Pfizer and Moderna SEC filings; HHS debarment notice January 2025.]*

A.9 Origins Suppression — Key Operators

Anthony Fauci — NIAID Director 1984–2022. Funded EcoHealth/WIV gain-of-function research via NIH. Intervened in IC analysis February 2020 and June 2021 (Erdman sworn testimony). Prompted the Proximal Origin paper. Identified as "Senior NIAID Official 1" in the Morens indictment (Case 8:26-cr-00138-PX). Perjury statute expired May 11, 2026 without charges. **Pardoned January 19, 2025 by autopen — final approval by Jeff Zients at 10:31pm.** Under *Burdick v. United States* (1915), pardon acceptance carries imputation of guilt and removes Fifth Amendment protection on covered matters.

David Morens — Federally indicted April 16, 2026. Case 8:26-cr-00138-PX. Five counts including conspiracy against the United States. Maximum exposure: 20 years per §1519 count. Quoted in the indictment: "I can either send stuff to Tony on his private gmail." Peter Daszak identified as Co-Conspirator 1. Daszak used the word "cabal" in his own emails. Debarred by HHS January 2025.

Adrienne Keen — Simultaneously State Department official and WHO consultant. Actively discredited lab leak evidence presented to Secretary Pompeo (DiNanno, on the record to Sky News). Promoted to Director for Global Health Security at NIC — the position responsible for the Biden-ordered 90-day COVID origins review. That review excluded the FBI, cut 90% of NCMI's submitted material, and was contradicted by the CIA's own top scientist to Biden in real time. Subsequently moved to CDC's Center for Forecasting and Outbreak Analytics, March 2022. **Has never testified under oath.**

Avril Haines — DNI 2021–2025. FBI excluded from Biden briefing; 90% of NCMI material cut from NIC COVID origins product; COVID Origin Act declassification not seriously executed. Attended Event 201, October 2019. **Was a Palantir consultant immediately prior to joining the Biden**

campaign. Has never testified under oath.

Jeff Zients — White House COVID Coordinator January 2021–April 2022; Chief of Staff February 2023–January 2025. Personally approved Fauci's autopen pardon at 10:31pm January 19, 2025. Previously CEO of Cranemere Group — founded by Vincent Mai, whose prior firm AEA Investors was founded to invest for the Rockefeller, Mellon, and Harriman families.

Ron Klain — White House Chief of Staff January 2021–February 2023. Controlled West Wing access and presidential briefing preparation. Prior role as Obama's Ebola czar gave deep knowledge of pandemic intelligence structures. **Has never testified under oath.**

Robert Kadlec — HHS ASPR, Trump administration first term. Dark Winter designer. Now confirmed as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Deterrence, Chemical, and Biological Defense Policy, December 2025. **Has never been examined in any public COVID accountability proceeding.**

Andrew Makridis — WCPMC Founder; CIA COO 2018–2022. A 2023 whistleblower told Congress he "played a central role" in the conclusion that CIA was unable to determine COVID's origin. Now Senior Fellow at Yale Jackson School. **Has never testified under oath.**

Maura Burns — WCPMC Associate Director; CIA COO 2022–2025; Acting DCI January 2025. Now retired. **Has never testified under oath.**

Amy McAuliffe — WCPMC Associate Director 2021–2022; former NIC Chair; Director of the President's Daily Brief. Now Visiting Distinguished Professor at Notre Dame. **Has never testified under oath.**

Melanie Walker — Deputy Director, Gates Foundation; Director, World Bank President's Delivery Unit (throughout entire PEF design period); adviser to Bill Gates at bgC3; WEF Young Global Leader; **David Rockefeller Fellow**. Authored the March 2017 bgC3 pandemic simulation deliverable Gates forwarded to Epstein (DOJ production EFTA02381427). Used Epstein as communications channel to Gates. Has never been examined in any COVID accountability proceeding.

David Rubenstein — CFR Chairman; Carlyle co-founder; **Moderna Director**. Moderated Zients's vaccine procurement interview without disclosing Moderna board seat. Has never been examined in any COVID accountability proceeding.

Jim Yong Kim — 12th World Bank President. Designed the Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility. Resigned January 2019 — five months before PEF bonds matured, fifteen months before COVID — to join Global Infrastructure Partners, subsequently acquired by BlackRock for $12.5 billion in October 2024. **Has never been examined in any COVID accountability proceeding.**

This appendix contains the full EU documentation summarised in Section 2.2. It is provided for researchers, legal advocates, and policy analysts who require the complete evidentiary record.

B.1 The Contractual Record — Primary Sources

- **Moderna Advance Purchase Agreement, Annex VI:** safety, efficacy, and durability of protection explicitly stated as unknown — signed by all 27 EU member states. Unredacted APA via Good Law Project
- **Pfizer Advance Purchase Agreement, Order Form Article 4:** unknown long-term effects acknowledged by signature. Unredacted contract — Good Law Project
- **Moderna APA Article II.5.4:** indemnity clause interpreted "broadly in favour" of Moderna — member states assumed liability for a product whose safety they had contractually acknowledged was unknown
- **EMA letter to MEP Marcel de Graaff, October 18, 2023:** confirmed vaccines were not authorised for prevention of transmission. Letter published by de Graaff's office
- **Comirnaty occupational safety datasheet (OEB5 classification):** classified as a biohazardous agent requiring full containment protocols in occupational settings — not disclosed to citizens during the coercion period

B.2 Key EU Operators

Ursula von der Leyen — Negotiated the €35 billion Pfizer contract by private SMS with Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla. Messages deleted and declared lost — EU General Court, Case T-252/21. EPPO criminal investigation ongoing. Husband Heiko appointed Medical Director of Orgenesis in September 2020 — undisclosed. Jointly received Atlantic Council Distinguished Leadership Award with Bourla, November 2021, while contracts were being executed. Re-elected Commission President July 2024 — during active criminal investigation. **Has never testified under oath.**

Emmanuel Macron — Former Rothschild & Cie banker 2008–2012. First major deal: Nestlé-Pfizer $11.8 billion acquisition. Financial Times named him a Rothschild protégé in 2018. Installed Von der Leyen at 2019 European Council. WEF Young Global Leader. Led France's most aggressive vaccine mandate policies. **The Macron-VdL-Rothschild-Pfizer chain is a documented institutional circuit, not an inference.**

Angela Merkel — Co-founded CEPI in 2017; provided €375 million directly to BioNTech in 2020 — creating direct German state financial interest in the vaccine whose uptake Germany then coerced by

executive action after parliament refused to authorise a mandate. Blocked TRIPS waiver 2021. Stasi file sealed by court order, March 2026. Former BfV president Maaßen's public statement — "operative of MfS/KGB?" — is on the public record. *[Sources: CEPI founding documentation; BMWi press release; Berliner Zeitung, March 2026.]*

Jeremy Farrar — Wellcome Trust CEO when CEPI was co-founded. Organised the February 1, 2020 confidential teleconference at which Proximal Origin authors who privately assessed 70% lab probability reversed to natural origin. Wrote in his book *Spike* that he thought the virus "looked like an engineered virus" and took a burner phone on MI5 advice. Shared Proximal Origin draft with Fauci and Collins February 4, 2020. House Select Subcommittee concluded he went uncredited despite significant involvement. Now **WHO Chief Scientist** — the institution whose pandemic declaration triggered the entire financial apparatus. **Has never testified under oath.**

Klaus Schwab / World Economic Forum — Founded WEF 1971; intellectual formation under Henry Kissinger at Harvard. WEF co-hosted **Event 201** (October 2019) — coronavirus pandemic simulation attended by Fauci and Haines. **CEPI launched at Davos January 2017** with $460 million in Gates Foundation funding, explicitly naming mRNA platforms and Disease X. WEF Young Global Leaders programme placed Macron and others in government. WEF CEO Børge Brende resigned in February 2026 after the DOJ Epstein files revealed his documented close ties to Epstein. Schwab himself resigned as WEF Chairman in April 2025 under separate misconduct allegations.

CEPI — Co-founded by Gates Foundation, Wellcome Trust, and the governments of Germany, Norway, Japan, and India. Launched Davos January 2017. Founding documents explicitly name mRNA technology and "Disease X" as targets — two and a half years before Event 201, three years before COVID-19. Germany co-founded the institution that pre-positioned mRNA vaccine development for a disease that did not yet exist. *[Sources: CEPI founding documentation; CEPI at Davos — WEF records.]*

B.3 The Rothschild Institutional Layer

Jeffrey Epstein described himself as a Rothschild representative in his own email to Peter Thiel: "As you probably know, I represent the Rothschilds" — DOJ Epstein files. Les Wexner testified under oath before Congress: "His personal work for the Rothschild family in France. Specifically, I spoke to Élie de Rothschild. He represented their whole family." Edmond de Rothschild Holding S.A. entered a $25 million contract with Epstein's Southern Trust Company in October 2015. Ariane de Rothschild corresponded dozens of times per month with Epstein over five years. Lord Guthrie — former Chief of the Defence Staff and former director of N M Rothschild & Sons — sat on the founding board of ISD, the Gates and Open Society-funded disinformation organisation that in May 2020 declared public discussion of "Bill Gates, George Soros, the Rothschilds and Jeff Bezos" in connection with pandemic profiteering to be "far-right extremist conspiracy theory." The Epstein files document each of those names in connection with pandemic finance structures. *[Sources: DOJ Epstein files — public release January 2026; Les Wexner sworn testimony, House Oversight Committee, February 18, 2026; Edmond de*

Rothschild contract documentation; ISD founding board records.]

B.4 The WHO as Trigger Mechanism

The WHO's single pandemic declaration simultaneously activated: EU vaccine contracts (€35 billion Pfizer); US Operation Warp Speed procurement; CEPI emergency funding; and the $195.84 million World Bank Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility payout. The WHO is funded primarily by the Gates Foundation (largest private donor), substantially influenced by China (which refused independent COVID origins investigation), and had its pandemic declaration process shaped by the same network documented throughout this appendix. Farrar — who organised the February 2020 origins suppression teleconference — is now WHO Chief Scientist. Keen — who suppressed lab leak evidence at State — simultaneously consulted for the WHO. One institution. One declaration. Every financial instrument triggered simultaneously. *[Sources: WHO donor records; PEF trigger documentation; EU contract activation clauses; CEPI emergency funding records.]*

Appendices current as of June 7, 2026. All primary sources live.