

Dr. med. Mag. theol. Ryke Geerd Hamer
Sandkollveien 11
N-3229 Sandefjord

4.11.2013

cc: Mrs. Atty. Birgit Steinacker
Olgastrasse 53
70182 Stuttgart
bs@kanzlei-steinacker.de

To: Landgericht Hamburg [Regional Court Hamburg] **in advance per Fax**
So-called Zivilkammer [Civil Division] 10
Sievekingplatz 1
20355 Hamburg
Fax (Court Registry): (040) 4 28 43 – 2378
Fax (Deadline-Sensitive): (040) 4 28 43 – 4318/9
poststelle@lg.justiz.hamburg.de
Mr. so-called Judge Hartmann

Reference Number: 310 O 53/12

Dear Mr. Hartmann,

Recently I received mail¹ that shocked me. You will understand this immediately. If the quote from the following letter is correct, then not only fooled me, but I also feel shamefully deceived by you, as you have faked the authority of a judge which you are not entitled to. Thus you are nothing other than a miserable actor draped with a robe around his shoulders without permission, arrogates and **plays** the role of a state-certified sworn judge, but is in fact a nobody.

Quote:

"I received information just now about the alleged court case against colleague Hamer. It is again and again surprising to me to see how one still takes the public for a fool.

Already in 1962, Paragraph 15 of the *Gerichtsverfassungsgesetz (GVG)* [Courts Constitution Act] was repealed, which stated: "Courts are courts of the state". Since then, there are no courts of the state in Germany anymore. With the so-called *Bundesbereinigungsgesetze*

1 Translator comment

The letter cited on continuation, just as the following and the rest appearing as attached documents in the present letter from Dr. Hamer, was directed to the court in Kempten (Germany), and for acknowledgement, also to Dr. Hamer, when the intention of prosecuting him in the case of the death of the girl Susanne Rehkla was published. Resuming, the Rehkla case was as follows: the girl Susanne Rehkla, who had been diagnosed with cancer, was submitted to chemotherapy. Her parents did not want to continue the treatment protocol and were threatened for this reason to lose custody of their daughter. On inquiry of her parents and the lawyer representing Susanne, Dr. Hamer submitted three expert opinions on the case, in which he proved that the diagnosis was wrong, thus chemo-"therapy" useless and criminal. After the death of little Susanne, the public prosecutor accused Dr. Hamer of "intention to kill" Susanne Rehkla (allegedly of abandoning chemotherapy). When Dr. Hamer made this fantastic horse-trade public, which the German "justice" had constructed with the intention to imprison or lock him up in a psychiatry if he showed up in court, many people were outraged and wrote to the above mentioned court, denouncing its missing legality and the absurdness of the accusation.

[Federal Revision Laws] of 2006 / 2007, even the entire GVG was rendered invalid by elimination of the area within which the law is operative. In allied occupied territory Germany (allegedly run by the private corporation Federal Republic of Germany, Inc.), there is therefore only one undertaking of justice in which verdicts are delivered according to maritime law. Thereby, **both** parties at the trial or hearing must acknowledge the judge. This occurs by sitting down, use of the reference number and by not objecting to the opening of the trial or hearing, among other things. If these conditions are not fulfilled, the decision is a worthless piece of paper. Before the start of a trial or hearing, it is advisable to request the judge to submit an affidavit, he is an appointed judge of a legally existing country and to show his *Amts-Ausweis* [official credentials] (not *Dienstausweis* [company identity card])- which he cannot have. The *Grundgesetz* [Basic Law] of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) is likewise invalid since September 23, 1990 by elimination of Article 23 (the scope of application). According to the decision from the Federal High Court at that time, the only existing state in Germany is the German Reich. The FRG was never a state, but only a self-governing body of the Allies. There have always been citizens of the German Reich, never citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany (see *Staatsbürgerschaftsgesetz* [Citizenship Act]). Unfortunately, most lawyers don't know this."

Dr. P.

I am ashamed with my entire people that we have guilelessly let ourselves be fooled for over 60 years by an illegal so-called justice and have sat dutifully in dishonest and fraudulent courtrooms.

Research in the internet proves that every court in our country is a company and has a private company owner, who is always a Master of the Lodge, according to concurring statements from retired jurists of our country. Since the lodge master, who actually "owns" the lodge, must always be a member of the Jewish religious community (usually a rabbi) according to the lodge constitution, our courts – all courts without exception! – are the opposite of sovereign nations – courts with impartial sworn judges of a nation of law under the rule of law.

For the sake of simplicity, let us assume that the owner of the Regional Court Hamburg² would be the lodge master and hundred times billionaire Max Warburg of the Warburg Bank in Hamburg, therefore your boss, and you would then, naturally as private people, have a joint meeting with the Austrian multi-millionaire Eybl, the opposing party in my case, and in the process crack up laughing loudly with the thought of how you would cheat the goy Dr. Hamer, who still believes blindly in state courts. The copyrights and publishing rights of the Germanic New Medicine are thereby one day more worth than the banks from Warburg and Eybl combined.

2 Translator comment

The court in its first instance in Hamburg was the court where the lawsuit of Hamer vs. Eybl was to be decided. Dr. Hamer intended to sue the multimillionaire Mr. Björn Eybl for copyright infringements. Mr. Eybl had published an "Organic Atlas" plagiarizing the Scientific Table of Dr. Hamer, but eliminating his system of embryonic leaves and mixing it up with all types of non scientific hypothesis, thereby faking German Medicine (his real intention together with the intention to make more money deceiving the public), which means, the scientific work realized by Dr. Hamer. Mr. Eybl, lacking a scientific education but counting on great protection, had put into this publication copyrights of Björn Eybl (of contents and graphics patented by Dr. Hamer), 30 years later than Dr. Hamer had discovered and patented them. The problem was that according to English maritime law in which the "justice" administration is based in Germany, there was clearly the risk that once agreed on the profits of both accomplices (the owner of the court and Mr. Eybl) for the illegal appropriation of copyrights, the false "judge" "legalized" this action by means of this judicial sham: from this moment onward, they would be property of the multimillionaire Eybl & Co by "judicial decision". For this reason Dr. Hamer had to abandon the lawsuit against Mr. Eybl, who maintains the intellectual property of everything discovered by Dr. Hamer.

Mr. Hartmann, I have a human right thereupon, that you give me – through my lawyer by the deadline of 4.23.2013 – an affidavit that you are an appointed sworn judge of a legal existing state and to enclose to me a certified copy of your *Amtsausweis* [official credentials] (not *Dienstausweis* [company identity card]).

If out of arrogance you do not answer me or you lie to me, I will publicly name you a fraud. I will also give this letter to all Germans as an example, so that my, trusting countrymen finally wake up.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ryke Geerd Hamer

P.S.

A further quote from a letter to the Regional Court Kempten (applies in like manner to the Regional Court Hamburg and respectively to all pseudo-courts in the Frankfurt Management, Inc = FRG).

“Ladies and Gentlemen,

You are investigating Dr. Hamer in the Rehklau case. What is your actual right to do this? You address yourself as public prosecutor, yet which state authority do you represent? It cannot be the FRiG, as Sigmar Gabriel described it as a “non-governmental organization with Ms. Merkel as CEO” at the SPD’s [Social Democratic Party of Germany] State Convention Day in Nordrhein Westfalen. Wolfgang Schäuble stated that we have not been sovereign since 1945, which means we are an occupied country, which, in turn, means that SHAEF Laws³ are in force. In law number 2 is stated: “9. No person shall act as judge, prosecutor, notary, or lawyer without the consent of Military Government.” My question now: do you have consent from the Military Government? If yes, please send Dr. Hamer the corresponding **notarized** photocopy. Otherwise, to my knowledge, you make yourselves guilty of malpractice.

Furthermore: Paragraph 15 of the *Gerichtsverfassungsgesetz* (“All courts are courts of the state”⁴)

³ Translator comment

The military **SHAEF law**, which continue to be applicable and of which very few people are aware of, have been imposed on Germany in the postwar by the powers exerting the military occupation.

⁴ Translator comment

A non-governmental court (not public) is simply a private court, which is directed according to interests of a particular or private person

was repealed in 1950 and in Article 101 of the *Grundgesetz* stands⁵ "(1) Special courts⁶ shall not be allowed. No one may be removed from the jurisdiction of his lawful judge."
If courts of the state are abolished and no one may be removed from the jurisdiction of his lawful judge, on which basis do you want to press charges? As a side note: In the first *Bereinigungsgesetz* in 2006, the *Gerichtsverfassungsgesetz* was also revoked. Did this escape your notice? Now there are only salad, vegetarian and meat GERICHTE! [Translator's Note: This is a pun. "GERICHT" in German means both court and dish.]

Hopefully you are aware you are personally and legally accountable and that this legal liability does not fall under the statute of limitations.

Dr. H.V.

Enclosures:

Bundesministerium

⁵ **Translator comment**

The basic law, or "Grundgesetz" was imposed on the German people by the Allies, continuing the postwar occupation of Germany, and came into effect on May 23rd, 1949. This basic law was originally regarded a provisional constitution, but since then 60 years have passed. The Parliamentary Council used the expression "Basic Law" instead of Constitution to emphasize its provisional character because of the separation of Germany. The intention was, that with Germany's unification, the "Basic Law" as a provisional constitution would be replaced by a constitution decided upon and adopted by all the German people in free decision. More than 60 years have passed since, the German unification has become reality, but the initial idea to substitute the "Basic Law" by a new constitution has not been realized. The "Basic Law" (Grundgesetz) is not a constitution in the proper sense because it was not the result of a regular constitution forming process.

⁶ **Translator comment**

In a short and simple form we can define an **Exceptional (Special) Court** as one that does not respect the fundamental principles of criminal justice and legal security. These courts are very inherent to dictatorial or totalitarian states. One could say that these Exceptional Courts are exactly the contrary of legal principles or priority of the law, defining as such the fundamental principle according to which all exertion of public power has to be subject to, inevitably to the will of the law and its jurisdiction, not leaving the exertion of this public power in any case to private persons, which is exactly what occurs with the Exceptional Courts (where one "adjudicates" causes with scarce or absent judicial guarantees and without legal procedures). The principle of legality acts as an essential parameter to say if a state is a constitutional state, and it is affirmed that the principle of legality establishes the judicial security, which is the maxim for which every citizen has to have to opportunity or security to know everything that is forbidden, allowed or ordered by the state.

des Innern

Otto Schily
Bundesinnenminister
[Federal Minister of the Interior]

Date: 2.14.2004

as per Distribution List

To: All employees of the
Department of the Interior,
Federal Border Guard,
Police and Customs

Dear Colleagues,

The Federal Republic of Germany has, according to international law de jure, expired. In Article 25 of the *Grundgesetz* the FRG is itself obligated to acknowledge the universal regulations of international law, as they are a component of federal law. Therefore, any legal bases of the branches and authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany are no longer legally valid. The German Reich exists within the borders from December 31, 1937. Every citizen of the German Reich is not subject to the laws and jurisdiction of the state simulation, governed as a dictatorship, by the name of "Federal Republic of Germany".

I promise you nothing. I ask something from you: Join the front line of Germans who still want to be Germans! We do what we can – for our Fatherland. Germany must become German again! We can do more with your support. Germany needs you. Come to us and don't be afraid.

The FRG is at the end. The *Grundgesetz* shows the way to a German Constitution, the rebirth of the German Reich. For: "This *Grundgesetz* ... shall cease to apply on the day on which a constitution freely adopted by the German people takes effect." (Article 146 GG)

Your,

Otto Schily
Bundesinnenminister

The Legitimization of a Judge
Article by Antonio M. Dorado 5.31.2008

The first paragraph of Article 101 in the "*Grundgesetz* for the "Federal Republic of Germany" states: "Extraordinary (SPECIAL) courts shall not be allowed. No one may be removed from the jurisdiction of his lawful judge!" That means that a citizen can demand to see the credentials of a judge. A police officer, whether or not in uniform, if personally known or not, is required by law to show proof of identity to a citizen before any legal action and intervention, if the citizen so demands! Without any if and but! And exactly the same is valid for a judge indeed. If a citizen asks for these credentials, then the judges are legally obligated to submit this in writing, according to the *Grundgesetz* (Article 97 Paragraph 1: "Judges shall be independent and subject only to the law"). For this reason, in the last 12 months altogether over 1,200 judges were asked before the court: "Are you a legitimate judge in accordance with Article 101 of the "*Grundgesetz* for the Federal Republic of Germany" and can you provide proof of it?" Interestingly, not one could or wanted (?) to show proof of their authorization in accordance with the principle of Article 101, which

at the same time means that there are no legitimate judges in the so-called “Federal Republic of Germany”. For, without compliance to Article 101 and Article 103 (Paragraph 1: “In courts every person shall be entitled to a hearing in accordance with the law”) every court in Germany is a drumhead court martial or even a special court – which, mind you, are inadmissible according to Article 101 -, because no court in Germany complies with the legal norms as per the *Grundgesetz*. For this reason, dispensation of justice in accordance with the principles of law and order is not possible in the “Federal Republic of Germany” and all so-called judgements, decisions, etc. are legally invalid.

A further quote from a letter to the Regional Court Kempten

Landgericht Kempten
Residenzplatz 4/6

87435 Kempten

04.06.2013

“Your allegations against Dr. Hamer

Ladies and gentlemen,

It has come to my knowledge through the global network that you incriminate Dr. Hamer with baseless allegations. Dr. Hamer discovered the 5 Biological Laws approximately 30 years ago. This medical discovery is unparalleled in the history of medicine and comparable to a “quantum leap”. These 5 Biological Laws describe the cause and progression of almost all diseases. The laws can comprehensively explain illnesses (also psychoses) and are verifiable on the next best patient. In contrast to conventional medicine, they require not a single hypothesis. Conventional medicine, on the contrary, is composed of over **5,000 hypotheses** (unproven assumptions).

The well-known medical journalist Schmidberger exactly encapsulates the discoveries by Dr. Hamer: **“If Dr. Hamer is correct, the books of conventional medicine are only worth waste paper.”**

This statement, makes clearly understandable that the discoveries by Dr. Hamer bring countless adversaries into the arena. And exactly that has happened, as well. It is an unbelievable outrage that of all things a Regional Court, stocked with medical laymen, would elevate itself to the opposition.

During my Internet research I discovered further **incredibilities**.

If one researches in the international business listing companies that specialize on businesses worldwide, for example the Firmen Hoppenstedt, Manta, Dun & Bradstreet, etc., one learns the seemingly unbelievable: that the **Regional Court** Kempten is listed as a **company**. Just the same as the **Federal Republic of Germany**, including all of its **agencies**. If all of this corresponds to the truth, then the **suspicion** arises, the **“Regional Court”** Kempten could not be a government court? And the judges would not be constitutionally legitimate judges?

Evidence:

D&B Search

Alles über Firmen.de [Everything about companies]

The next entry also cannot refute the **suspicion** given above:

<http://aufenthaltstitel.de/staaten/schluessel.htm>

Explanation

- AZR = Nationality Code of the Foreign National Central Register

D	AZR	KFZ	ISO 3166
Denmark	126	DK	DK
Germany	00-0	D	DE

Could the entry given above with the Nationality Code **00-0** mean that the “Federal Government” operates as a “**simulation of a state**”?

Even remarks made in public by senior politicians of the FRG cannot refute the **suspicion** given above.

I ascertained that *Bundesfinanzminister* [Federal Minister of Finance] Wolfgang Schäuble said at the European Banking Congress in Frankfurt on 11.18.2011:

“And we in Germany have been at no time further fully sovereign since the 8th of May 1945.”

This statement is circulating the global network and through that become publicly known. With this, *Bundesfinanzminister* Schäuble confirmed that “Germany” has no longer been in possession of **national sovereign rights, absolute rule**, as well as able to act **independently** and **sovereignly** since the 8th of May 1945.

I ascertained that Mr. Horst Seehofer, *bayerischer Ministerpräsident* [governor of Bavaria], said on Erwin Pelzig, ARD, on May 20, 2010 in front of millions of TV viewers, among other things:

“Those that decide are not elected and those that are elected have nothing to decide!”

Mr. Seehofer confirmed with this exactly the statement from Mr. Schäuble. This television transmission is circulating the global network and therefore **publicly known**.

I ascertained that Mr. Sigmar Gabriel, SPD-Chairman said at a special party convention in Dortmund on February 27, 2010, among other things:

“We have no federal government at all – Mrs. Merkel is CEO of a new non-governmental organization in Germany.”

This statement is circulating the global network, as well and therefore **publicly known**. With that, did *Bundesminister* [Federal Minister] Sigmar Gabriel possibly bring the **real** legal position of the “FRG” most clearly to the point?

If Mr. *Bundesminister* Sigmar Gabriel should in fact be correct with his statement, then would that have to be provable?

Could this entry and the images given above be considered as **proof**?

<http://aufenthaltstitel.de/staaten/schluessel.htm>

Explanation

• AZR = Nationality Code of the Foreign National Central Register

D	AZR	KFZ	ISO 3166
Denmark	126	DK	DK
Germany	00-0	D	DE

In a TV discussion in ARD in 2008 with Mr. Westerwelle and Mr. Lafontaine, didn't the Bundesminister of the "FRG" Jürgen Trittin himself say that the "**FRG**" would be a **company**? His discussion partners did not contradict this statement.

Source:

This TV discussion is circulating the global network and thus **publicly known**. Could this statement from Mr. Trittin substantiate the **suspicion** given above?

Video Title: BRD ist eine Firma! Trittin sagt dies selbst... [FRG is a company! Trittin says that himself...]

In addition to the **suspicion** cited above could come the **suspicion** of the fraudulent exercise of a **public** office.

Due to that I am expecting the following copies from you:

1. The founding national charter for the "**Federal Republic of Germany**" from which laws the judges of the "Regional Court" Kempten refer to.
2. A constitution approved by the people for the "**FRG**".
3. A founding charter for the "**United Germany**" that was founded in 1990 and is currently a member of the United Nations.
4. A constitution approved by the people for the "**United Germany**".
5. The copy of the **Amtsausweis** [official credentials] (no **Dienstausweis** [company identity card]) for the investigating public prosecutor and for the judges, out of which I can discern if the **official** duties are being fulfilled for the "**FRG**" or already for the "**United Germany**".

Should I not receive these documents within 4 weeks, then I will assume that there is **in fact** no **official state**, but only **companies**, and the judges, including the public prosecutors, perpetrate the fraudulent exercise of a **public office** and **deception**.

Yours sincerely,

Flugkreisel"