

---

**International Attorneys**

**MEDIA RELEASE**

**February 16, 2024**

---

Dr. Reiner Fuellmich has been at the forefront of the COVID-19 investigations since its inception. With his investigations, he sought to unravel the true nature of the COVID-19 pandemic and its implications on society.

By being vocal and imploring society to question the official COVID-19 narrative, Reiner placed himself in the spotlight and in direct conflict with the German government's narrative of *'follow the science'*; for them and governments worldwide, no one was permitted to question the science or debate it in any meaningful way. Reiner has investigated the true nature of the COVID-19 science for the past three-four years, and even after he was unlawfully kidnapped and detained in Mexico, he continued to expose world governments' crimes against humanity as a direct consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic measures taken at the time.

On or about October 11, 2023, the Mexican authorities detained Reiner in Tijuana, Mexico, from where he was flown with chaperones to Frankfurt on the next available flight against his will. He was not detained at the German Embassy premises, but rather as he disembarked the plane at Tijuana International Airport, where he and his wife had a meeting with a German consulate official for the handover of their newly minted passports. They were unaware that they were hoodwinked by Mexican and German government authorities, with the help of someone in Germany who informed the authorities of their whereabouts. The following excerpt is

from an email read by Reiner in court on the first day of his trial (as related by Jiota, a freelance journalist who was present at the time). It validates the orchestrated plan to unlawfully kidnap Reiner in Mexico. This email appear to have been sent to the state prosecutor, who is currently prosecuting the criminal case on behalf of the German government and the complainants.

*"Hello Mr. John, as of now it is planned to lure Reiner Fuellmich to the consulate under the pretext that he still has to correct a signature on the passport (!) and then have him arrested by the Migration Authority. A date has not been set. Probably week 36 or 37."*

Reiner was detained and arrested, but not his wife; thus, Reiner was not detained and arrested for his visa; otherwise, why the disparity in treatment, compared to his wife who received her passport and renewed her visa.

There was no international warrant for Reiner's arrest, and Mexico has no extradition treaty with Germany of which we are aware. There appears to be many serious questions surrounding the legality and jurisdictional powers exercised that led to Reiner's unlawful kidnapping. The primary goal was to lure Reiner into the German Embassy and or Consulate, deport him and subsequently arrest him as soon as he enters German territory in Frankfurt. In fact Reiner was summarily arrested when he arrived in Frankfurt, from where he was sent to a maximum-security prison in the Rosdorf municipal area without official charges having been instituted against him.

It was only on November 17, 2023, a year two months and 15 days later, that official charges were instituted against Reiner based on a criminal complaint dated September 2, 2022, filed by the unregistered Corona Investigative Committee's two lesser-known shareholders and Berlin attorney. In Germany during an investigation, an accused must generally

be given the opportunity to respond to the accusations leveled against him; however, Reiner was refused this right, and he was denied unfettered access to the criminal dossier files. Reiner was thus not given an opportunity to make an informed statement. Only after receiving the statement of an accused can the prosecutors determine whether to file charges or seek a penalty order in court. The way the prosecutors handled the case is nothing short of a farce of justice in that it violates Reiner's rights to unbiased investigations and court hearings. Of further concern, Reiner was not subjected to any interrogation in terms of Section 163a of the German Criminal Code, a prerequisite before any charges can be filed in Germany.

In Germany, ordinarily civil disputes are filed in a civil court, however such an option results in significant legal expenditures for claimants. As a consequence, claimants in Germany frequently choose to file criminal complaints in order to minimise their legal costs, where the state is called on to do all the necessary investigations with no costs to the claimants. The dispute currently before the full bench is a contractual dispute that should have been resolved between the shareholders and if not should have been escalated to a civil court. However it seems to be an acceptable proclivity for claimants in Germany to threaten debtors to make payment if not, claimants then proceed to press embezzlement criminal charges. Section 266 (embezzlement provisions) of the German Criminal Code is barely Constitutional owing to its elements. As a result, state prosecutors and investigative agencies in Germany can easily criminalise corporations and or individuals conduct after the fact.

At the time of Reiner's bail appeal application, the presiding judicial officials allowed the statutory response time limits to lapse without giving any justified explanation for their delay. An application for the presiding judicial officials disqualification were lodged on the basis of their impartiality in the manner in how they handled the matter since its inception. Given Reiner's

track record of being a law-abiding citizen it would have been prudent to release him on bail, with specified conditions for example, an electronic bracelet, he reporting himself to his nearest police station as well as by confiscating his passport. Reiner's broader family resides in Germany and since he does not have any previous criminal record, there were no justified grounds for him not to have been released on bail. Furthermore, Reiner was denied his most fundamental right to add additional legal assistance for his defense; it appears that the court intend to expedite the trial even if it violates Reiner's fundamental right to a fair hearing.

Reiner was charged with 18 charges of alleged wrongdoing. The judicial Chamber dismissed 16 of the 18 charges during the initial inquiry stage. The remaining two charges are based on Section 266 of the German Criminal Code's embezzlement provisions. The two embezzlement charges of €500,000 and €200,000 stem from two credit loan arrangements. The two documented loan agreements were executed with the approval of the unregistered and registered Corona Investigative Committees co-host and co-shareholder (Viviane Fischer). These agreements were made to prevent the donations from being arbitrarily taken by German authorities, as they had done with other activists who did not '*follow the science*'. On or about November 6, 2020, and May 14, 2021, Reiner took out the €200,000 and €500,000, respectively.

Around November 2021, it became clear the non-profit status of the unregistered Corona Investigative Committee's operations was being challenged by the two lesser-known shareholders, who voluntary resigned before the Committee was officially registered. To counter any stagnation or cessation of the Committee's operations, Reiner and Viviane Fischer established a new Corona Investigative Committee, the SCA Investigative Committee UG, on December 17, 2021, which was later registered on February 25, 2022, with Reiner and Viviane Fischer each owning 50% shares. This was done to fully implement the Committee's non-profit

objectives. In terms of Section 2(3) of the SCA Investigative Committee UG, Articles of Association, no shareholder is entitled to any financial benefit. This was apparently the same set of conditions agreed upon implicitly, tacitly, or explicitly when the unregistered Corona Investigative Committee was formed.

The two lesser-known shareholders of the unregistered Corona Investigative Committee are now seeking financial recompense from the SCA Investigative Committee UG. It is Reiner and Viviane Fisher's respective views that the two lesser-known shareholders of the unregistered Corona Investigative Committee's value contribution do not exceed 5%. In Reiner's submission made in court on February 2, 2024, he stated that the two lesser-known shareholders seek to line their pockets with the donations. Inexplicably the two lesser-known shareholders are now claiming ownership of the donations even though they have not been actively involved in the unregistered and registered Committees since about the beginning of 2021 and have not even attended any Committee meetings since about mid 2021. How they can claim ownership of the donations is beyond odd, as it violates the registered Committee's Articles of Association; in that money donated should be utilised to achieve the registered Committee's objectives, not benefit shareholders financially. It is absurd for state prosecutors to ignore and dismiss this all-important fact and for them to not direct the two lesser-known shareholders of the unregistered Committee to seek remedy in a civil court further amplify the prosecutors bias in this case. The impasse between the unregistered and registered Committees can only be resolved in a civil court, not a criminal court. The only conclusion reached is the criminal case against Reiner is nothing more than a malicious prosecution.

With reference to the German Criminal Code, one of the basic elements of the crime of embezzlement is the intention to replace the owner of the property at the time the alleged act was committed. The alleged offense of

embezzlement can only be genuine if the property (in this case, money) is appropriated without the owner's consent with the intent to permanently deprive the owner of the property. How can it be argued that Reiner appropriated the money without the shareholders' knowledge based on the indisputable written loan agreements that were signed-off, and the loan amounts reflected in the yearly financial statements?

Viviane Fischer was aware of the two loan agreements in a matter of fact she signed it off. Financial statements were accessible to all four of the unregistered Corona Investigative Committee shareholders and the public on request. The question that comes to mind: why is the Göttingen state prosecutors not pursuing Vivian Fischer for her €100,000 loan agreement? The only reason they are not pursuing Vivian Fischer is that they are biased and lack the necessary fortitude to objectively analyze the merits of this case in its totality. Thus, what the prosecutors intend to present to court is a half-backed cake by not disclosing the whole truth and nothing but the truth to court. Logic dictates, in all fairness, that this should have been done by now if it were all about justice and fairness. This clearly demonstrates how ludicrous the case against Reiner is, and the court's decision to hear such a meritless case raises more questions than answers.

Since early October 2021, Reiner has always stated that the money he borrowed was invested in his property in Germany and that he intends to repay the loans, even if it means that he needs to sell his property, which at the time had sufficient equity in it. It's unclear how German state prosecutors intend to prove the core elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. The evidence is clear and unequivocal that the amounts in question were taken out as loans, of legal importance was his intention and ability (creditworthiness) to pay back the loans. Reiner would have paid off the loan amounts in full by November 2022 from the proceeds of the sale of his house, however due to one of the complainants unlawful tortious conduct, he was unlawfully deprived of the entire purchase price. The

prosecutors are playing for the public gallery by sensationalizing how Reiner invested the money in his property by obscuring the true nature of their weak case against Reiner. All 18 charges brought against Reiner should have been dropped summarily when the judicial Chambers initially evaluated the case.

By all indications, the criminal charges Reiner is currently faced with, and the need for these charges to be adjudicated by a full bench of three judges and two assessors, come as no surprise. Given the judicial climate in which COVID-19 cases are adjudicated in German courts, such as the Weimar judge who dared to adjudicate one of the first COVID-19 cases in Germany by not *'following the science'* but rather the objective scientific facts presented to him, it is no surprise that prosecutorial and judicial interference is plausible. The German courts ability to be impartial and render fair and equitable judgements in any matters that deal with COVID-19-related cases is yet to be seen. This case is one of a personal and or political vendetta that does not involve any crime, but rather, an attempt to silence a warrior for the truth.

**Ana Garner**

United States of America Attorney at Law

**Virginie De Araújo-Recchia**

France Attorney at Law

**Tony Nikolic**

Australia Attorney at Law

**Dr. Dexter Ryneveldt**

South Africa Attorney at Law (advocate)