

# The revenge of David against Goliath



**Gerhard ULRICH**

**This book (39 pages) is aiming to leave historic finger prints in the annals of the years 2000 to 2016:**

In 2000 the author of this book had founded the citizens' initiative APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, having as objective the sanitation of the hopelessly degenerated judiciary system by non-violent means.

Starting 2006, this movement, which had about 1000 adherents/sympathizers at that time, was masqueraded by several show trials, since the Lawyers were not able to accept the critics, or even to put themselves or their system in question.

The pronounced condemnations of the activists were the total immoderation: 111 months of firm imprisonment, of which 48 months = 4 years for its founder/president, 21 months for Marc-Etienne BURDET, and 6 other sentences with suspended prison sentences + fines/judiciary fees for others.

For commemorating the 10 years of the first show trial which ended by the judgment of WINZAP on November 24, 2006, the author (the David) launches a revision request of this joke of a procedure, by lodging a penal complaint against the Vaudois cantonal «Judge» Pierre-Henri WINZAP (the Goliath) and 13 of his partners in this crime, including 3 «Prosecutors», of which the Vaudois Attorney General Eric COTTIER, 4 Vaudois cantonal «Judges», 4 federal «Judges» and one «Judge» at the European Court of Human Rights.

After 16 years of humiliations, the author is unveiling that the Swiss supreme Federal Court and the European Court of Human Rights are fake authorities.

The Vaudois Judiciary, which has censored the author illegally with a secret procedure (the methods of the inquisition) is challenged in block, and it is suggested to let the Historians deal with this revision.

Morges, September 2016

Gerhard ULRICH

**Hello,**

**The aim of this book is to leave historic finger prints in the annals of the years 2000 – 2016, of the citizens' initiative APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE - association of the judiciary victims who did have the courage and merit to have had the determination to clean up by non-violent means the judiciary system, presently hopelessly degenerated.**

**This work is existing as well in German and French versions.**

**For being in a position to finance its printing, and to place it in the libraries, I appeal to the reader to make a donation.**

**Here the coordinates:**

**Editor Samizdat c/o Gerhard ULRICH**

**Avenue de Lonay 17**

**CH-1110 Morges**

**0041 21 801 22 88 - [catharsisgu@gmail.com](mailto:catharsisgu@gmail.com)**

**Swiss Postal Account: 31-638688-3      IBAN CH65 0900 0000 3163 8688 3**

**For printing subsequently a book, it was necessary to respect certain printers' habits. That is the reason, why you will find some blank pages in the text which starts only on page 3.**

**Thank you for your understanding.**

**Gerhard ULRICH**



# **The revenge of David against Goliath**

ISBN No .....

September 2016

Printed by .....

Editor: Samizdat

Swiss Postal Account: 31-638688-3

Donations to support the struggle for the sanitation of the Judiciary  
apparatus are welcome.

Address e-mail of the author: [catharsis.gu@gmail.com](mailto:catharsis.gu@gmail.com)

Author: Gerhard ULRICH

Avenue de Lonay 17

CH-1110 Morges

0041 21 801 22 88

Original in French, translated into English and German.

Selling price: CHF / EUR 20.- on USB stick



## **Content**

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Revision Request</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Goliath of the Judiciary system: Pierre-Henri WINZAP</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>The European Court of Human Rights: a Fata Morgana</b>	<b>25</b>



## ***Revision Request***

- 1 -

**Gerhard ULRICH**  
Avenue de Lonay 17  
CH-1110 Morges  
0041 21 801 22 88

October, 5, 2016

Mister **Jean-François MEYLAN**  
President of the cantonal court VD  
Route du Signal 8  
CH-1014 Lausanne

cc. *Book cover without enclosures:*

1. *To all Federal Councillors and their spouses; to the Federal Chancellor Walter TURNHERR*
2. *Michael Lauber, Attorney General of the Swiss Confederation*
3. *Nicoletta DELLA VALLE Valle, Director of FedPol*
4. *Daniel KIPFER FASCIATI, President of the Penal Federal Court*
5. *To the Deans of the History Faculties , Universities of Lausanne, Geneva, Fribourg, Neuchâtel, Bern*
6. *To all Vaudois and Federal Members of Parliaments*
7. *To all Members of the Council of Europe - To whom it may concern*

### ***Revision Request of the judgment WINZAP of November 24, 2006***

#### ***Rehabilitation of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE***

***Penal complaint against Pierre-Henri WINZAP and his Partners in Crime***

#### ***Penal Challenge***

*Hello Mister President of the Vaudois cantonal court,*

*For having criticized Lawyers, you did gratify me by 12 penal trials and you did jail me during 4 years. The 10th anniversary of the first show trial against APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE is approaching. The sanitation of the Judiciary system by non-violent means – presently hopelessly degenerated – has been our objective.*

*Let's point out that this passing through the Vaudois jails was equivalent to postgraduate studies for completing my knowledge of your tyranny. Nonetheless, time has come to rehabilitate APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, and logically as*

- 2 -

*well its founder Gerhard ULRICH. My former supporters are reading me in copy and are invited to follow the example. It is but logical to start to request the revision of the first show trial. Here my motivation:*

*The judgment WINZAP PE01.027095-JAN/EMM/PW of November 24, 2006 is an incredible judiciary fraud – denial of justice – refusal to grant an efficient defence – non-summoning of the requested witnesses – overshadowing of exculpatory proofs – decisions taken by partial/plaintiff Judges – condemnation for crimes which I did not commit. It is a forged document. See my explanations below. The evidences are contained in the file archived by your apparatus. If certain documents should have disappeared in the meantime, I will willingly provide the replacements.*

*The enumerated violations signify that the procedure was a joke and the guarantees of the Swiss Federal Constitution, article 5.2 (public interest, proportionality) and 5.3 (rules of good faith) have been massively violated.*

*The superior instances just took over the lies of WINZAP as procedural truths, lying in their turn, without any verification.*

*The European Court of Human Rights did not even read my complaint (see below) as they do it with 90 to 98 % of the submitted requests, fore they did not even motivate their decision, although imperatively imposed by the Convention.*

*These proceedings are not only frequent but systematic. See my book The Album of Dishonour, chapter V in the enclosure. However, lies of the Federal Court are never prescribed, because a lie, albeit old of half a century, is still today infringing the article 5.3 of the Federal Constitution.*

*Winzap has been blindly supported by the following 12 perjured Officers:*

*[Françoise DESSAUX](#), investigating «Judge»VD, promoted cantonal «Judge»*

*[Yves NICOLET](#), cantonal investigating «Judge» VD, promoted federal Prosecutor*

*[Eric MERMOUD](#), Vaudois Prosecutor*

*Georges Borer, Assessor*

*[Jean-François VUILLEUMIER](#), Assessor, Elisabeth Vermeil, Assessor*

*[François DE MONTMOLLIN](#), former President of the cantonal court VD, retired*

*[Blaise BATTISTOLO](#), Vaudois cantonal «Judge»*

*[Christian DENYS](#), Vaudois cantonal «Judge», promoted federal «Judge»*

*[Hans WIPRÄCHTIGER](#), retired federal «Judge»*

*[Dominique FAVRE](#), retired federal «Judge»*

*[Michel FERRARI](#), retired federal «Judge»*

*[Nebojša VUČINIĆ](#), «Judge» at the European Court of Human Rights*

*Please let me know, if I have to provide their addresses.*

*The fraudsters have anyway well understood the danger to be unmasked one day, because they took care to censor the former Internet Sites of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE. See my complaint against Nicolet*

[www.swisscorruption.info/index\\_htm\\_files/gu\\_nicolet-e.pdf](http://www.swisscorruption.info/index_htm_files/gu_nicolet-e.pdf)

*addressed to COTTIER on October 5, 2016 (accomplice of the illegal censorship). Herewith I lodge a penal complaint for abuse of power, forging documents etc. against the 14 «Magistrates» quoted above. I request to start to put WINZAP in pre-trial custody, because of the risk of collusion.*

*Here my civil pretensions:*

*To compensate me for the 21 months in prison due to WINZAP, I request the amount of CHF1'400'000 (700 days x 2'000 CHF). Future revision requests are reserved.*

*The State of Vaud will be liable in the first place for this judiciary failure. However, it would be unfair to have the tax payer to assume this damage. The State of Vaud shall subsequently turn to the 14 cheating Magistrates for having them payed the invoice, by sequestering their fortunes, starting with their second old age pillar. The sum shall be divided by 14 and the offenders will have each to bear severally his part.*

### ***Challenging the Vaudois Judiciary in block***

*You find enclosed a copy of the challenge formulated in the context of the discovered secret and illegal file [PE03.0183380-YNT](#), having served to censor me, presented to the Attorney General Eric COTTIER, on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016, by which I did challenge the Vaudois Judiciary in block. Hence, the enmity of the Lawyers is not directed against a procedure, but well against my person. **You shall know that I will never again accept to participate at one of your spectacles.** I shall oppose passive resistance.*

*Seen the incapacity of your trading union to make amend and to correct your blunders, there remains the question, who shall deal with the present request. One knows the reluctance of the Members of Parliament to realize their constitutional duty to survey you. Given the circumstances, I suggest that the Vaudois Parliament will mandate a team of Historians, composed e.g. of one student each of the faculties*

*for contemporanean History of the Universities of Lausanne, Geneva, Fribourg, Neuchâtel and Bern to carry out a serious investigation of this request and to prepare a final report.*

*Of course, you will ask the question, on which essential new element I am basing my audacity to request the rehabilitation. It consists of my discovery made after 16 years of humiliations that the Swiss supreme Federal Court and the European Court of Human Rights are violating systematically the Swiss Federal Constitution. Where the first Judges did not deliver a good job, be it by inadvertence or intentionally, these authorities are not assuming their task to act as a fuse. The existence of these institutions is thus not legitimated. See my book The Album of Dishonour, chapters II, V, VI, IX - XI in the enclosure.*

***If you should burry this request, your problem will not at all be resolved, because I shall take care that your cheatings which are imprisoning the life of plenty honest people will be dealt with one day by History. This is the revenge of David against Goliath.***

*Sincerely yours*

**Gerhard ULRICH**

*PS: In the file PE01.027095-JAN/EMM/PW one is finding as well two affairs of minor importance, denounced at the time by APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE for which I had made amend. This is concerning two «grey» cases (tricks committed by both sides) – one from Neuchâtel, for which one I did retract well before the trial, and the other one from Fribourg, which made me assume my responsibility after the trial, and caused my resignation as President of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE. During the upcoming revision, my penal and civil responsibility for this shall be established. I doubt that this will justify even one day in prison.*

*Annexes: my books The revenge of David against Goliath and The Album of Dishonour on enclosed USB stick.*

*My challenge of the Vaudois Judiciary en bloc, sent to COTTIER on Oct. 5, 2016*

# Evaluation du juge cantonal VD

## Pierre-Henri Winzap

Swiss (Vaudois) senior officer. He calls himself a cantonal «Judge». «Works» in the palace of the Hermitage, route du Signal 8, 1014 Lausanne.

**Private address:**

Avenue du Général-Guisan 21, 1009 Pully

Private phone: 021 601 94 00

Marital status: unknown; is cohabiting with Anne-Laure PAGES.



Pierre-Henri WINZAP during a conference of the GRAAP at the Casino of Lausanne, April 18, 2016 – the hypocrisy in person



Inscription on the mailbox, glued on by the postman. WINZAP is obviously penny-pinching, and does not want to spend money for a simple engraving.

### **Shots of the house**



Villa of WINZAP seen from the south – possession probably inherited from his parents, a few meters from the shores of Lake Geneva



View from north-west, with the lake just visible

## **Profile**

Former partner of the Lawyer Christian BETTEX (Bâtonnier in 2007)

Later President of the district court of Lausanne.

Promoted cantonal «Judge» in 2009, after having committed the monstrous judiciary fraud of the first show trial against APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE in October/November 2006.

## **The first big show trial against APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE**

The citizens' initiative APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE was founded in 2000 as a result of my efforts. In 2006 there were about 1000 followers united. Our objective was the sanitation of the judiciary system by non-violent means. Since August 2001, penal complaints had accumulated for pretended infringement of honour of Lawyers. The investigation of these complaints had dragged on during 5 years.

The court of WINZAP had offered to us the honour to run this trial in the main courtroom of the Palace of Montbenon in Lausanne, once built as the first Swiss supreme Federal Court. The rostrum was crowded with supporters, curious people and journalists. The atmosphere in the lobby was tense. Nine accused persons were facing the Substitute of the Attorney General, **Eric MERMOUD**, as well as fifteen plaintiffs, of which a dozen Judges and Lawyers, who were in turn assisted by their defenders, Lawyers as well. With our eight defenders ex officio (in reality only seven, since SAAL had abdicated), we were facing a phalange of twenty Lawyers.

According to the rules of jurisprudence, this trial should not have happened at all. On October 4, 2006, that is to say four weeks prior to the opening of the trial, my former Lawyer ex officio, SAAL, had requested in writing to WINZAP with copy to the cantonal court to be released from his mandate.

See next pages.

# Letter of the Lawyer SAAL of October 4, 2006, requesting to be released from his mandate

All Links in red have been censored illegally by the Prosecutor Yves NICOLET, by secrete procedure.

## BUDIN & ASSOCIES AVOCATS

20, rue Sènebier - Case postale 166 - 1211 Genève 12 - Téléphone +41 22 818 08 08 - Téléfax +41 22 818 08 18  
e-mail : urs.saal@budin.ch - www.budin.ch

Genève, le 4 octobre 2006

PIERRE-ANDRÉ BÉGUIN  
PATRICK SCHELLENBERG  
CAMILLE FROIDEVAUX  
PATRICK T. BITTEL  
GABRIEL A. BENEZRA  
CHRISTIAN GROSJEAN  
PHILIPPE BONVIN  
URS SAAL  
MICHEL D'ALESSANDRI  
Lic.sc.éc. HEC

Monsieur le Président du  
Tribunal Cantonal  
Palais de justice de l'Hermitage  
Rte du Signal 8  
1014 Lausanne

JEAN DONNET  
SILVIA TEVINI DU PASQUIER  
Docteur en droit

Par télécopie 021 316 13 28 et pli simple

SYLVIE HOROWITZ-CHALLANDE  
INÈS FELDMANN-WYLER  
JEAN-CHARLES LOPEZ

Concerne : Mes mandats d'offices  
Monsieur Gerhard Ulrich

PASCAL DÉVAUD  
LL.M. Georgetown  
Admis au Barreau de New York  
MALIKA SALEM THÉVENOZ

Monsieur le Président,

PATRICE HUGUENIN  
M.B.A., New York University  
PHILIPPE BURNAND

Comme vous le savez, j'ai été commis d'office depuis quelques années maintenant à la défense d'office de Monsieur Gerhard Ulrich (dans son divorce ainsi que diverses procédures pénales).

LUCIEN FENIELLO  
M.B.L., Université de Genève  
MARIE-CHRISTINE BALZAN  
Lic.sc.éc.

Je viens par la présente requérir d'être relevé de l'ensemble de ces mandats, en raison de divergences d'opinions insurmontables et une confiance totalement disparue entre mon mandant d'office et moi-même.

NICOLAS BEGUIN  
PHILIPPE SCHELLENBERG  
PATRICIA COURTOIS  
Clerc d'avocat breveté

Conseils

ANDRÉ KAPLUN

STEVEN J. STEIN  
(New York)

PIERRE R. MONNEY

ROGER MERKELBACH

La procédure de divorce de M. Ulrich (plus précisément les quelques questions encore en suspens qui sont plus d'ordre techniques que juridiques) ne nécessite par ailleurs pas ou plus l'assistance d'un avocat. De toute manière, Monsieur Ulrich refuse de participer à la procédure.

De plus, les procédures à venir, au-delà d'un certain tapage médiatique et des audiences fleuves devant une cour correctionnel (bien qu'au regard des infractions retenues, il s'agissait plutôt de matières relevant d'un tribunal de police) ainsi que la présence du Ministère public (probablement également en raison dudit tapage médiatique) ne présentent pas de difficulté particulière nécessitant la présence d'un avocat d'office (il s'agit encore et toujours d'infractions présumées contre l'honneur poursuivies sur plainte, les infractions présumées de contrainte ne reposant strictement sur rien ...).

J'adresse copie par courrier de la présente aux différents juges saisis (en l'état Monsieur le Président du Tribunal de l'arrondissement de Lausanne Philippe Colelough, Monsieur le Président du Tribunal correctionnel de l'arrondissement de Lausanne Pierre Henri Winzap, ainsi que Monsieur le Président du Tribunal d'arrondissement de Vevey Philippe Goermer) pour information ainsi évidemment qu'à Monsieur Ulrich.

En vous remerciant d'accueillir favorablement ma requête, je vous prie de croire, Monsieur le Président, à l'expression de ma haute considération.

Urs Saal, av.

Since there came no reaction from the part of the court of WINZAP, I submitted on October 18, 2006 the written request to have another defender appointed ex officio. In spite of reiterate recalls, WINZAP reacted with a denial of justice. Only after the beginning of the trial, he wanted to impose a new Lawyer, who I did not know, and with whom I had no confidential relationship. On top of that, I did not have had the opportunity to prepare with him the trial. This was a unbelievable violation of article 6 ECHR, granting explicitly the right to dispose of enough time to prepare a trial. Marc-Etienne BURDET and myself have therefore refused to participate at this phony trial, having reiterated in vain at the opening of the trial to have it postponed for granting an effective defense. A posteriori, Winzap deformed the facts. In his judgement, he pretended wrongly that I had terminated the mandate of my former lawyer, and that this act was to be assimilated with a abuse of law. The opposite is proven: SAAL gave up. Winzap has committed an abuse of law.

This ly of WINZAP was subsequently simply reproduced by copy/paste by the superior instances, notwithstanding reiterated objections from my side.

The judgement of the cantonal court PE01.027095-JAN/EMM/PWI of August 31st, 2007 preserved this forgery, according to which I had fired SAAL (= abuse of law) and overshadowed the fact that Saal had himself requested to be relieved from his mandate.


In this trial, our strategy of defence was to administer the proof to have said the truth concerning two affairs. The one who has said the truth cannot be punished for infringement of the honour (article 173, part 2 of the Swiss Penal Code).

Let's start with the affaire of Danielle RUSSELL.

On October 29, 2006, we launched on the French version of our Home Page our last attack preceding the show trial to come. We had chosen deliberately that case, which demonstrated very visibly the failure of the judiciary apparatus. Certain of our position of strength, we formulated the headline:

## THE FIRST SHOW TRIAL AGAINST APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE IS PUT TO AN END...

...and the counter-attack is opened, by denouncing a trial fraud big as a house ... which is in addition well visible:



(The photo on the right side shows that a reconstructed house was exceeding 2 m the previous height, in contradiction with the judgement of March 3, 1997, prohibiting such an elevation. Photo to the left: situation before the reconstruction.)

This photomontage was concluding a double sheet DIN A4-Folder, addressed as open letter to the then acting President of the National Council, **Claude JANIAK** and copied to all Members of Parliament of the Confederation and of Vaud; this leaflet was distributed massively among the population in the region of La Côte. Extract (translation):

Mister **Claude JANIAK**  
President of the National Council  
Hauptstrasse 104  
4102 Binningen

October 28, 2006

cc: Mister **Jean-Marc Surer**, President of the Parliament of Vaud

**The trial fraud which went too far**  
[www.swiss-justice.net/id/wyss](http://www.swiss-justice.net/id/wyss)

Dear Mister President of the National Council,

On October 12, 2006, our member of the committee Franz Duss from St. Gallen has explained to you a case of judiciary arbitrary (which is proven visually) and we discussed the same day with a dozen of Members of the federal Parliaments in Flims GR. They have all encouraged us to continue our struggle. On page 4 you find another representation of a trial fraud from the canton of Vaud, in which 19 dishonest magistrates, including 3 federal Judges are involved (see list on page 3). For reconstructing a building, which is circumnavigating all determinations of a legally valid judgement of the administrative court of Vaud, the protagonists have produced several forged documents (submission of plans in another scale than indicated – 1 : 125 instead of 1 : 100 – and subsequently exchanging these plans after the public announcement of the reconstruction project: plans which are insinuating elevated dimensions of the neighbouring buildings, for suppressing the illegal elevation of the planned reconstruction etc. These offenses were covered up by the mayor Michel ROULET-CHAUVY and among others the Judge Assessor Arnold CHAUVY (Geometer, former President of the Parliament of the canton of Vaud and son in law of SCHNETZLER, a former President of the cantonal court of Vaud). In 1997 the affair could not be presented to the High Federal Court, because the lawyer of the cheated couple – a former trainee in the layers office of the guilty President of the administrative court **Jean-Albert WYSS** – had strictly refused to do it.

On December 21, 2002 the victims of this fraud had lodged a complaint for forged documents etc. The investigating «judge» **Nicolas CRUCHET** had investigated seriously in appearance in the beginning, for burying subsequently the complaint

finally on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2004 with cheap pretexts. The cantonal court, presided by the cantonal «Judge» **François DE MONTMOLLIN** had than this arbitrary decision confirmed on October 5, 2004, followed by an identical decision of the Federal Court 6S.12/2005/rod dated February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2005 with the federal «Judge» **SCHNEIDER** as chairman:

[www.worldcorruption.info/schneider.htm](http://www.worldcorruption.info/schneider.htm)

The nonsense of convictions to long prison sentences without proofs/avowals is difficult to demonstrate. For illustrating the silliness of «inner conviction» of a Judge, resulting in such a penalty, one has to activate logical thinking. Only a minority of persons are able/ willing to make an intellectual effort to re-enact such injustices. In the present case the offense can be proven by geometry, and made visible. Everybody understands thus instantly the direct correlations....

This affair has triggered off the political trial against APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, which shall start on October 30, 2006 before the court of **Pierre-Henri WINZAP** in Lausanne. The case RUSSELL is unveiling very clearly the arbitrary of the judiciary apparatus, and demonstrates how the system has degenerated to become an organized gang of criminals, proliferating from the small mayor of the political party UDC at Etoy up to the UDC President of the federal cassation court. After 6 years of tough struggle, APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE will manage not only to be heard but to be as well understood by the public, by revealing this single evident abuse.

Only politics can clean out these Augean stables. As first citizen of Switzerland, you are in the obligation to care, and as well the President of the Parliament of Vaud, receiving a copy of this letter, has this duty. The guilty magistrates want to retract from the circulation those who do have the courage and the merit to denounce there misdeeds. It is indeed a perversity that the same multi recidivist Judges, who we know from many other judiciary crimes , dear to deal with court cases concerning members of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, for exploiting an opportunity for revenge and to cover up the truth. The Parliaments have exercised finally their constitutional duty which is obliging them to survey the courts, and to have the judiciary criminals pursued.

**The scandal of the couple Russell is that trial fraud which went too far!**

Respectfully

Gerhard ULRICH, President of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE

Danielle RUSSELL provided me on Tuesday evening, November 7, 2006 at 6.20 p.m. by secured e-mail with new information:

*«This morning, Friday, November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2006 Reto BARBLAN has been interrogated as witness in my absence. He made a strong impression on the court. WINZAP has asked him, if the term intentional deceit was not an exaggeration and Reto has denied. When one is committing an unintentional mistake of appreciation a first time, one will not persist a second time. He said that the scales had been falsified intentionally. The substitute of the Prosecutor has mentioned the law RPE, which is allowing a height of buildings of 12 m, and Reto has replied that that was correct, however that there was as well article 4 RPE, stipulating that buildings could only be reconstructed according to the existing measures. This article determined the issue in this case, since it concerned a reconstruction. In consequence, the concerned building had been elevated illegally by one floor, respectively 2 m, although the administrative court had prohibited earlier an elevation of 1.60 m.»*

As I had predicted already on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2006 WINZAP had deceived Mrs. RUSSELL. Since he could interrogate the witness in her absence, she had no opportunity to request the declarations to be retained in the minutes of this determining witnessing. Indeed, in the judgement of WINZAP of November 24, 2006 (on page 28 out of a total of 289 pages) on is reading just the following empty verbalization:

*«Reto BARBLAN, 1946, géomètre breveté. Il est exhorté à dire la vérité. Le Ministère public produit le Règlement sur le plan de zones et la police des constructions. L'audition de Reto BARBLAN étant terminée, il se retire.»*

On October 25, 2006 Danielle RUSSELL had submitted for the trial records the detailed written report of the geometer BARBLAN, dated October 24, 2006, and Winzap has of course suppressed this evidence in his forthcoming judgement.

The other judiciary corruption case denounced by APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE concerned Birgit SAVIOZ, cheated in the sale of her real estate property at Sâles FR. See [www.worldcorruption.info/savioz.htm](http://www.worldcorruption.info/savioz.htm)

Birgit SAVIOZ had submitted to the court of the Tribunal WINZAP the notice of law of Professor Denis PIOTET, dated October 28, 2006, which had concluded as we had done that this sale of the property of Mrs. SAVIOZ had been illegal.

Of course, WINZAP ignored as well this legal advice of PIOTET.

The judgement of WINZAP is pretending on page 84, second last paragraph, «Toutes les accusations se sont relevées sans fondement». (all accusations – brought forward by APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE – have turned out to be unjustified). This is the nicely faked procedural truth, which could be obtained by suppressing the witnessing of the geometer Reto BARBLAN (see above) and the legal advice of the professor Denis PIOTET.

The affairs Birgit SAVIOZ and Danielle RUSSELL had been in the centre of the attention in this show trial, since

- a) 9 out of 15 plaintiffs were concerned by those denouncements.
- b) Birgit SAVIOZ and Danielle RUSSELL have been convicted in court as members of the committee of our civic action group.

On page 60 of his judgement, WINZAP had confirmed it himself: «Deux affaires ont eu un retentissement plus important que les autres, soit celle relative à Danielle RUSSELL d'une part et celle relative à Birgit SAVIOZ d'autre part.»

The court of WINZAP has been provided very well with the evidences, that APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE had denounced those cases rightfully.

**Conclusion: We are in the presence of a monstrous judiciary fraud.**

WINZAP did condemn us with exemplary sentences that is to say without any moderation. 6 activists of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE were condemned to suspended prison sentences going from 1 to 9 months. Marc-Etienne BURDET was knocked down with 18 months in prison firm and Gerhard ULRICH was gratified with firm 21 month imprisonment. In addition, WINZAP charged us with the judiciary costs and allocated to the abusive plaintiffs generous allowances for the so called moral damages. He ordered his judgment dispositive, i.e. his disinformation to be published in various daily newspapers of French speaking Switzerland. The objective has been achieved: the repression of the freedom of expression.

WINZAP did not limit himself to condemn us for infringements to honour (defamation, qualified slander). The public opinion would not have understood the heaviness of the sentences. For exhibiting us to be dangerous, he charged us

in addition with offenses of violence which we had not committed. In my case, he condemned me as well for attempted constraint and home invasion.

The penal investigation had been started by the cantonal investigating Judge **Françoise DESSAUX**. When the Lawyers from the canton of Fribourg started to accuse me of constraint, she countered by pointing out that the invitation in a flyer to a given Judge to abdicate because of his failures, is not a constraint. But when this file was taken over by her successor, the investigating Judge **Yves NICOLET**, this Magistrate eagerly picked up those fanciful complaints for constraint, and WINZAP hurried to condemn me for that law violation, although there existed no element on charge in the file.

Actually, 8 federal Judges have jointly lodged a complaint against me in August 2004, among others for alleged constraint. Let's be clear, that our actions at the residences of the federal Judges had been far more massive than those carried out at the homes of the Fribourg Lawyers. In spite of a one way instruction on charge and all the cheatings undertaken by the dark room of the nation (Federal Prosecutors' Office, Office of the federal investigating Judges), the Penal Federal Court was obliged to acquit me from the indictment of constraint on April 14, 2010. This is demonstrating that 8 federal Judges did not even know what constraint means on the penal level. See [www.swiss1.net/info/aap/forni](http://www.swiss1.net/info/aap/forni)

The condemnation pronounced by WINZAP for attempt of constraint was thus definitely abusive.

I am of the opinion that there was neither home invasion. Here the event which did serve as a pretext to stick to me this offense:

On February 20, 2003, we entered as a group of five persons in the lobby of the Federal Court, just for the time span to deliver orally the following protestation message: «APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE. **SCHUBARTH** has gone. That is a good thing. He has produced too many victims. We did come together with the spouses S., victims of **SCHUBARTH** and condemned to long prison sentences without proofs. **SCHUBARTH** did not want to hear them face to face as they had requested. He defeated them by way of correspondence. – The successor of **SCHUBARTH** as a President of the cassation court is **WIPRÄCHTIGER**, the same who has interrogated beforehand against **SCHUBARTH**. But **WIPRÄCHTIGER** is dysfunctioning according to the same pattern as

**SCHUBARTH:** He has rejected the demand of the couple S. to be heard face to face. The Federal Court is a retreat of lazy people and is presided by the perjurer liar **AEMISEGGER**. We re-vindicate all Federal Judges to be fired!»

Thereafter, we accepted to be complemented outside of the building by the security agent Remo MEIER. This event did result in a complaint by the Federal Court, dated March 27, 2003 for alleged home invasion.

By filling up my judiciary records with law infringements of non-committed violent acts, WINZAP did close the judicial ambush over me, because the public opinion was that way misinformed: The Swiss consider the judiciary records to be truthful. The Mass Media, devote to the regime, did willingly amplify this slander ex officio by WINZAP.

WINZAP has been compensated for his cheating feat, since a few months later, he was promoted to become Vaudois cantonal «Judge» for having stifled two heavy judiciary corruption cases, one in Vaud, and the other one in Fribourg. This is a form of corruption which is commonly applied by the Vaudois

The same WINZAP has equally fraudulent in the corruption affairs at the costs of Naghi GASHTIKHAH and of **Michèle HERZOG**. See *The Album of Dishonour*.

**Not the Members of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, condemned by WINZAP on November 24th, 2006 had infringed the honour of respectable persons. In the present case the professional slanderer ex officio was WINZAP.**

**Some victims of this Mafia Judge:**

Danielle RUSSELL

Birgit SAVIOZ

**Michèle HERZOG**

Naghi GASHTIKHAH

Marc-Etienne BURDET

Gerhard ULRICH

François LÉGERET

**List of references (observations collected since 2000):**

**Number of negative references: 9**

**Number of positive references: 1**

**Consequently, the author is legitimated to classify WINZAP in the category of corrupt Mafia Judges.**

## The European Court of Human Rights: a Fata Morgana

**Gerhard ULRICH**  
Avenue de Lonay 17  
CH-1110 Morges

All Links in red have been  
censored illegally by the  
Prosecutor Yves NICOLET, by  
secrete procedure.

*Mister Registrar*  
**European Court of Human Rights**  
*Council of Europe*  
*F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex*

*August 20, 2008*

### ***My enclosed request***

*Ladies and Gentlemen,*

*Enclosed I submit a request containing 16 documents, numbered from a) to p), with a total of 304 pages. I kindly ask you to confirm to have received the full file. Without reaction from your side, the sending is reputed to have arrived completely. This way, I prevent you from pretending one day wrongly, not to be in possession of all necessary documents.*

*I draw your esteemed attention to the fact that I have earmarked quite a great number of your Judges on [www.swissjustice.net/references/ref\\_av-juges/cedh-f.pdf](http://www.swissjustice.net/references/ref_av-juges/cedh-f.pdf), for denouncing their misdeeds in other judiciary files which I have studied. Consequently, it would be advisable that the concerned refrain from dealing with this file, if your Court wants to preserve the claim to be impartial.*

*Furthermore, I request that the European Court of Human Rights shall deliver a duly motivated decision, and to refrain from making use of its well-known unpalatable habit to dismiss the complaint by a one page letter containing a prefabricated standard text module pretending summarily and untruthfully that the conditions according to articles 34 and 35 ECHR were not fulfilled. Up to date, this practice is making your Court to be worldwide the most monumental injustice factory. However, there is always a hope for more promising tomorrow left!*

*Awaiting your news, I remain, Ladies and Gentlemen, with respectful regards*

**Gerhard ULRICH**

*Enclosures: mentioned*

# EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Council of Europe  
Strasbourg – France

## REQUEST

Presented in application of the article 34 of the European Convention of Human Rights, as well as articles 45 and 47 of the Regulations of the Court

**Important:** The present request is a judiciary document and may affect your rights and obligations

## I. THE PARTIES

### A. THE APPLICANT

(Information to be provided concerning the applicant and his/her possible representative)

- |     |                                           |                                      |
|-----|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1.  | Family name                               | ULRICH                               |
| 2.  | First name(s)                             | Gerhard                              |
|     | Gender                                    | male                                 |
| 3.  | Nationality                               | Swiss                                |
| 4.  | Profession                                | Ing. ETS                             |
| 5.  | Date and place of birth                   | 16.12.1944<br>Winterthur ZH/CH       |
| 6.  | Home address                              | Avenue de Lonay 17<br>CH-1110 Morges |
| 7.  | Phone No                                  | 0041 21 801 22 88                    |
| 8.  | Present address (if different from 6.)    |                                      |
| 9.  | Name and first name of the representative |                                      |
| 10. | Profession of the representative          |                                      |
| 11. | Address of the representative             |                                      |
| 12. | Phone/Fax no                              |                                      |

### B. THE HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES

(Indicate thereafter the name of the State(s) against which the request is directed.)

13. Switzerland

\* If the applicant is represented, join the procuration of the applicant in favour of the representative.

## II. ACCOUNT OF THE FACTS

(See chapter II of the explanatory notice)

### **Preliminary account**

The present request will be published on line, together with all documents of the file under several Internet addresses, see

[www.appel-au-people.org](http://www.appel-au-people.org)                      [www.swissjustice.net](http://www.swissjustice.net)

[www.euro-justiz.org](http://www.euro-justiz.org) *etc, etc.*

In that way, in case of refusal from your side, your doubtful practice to destroy the files of the applicants (= falsification of History) will not be lost in reality by the Historians.

A bunch of other portals of Internet, as [www.euro-justiz.org](http://www.euro-justiz.org) etc. will complete the ways of publication, which together with the search engines as [google.com](http://google.com) and other devices of conservation of memory will grant a historic record for fifty years at least, granting thus the non-disappearance of the contents.

I inform you in addition that the Swiss regime did once more practice the brutal censorship for making disappear the Internet Sites in question; here it is made reference in this context of the publications of the following third party organizations:

- [www.heise.de/newsticker/Erneut-Website-Sperrungen-in-der-Schweiz--/meldung/37534](http://www.heise.de/newsticker/Erneut-Website-Sperrungen-in-der-Schweiz--/meldung/37534)
- [www.mail-archive.com/debate@lists.fitug.de/msg09791.html](http://www.mail-archive.com/debate@lists.fitug.de/msg09791.html)
- [www.euro-justiz.net/zensur0310.blick](http://www.euro-justiz.net/zensur0310.blick)
- [www.c9c.info/scandals/swiss/pctipp](http://www.c9c.info/scandals/swiss/pctipp)
- [www.c9c.info/scandals/swiss/heise0712](http://www.c9c.info/scandals/swiss/heise0712)
- [www.euro-justiz.net/zensur1207](http://www.euro-justiz.net/zensur1207)

14.

The applicant is a critic of the Swiss judiciary regime of the alleged Swiss «Constitutional State». He is denouncing the failures of the so called Lawyers, among others on Internet. See:

[www.appel-au-peuple.org](http://www.appel-au-peuple.org) [www.swissjustice.net](http://www.swissjustice.net) [www.euro-justiz.org](http://www.euro-justiz.org) etc.

Several criticized Lawyers did lodge penal complaints against the applicant, starting from August 31, 2001 onwards for alleged infringement of their honour. After an investigation on the one way road exclusively on charge, the investigating Judge of the canton of Vaud/CH had the applicant sent together with other fellow accused by decision of November 12, 2004 before the criminal court of the district court of Lausanne.

On August 10, 2004, the federal Judge **Hans WIPRÄCHTIGER** did constitute himself plaintiff against the applicant (document a) in connexion with another procedure. 12 other Officers of the Federal Court did do the same (document h).

On August 29, 2006 the Lawyer ex officio of the applicant has submitted to the criminal court a list of discharging witnesses to be summoned. (document b). **The court did not summon any witnesses.**

On October 4, 2006 this Lawyer requested the court to be released from his mandate, with the motivation that the bonds of trust were broken (document c).

On October 18, 2006 the applicant has requested by registered letter to get appointed another Lawyer ex officio, invoking article 6.3.c ECHR (document d). **The court of first instance ignored this request.**

October 30, 2006: Opening of the trial before the criminal court of Lausanne. **The applicant recalled that his request of October 18, 2006 has been ignored**, he renews his demand and requests to delay the trial, for being in a position to prepare the trial jointly with his new defender. The President ignores this request and is assigning a Lawyer ex officio to him **after the opening of the trial** and decides to carry on with the trial. **The applicant leaves the courtroom since his rights for an effective defence (article 6 ECHR) are violated.**

November 3, 2006: Second written request (confirming my request presented on October 30, 2006 to the court) for an effective defence submitted to the criminal court (document e), which has been equally ignored.

November 24, 2006: Condemnation by the first instance court, **violating my rights for an effective defence**, to 21 months in prison firm (document f).

The analysis is demonstrating an obvious judiciary fraud of this judgment (document g).

December 21, 2006: Recourse within the deadline to the cantonal court

February 23, 2007: 40 days after having taken notice of the complaints of 13 Officers of the Federal Court, the applicant submits a motivated demand of challenge of all federal Judges (document h). This request, of which the Federal Court has received a copy, has been ignored up to date. It is concerning another procedure. However, partiality is not related to a given procedure, but well inherent to the relations of the applicant with the federal Judges in exercise.

June 21, 2007: Judgement of the cantonal court (2<sup>nd</sup> instance), confirming the judgement of the 1st instance, violating thus my rights for an effective defence. (document i)

October 1st, 2007: Recourse within the deadlines to the Swiss Federal Court (document j)

February 22, 2008: Decision of the Federal Court (ATF), notified on March 5, 2008 (document k)

April 21, 2008: Request for a revision formulated by my Lawyer ex officio (document l)

May, 28, 2008: Refusal of the revision request by the Federal Court (document m)

June 18, 2008: Revision request of the ATF of May 28, 2008 = 2<sup>nd</sup> revision request of February 22, 2008 (document n)

July 8, 2008: Refusal of the 2<sup>nd</sup> revision request by the Federal Court (document o)

July 31st, 2008: Revision request of the ATF of July 8, 2008 = 3<sup>rd</sup> revision request of the ATF of February 22, 2008 (document p). Decision pending.

This procedure is documented in more detail on Internet:

[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118-fr.html](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118-fr.html)

[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118\\_dt.html](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118_dt.html)

If necessary, continue on a separate sheet of paper

### III. ACCOUNT OF THE VIOLATIONS OF THE ECHR AND/OR THE RELATED MINUTES, AS WELL AS THE ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT

(See chapter III of the explanatory notice.)

15.

According to article 6 ECHR every accused has the right to have summoned exculpatory witnesses, and to interrogate them. As a matter of fact, my Lawyer ex officio has submitted to the court a list of witnesses to be summoned on August 29, 2006 (document b). **None of those witnesses has been summoned. This is clearly violating many rights granted by article 6 .3 d ECHR.** The ATF 6F\_2/2008/rod of May 28, 2008 (document m) is invoking wrongly a jurisprudence of the Federal Court for insinuating the opposite: the ECHR as an international treaty overrules the national jurisprudence. The right to have exculpatory witnesses summoned to court and to interrogate them is absolute.

On October 4, 2006 my lawyer ex officio requested the court to be released from his mandate (document c). On October 18, 2006, I submitted to the court my request to be allocated a new Lawyer ex officio (document d). I renewed my written request to obtain an effective defence according to art. 6 ECHR on November 3, 2006, after the opening of the trial (document e).

The 2 requests were ignored. The violation of my right to be heard was doubled by reiterated denials of justice. Article 6 ECHR is granting to any accused to be assisted by a Lawyer, and if necessary by a Lawyer ex officio who is trusted by his client. **Having ignored my 2 written requests for the designation of a new Lawyer ex officio, the criminal court of the district court of Lausanne has consequently violated article 6 .1 ECHR on that point.**

The ATF 6B\_592/2007/rod dated of February 22, 2008, ATF 6F\_2/2008/rod of May 28, 2008 and ATF 6F\_7/2008/rod of July 8, 2008 (documents k, m and o) omit to assess the submitted evidences concerning this topic in my recourse of October 1st, 2007 (document j), respectively my revision requests of April 21st, 2008 and June 18, 2008 (documents l and n). This is in contradiction with the rules of good faith.

Article 6 ECHR is granting furthermore to any accused to dispose of enough time for preparing his trial. However, the first instance court, ignoring simply my written requests of October 18, 2006 (document d) and November 3rd, 2006 (document e) to get a new defender assigned, after the resignation request of my former Lawyer – the court assigned to me a Lawyer ex officio **after the opening of the trial** (document f, page 8). Evidently, I did not have the time to prepare me for the trial together with this unknown Lawyer prior to the trial. **This violates article 6.3 b ECHR.** The Federal Court did make use to the lie by omission - intentionally, for spreading that argument, however invoked with supporting evidences (documents j, l and n), violating in that way the rules of good faith as well on that point.

**For this triple reason, the applicant did not have a fair trial according to the ECHR, what he had invoked in his recourse of October 1st, 2007 to the Swiss Federal Court (document j, page 2).** In addition, my challenge request against the members of the Federal Court (document h) was ignored. One of the federal Judges, **Hans WIPRÄCHTIGER**, who did constitute himself as a plaintiff against the applicant (document a) even presided the court which did deliver the fateful ATF 6B\_592/2007/rod and ATF 6F\_2/2008/rod. **By this manoeuvre my right to deal with an impartial court according art. 6.1 ECHR was violated at the supreme national judiciary level. With all these actions, Switzerland did violate article 34 ECHR, since she did engage not to hamper by any measures the efficient exercise of the international law/treaty.**

**The conditions of admissibility according to article 35 ECHR are obviously fulfilled. The national legal means of objection have been exhausted, and this request is submitted within the deadline of 6 months after notification of the last definite internal decision. The request is not anonymous, and no other action has been submitted earlier to the ECHR concerning this same procedure. The request is well founded and not abusive.**

#### **IV. ACCOUNT RELATED TO PRESCRIPTIONS OF ARTICLE 35 § 1 OF THE CONVENTION**

(See chapter IV of the explanatory notice. For each grievance, give if need be on a separate sheet of paper the requested information under points 16 to 18 below)

16. Definitive internal decision (date and nature of the decision, organ – judiciary and others having pronounced it)

The last internal definite decision was pronounced by the Swiss Federal Court by ATF (Arrêt du Tribunal fédéral) 6B\_592/2007/rod dated February 22nd, 2008, and notified on March 5, 2008 (**document k**), confirming the judgments of 1st and 2<sup>nd</sup> instance, (documents f and i) which are violating my rights for an effective defence according to article 6 ECHR.

**This decision is applying for determining the admissibility of this request.**

This applies to all specified grievances.

This decision of the Federal Court is practicing the lie by omission. By ignoring:

- The letter of my former Lawyer ex officio Urs SAAL of August 29, 2006, submitting a list of witnesses to be summoned to court (**document b**)
- The letter of Lawyer U. SAAL of October 4, 2006, requesting to be released from his mandate (**document c**)
- My first request to be granted an effective defence of October 18, 2006 (**document d**)
- My second request of November 3, 2006 for an effective defence (**document e**)

If the Supreme Court of the country is lying deliberately, the legal means of appeal are annihilated. By these manoeuvres of bad faith, our Federal Court is not any longer a reference, but an instance of decline.

17. Other decisions (enumerated in the chronological order by indicating for each decision its date, its nature and the organ – judiciary or other – having pronounced it)

As a matter of fact, I did submit subsequently 3 revision requests to the Swiss Federal Court, since their definite internal decision of February 22nd, 2008 is evidently deviating from the truth.

I enclose the 3 revision requests (**documents l, n and p**) dated April 21st, 2008, June 18, 2008 and July 23rd, 2008, as well as the 2 first negative decisions of the Federal Court in this context, dated May 28, 2008, respectively July 8, 2008 – the 3rd revision request has not yet been decided (**documents m and o**).

18. Did you dispose of an option of appeal which you did not exploit? If yes, what kind of contestation was it, and why was it not exploited?

No. I did exhaust all possibilities of contestation here in Switzerland.

If necessary, add another sheet of paper.

## **V. ACCOUNT OF THE OBJECT OF THE REQUEST AND PROVISIONAL PRETENSIONS FOR A FAIR SATISFACTION**

(See chapter V of the explanatory notice)

19.

I request from the European Court of Human Rights to recognize that Switzerland has violated my rights to have a fair trial (= effective defence), and to condemn Switzerland for this violation of Human Rights.

It goes without saying that I expect from the European Court of Human Rights that it will invite Switzerland to repair the caused damages, that is to say to cancel the condemnation of November 24, 2006, having become definite and enforceable by the decision of the Federal Court 6B\_592/2007/rod of 22nd, 2008 and to allocate to me an adequate sum for the suffered moral and material prejudice.

Alternatively, I ask the European Court of Human Rights to demand Switzerland to pronounce the restoring of the suspensive effect of the pronounced imprisonment sentence.

## **VI. OTHER INTERNATIONAL INSTANCES DEALING OR HAVING DEALT WITH THE AFFAIR**

(See chapter VI of the explanatory notice)

20. Did you submit to another international instance of inquiry or relementation the given grievances in this request? If yes, display the detailed indications on that topic.

No. I did not refer to any other international instance.

## VII. ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS

**(NO ORIGINALS,  
ONLY COPIES)**

(See chapter VII of the explanatory notice. Join copies of any mentioned decision under Point. IV and VI above. If need be, obtain the necessary copies, and in the case that this is impossible, explain why these documents cannot be obtained. These documents will not be returned to you.)

21. a) Complaint of the federal Judge Hans WIPRÄCHTIGER against the applicant  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/CH1000/PROJET\\_1/2004-08-10wipraechtiger.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/CH1000/PROJET_1/2004-08-10wipraechtiger.htm)  
This complaint has been addressed to the Prosecutors' Office of the Confederation (document g)
- b) Letter of my former Lawyer ex officio Urs SAAL of August 29, 2006, submitting a list of witnesses to be summoned to court  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118\\_tf/2006-08-29\\_requete\\_Saal\\_a\\_Winzip\\_citation\\_temoins.html](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118_tf/2006-08-29_requete_Saal_a_Winzip_citation_temoins.html)
- c) Letter of Lawyer U. SAAL, requesting to be released from his mandate, of October 4, 2006  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/2006-10-04\\_Saal\\_relev\\_mandat.pdf](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/2006-10-04_Saal_relev_mandat.pdf)
- d) My first request for an effective defence of October 18, 2006  
[www.swissjustice.net/id/winzip-181006](http://www.swissjustice.net/id/winzip-181006)
- e) My second request for an effective defence of November 3rd, 2006  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/2006-11-03winzip.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/2006-11-03winzip.htm)
- f) Judgment of the first instance of 24.11.06  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118\\_tf/2006-11-24winzip.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118_tf/2006-11-24winzip.htm)
- g) Analysis of the judgment WINZIP of October 1st, 2007  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118\\_tf/2007-10-01analysejugementwinzip.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118_tf/2007-10-01analysejugementwinzip.htm)
- h) Challenge request against all Members of the Federal Court  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/CH1000/PROJET\\_1/2007-02-23zingle-d.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/CH1000/PROJET_1/2007-02-23zingle-d.htm)
- i) Judgment of the 2nd instance (cantonal court VD) of June 21st, 2007  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118\\_tf/2007-06-21montmollin.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118_tf/2007-06-21montmollin.htm)
- j) Recourse to the Federal Court of October 1st, 2007  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118\\_tf/2007-10-01recoursmontmollin.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118_tf/2007-10-01recoursmontmollin.htm)
- k) ATF 6B\_592/2007/rod date of February 22nd, 2008  
[www.swissjustice.net/repression/tf/ulrich-tf080222.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/repression/tf/ulrich-tf080222.htm)
- l) Revision request of April 21st. 2008  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118bis/Demande\\_de\\_revision\\_21\\_04\\_08.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118bis/Demande_de_revision_21_04_08.htm)
- m) ATF 6F\_2/2008/rod of May 28, 2008  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118bis/2008-05-28\\_ATF\\_Wipraechtiger\\_revision.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118bis/2008-05-28_ATF_Wipraechtiger_revision.htm)
- n) Revision request of June 18, 2008  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118bis/2008-06-18\\_Requete\\_Revision\\_ATF2008-05-28-f.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118bis/2008-06-18_Requete_Revision_ATF2008-05-28-f.htm)  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118bis/2008-06-18\\_Requete\\_Revision\\_ATF2008-05-28-d.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118bis/2008-06-18_Requete_Revision_ATF2008-05-28-d.htm)
- o) ATF 6F\_7/2008/rod of July 8, 2008  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118bis/2008-07-08ATF6F2008-rod.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118bis/2008-07-08ATF6F2008-rod.htm)
- p) Revision request of July 23, 2008  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118bis/2008-07-23\\_3eme\\_requete\\_revision\\_ATF2008-02-22-f.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118bis/2008-07-23_3eme_requete_revision_ATF2008-02-22-f.htm)  
[www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118\\_juges\\_av\\_c\\_aap/vd118bis/2008-07-23\\_3eme\\_requete\\_revision\\_ATF2008-02-22-d.htm](http://www.swissjustice.net/fr/affaires/vd118_juges_av_c_aap/vd118bis/2008-07-23_3eme_requete_revision_ATF2008-02-22-d.htm)  
The Federal Court has requested to remake this request «with a minimum of correctness which one may expect from any citizen ». This has been done on July 31, 2008, expressing the explicit hope that the Federal Court shall have a minimum of correctness which any citizen may expect from his Judges, that is to say to refrain from lying deliberately. This rewritten request has an identical content as the one of July 23rd, 2008, but has not been published on Internet for avoiding confusion. .

These documents are numbered strictly in the chronological sequence.

## **VIII. DECLARATION AND SIGNATURE**

(See chapter VIII of the explanatory notice)

I declare fully conscientiously and with loyalty that the information presented on the presented forms of the request are true.

Place and date

Morges, August 20, 2008

(Signature of the applicant

Or his/her representative

Gerhard Ulrich

# The text module from the ECHR was all what I got back

– 4 years and 4 months later.



Monsieur Gerhard ULRICH  
Avenue de Lonay 17  
CH - 1110 MORGES

CEDH-LF11.00R  
DAR/VRE/elf

Strasbourg, le 13 décembre 2012

**Requête n° 40795/08**  
**Ulrich c. Suisse**

Monsieur,

Je me réfère à votre requête introduite le 20 août 2008 et enregistrée sous le numéro susmentionné.

Je porte à votre connaissance que la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme, siégeant entre le 22 novembre 2012 et le 6 décembre 2012 en formation de juge unique (N. Vučinić assisté d'un rapporteur conformément à l'article 24 § 2 de la Convention), a décidé de déclarer votre requête irrecevable. Cette décision a été rendue à cette dernière date.

Compte tenu de l'ensemble des éléments en sa possession et dans la mesure où elle est compétente pour connaître des allégations formulées, la Cour a estimé que les conditions de recevabilité prévues par les articles 34 et 35 de la Convention n'ont pas été remplies.

Cette décision est définitive. Elle n'est susceptible d'aucun recours que ce soit devant la Grande Chambre ou un autre organe. Le greffe ne sera pas en mesure de vous fournir d'autres précisions sur la décision du juge unique. Dès lors, vous ne recevrez plus de lettres de la Cour concernant cette requête. Conformément aux directives de la Cour, votre dossier sera détruit dans le délai d'un an à compter de la date de la décision.

La présente communication vous est faite en application de l'article 52 A du règlement de la Cour.

Veillez agréer, Monsieur, mes salutations distinguées.

Pour la Cour



D. Rietker  
Référéndaire

## **Other books from the same author**

*Erinnerungen eines 44ers*

*Kindheit und Jugend eines Rebellen*

**1944 - 1964**

671 pages

Available only in German on USB stick for the price of CHF 20.-

*Betrayed by the own Judges*

*Memoirs of the «Nightmare of the Judges» Gerhard ULRICH*

**2000 – 2015**

405 pages, available as French and German versions on USB stick for the price of CHF 20.-

*The scandalous condemnation of Laurent SÉGALAT or*

*The Unmasked «Constitutional State»*

271 pages, available on USB stick for the Price of CHF 20.-

Printed versions available of the French and German version for CHF 30.-

The english version is available as well on Amazon at the price of US\$ 9.99.

*The judiciary crime at the costs of François LÉGERET or*

*The Album of Dishonour*

311 pages, versions in French and German available as well on USB stick for the price of CHF 20.-



The author Gerhard ULRICH, September 2015

## **The author, Gerhard ULRICH**

had accomplished a professional career and the path of an ordinary citizen when he was confronted, at the age of 55, with the betrayal of the judges of his own country. He accepted the challenge and founded the citizen's initiative APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, whose aim is to clean up the judiciary apparatus. This is in much need of a control from the outside.

The author brings to nothing the pretensions of impartiality claims formulated by the corporation of judges and their henchmen. He keeps an eye on the very real judiciary banditry in the alleged constitutional state of Switzerland, which is implicitly covered up by the Helvetian scheming of politics and of the media. He compares the current legal system with an outdated Soviet model. He benefits from the experience of a long nonviolent and disinterested struggle against judicial arbitrariness, all the while drawing on his voluminous and rich archives. His nonviolent criticism against judges and prosecutors attracted their blind hatred for him. They made his civil trial (divorce) last for 10 years, they dispossessed him and «rewarded» him with twelve criminal trials, which earned him a total of four years of imprisonment. This brain wash has left no trace within him. The man feels no bitterness, although his reputation was dragged through the mud by the concentrated power of the media.

The author has spent over 10'000 hours studying questionable legal records. By that way, he acquired expertise in this domain. In the present case, he publishes a non-fiction book which does away with the politically correct. This concerns one of the most current judicial crimes committed by the Vaudois / Helvetians.

Gerhard ULRICH feels very strongly attached to his people – the Helvetii – but his fate has forced him to become a dissident of his own country