

Gerhard ULRICH of Guntalingen
Avenue de Lonay 17
CH-1110 Morges

May 31st, 2018



Court of Nyon

Lionel GUIGNARD, «Judge»
Tribunal d'arrondissement
de la Côte
Route de St-Cergue 38

CH-1260 Nyon

PE11.011617-LGN/mpd – *TINGUELY* c/ ULRICH
Event of May 31, 2018 in front of your tables
Requests to obtain incident decisions

To you, Lionel GUIGNARD,

*This file cannot be dissociated from the fraud affair committed by **TINGUELY** at the costs of Birgit SAVIOZ : www.worldcorruption.info/savioz.htm*

*It is a farce to invoke **WINZAP**'s forged judiciary truth of *november 24, 2006*; it is a falsification de facto. It has been evidenced that we have said the truth, overshadowed by **WINZAP**.*

*This is the world upside down: The crook **TINGUELY** comes here as plaintiff, and those who have denounced his crimes by civism are indicted.*

I present my requests to obtain incident decisions in free speech, as well as in writing. The written version is binding and has to be fully intergrated in the judgement to be. I ask you to note this latter sentence in the minutes.

Requests :

- 1. Reply to my demand of transparency*
- 2. Your challenge, Lionel GUIGNARD*
- 3. Audio-visual recording of the debates*
- 4. Unseal the document 154 (mail exchange between **TINGUELY** and the hoster of my former Websites, c9c)*
- 5. Psychiatric expertise of **TINGUELY***
- 6. Postpone the trial/immediate arrest of **TINGUELY***

Plea

1. Reply to my demand of transparency

*By mail/letter of [May 21st, 2018](#) I submitted to the court and to the plaintiff a catalogue of 20 questions. Neither **TINGUELY** nor GUIGNARD did take a position with regard to my allegations.*

According to the constant practice of German courts, substantially uncontested allegations submitted by a party ought to be respected by the court as granted. It is pure Cartesian logic.

*Consequently, it has been substantiated that the dishonest plaintiff **TINGUELY** is benefitting since 16 years of impunity, thanks to the plot of the system. **Qui bono ?***

*In October 2010, **TINGUELY** has been whyning credibly in front of the court of **PELLET** that our denunciations had ruined his business. As a matter of fact, he earned with his fury the reset on line of the file **SAVIOZ** by Marc-Etienne BURDET in May 2016. It was thus counterproductive for him. Who is benefitting of the crime ? **TINGUELY** is the instrument of the system. He succeeded to have his opponents withdrawn from circulation and to impose the illegal censorship of the Internet. See:*

www.worldcorruption.info/index_htm_files/gu_nicolet-e.pdf

www.worldcorruption.info/index_htm_files/gu_2016-10-11_cottier_censure-e.pdf

Result: That measureless repression of the freedom of expression did benefit to all criticized lawyers, including you, Lionel GUIGNARD.

*Neither GUIGNARD nor **TINGUELY** did react upon my concluding questions of [May 21st, 2018](#):*

*«How to explain (...) the success (of **TINGUELY**) to obtain unlawful favors in a row from the judiciary apparatus? If it is not due to your connexions via the secret societies, what other answers can you present to explain this persisting dysfunctioning in your favour, lasting since 16 years?»*

The court has thus to respect my allegation according to which «Such an accumulation of complicity is excluding to be at random: we are undoubtedly in presence of a plot.»

In these circumstances it is just natural that I have the right for transparency.

*I request from the «Judge» Lionel GUIGNARD and the wrong plaintiff **Michel TINGUELY** to fill in and sign the form Demand of transparency (see following page).*

Demand of transparency

The undersigned declares on his/her honor to belong yes or no to the following secret societies:

<i>Secret societies</i>	<i>Yes*</i>	<i>No*</i>
<i>Freemasonry</i>		
<i>Scientology</i>		
<i>Darbists</i>		
<i>Rotary Club</i>		
<i>Lions Club</i>		
<i>Kiwanis Club</i>		
<i>Ambassador Club</i>		
<i>Zofingers</i>		
<i>Opus Dei</i>		
<i>Secret services – specify the country:</i>		
<i>Other</i>		

**Tick as correspondign with the reality.*

Contact information

<i>Family name</i>	
<i>First name</i>	
<i>Position</i>	
<i>Office/town</i>	

Date

Signature

2. Your challenge, Lionel GUIGNARD

In the case, if you, Lionel GUIGNARD shall sign said form, this request will become obsolete. If not, you ought to challenge yourself, since there will be obviously a conflict of interests. Your interest and that one of your corporation is to lavish me with the next salami slice – additional 60 day-fines = 2 months in jail, during which I will be muzzed.

Considering the facts alleged under point 1, such a refusal will have to be interpreted as a violation of article 6 of the European Convention of Human Rights: my right to have an independant and neutral court.

3. Audio-visual recording of the debates

No reasonable argument exists to refuse it. Our tyrants are repeating that the Procedural Code does not foresee it. This is a defect of the system, benefitting unilaterally to the cheaters. The superior instances cannot really check the job performed by the first Judges. The minutes are rudimentary and are not reflecting what has been said and heard in the courts.

However, one is admitting it in certain cases, even in Swiss courts. For what reason does one accept it in those cases and not for ever? All citizens are equal in front of the law.

***Immanuel KANT** has established the catoric imperative according to which any pretention of justice is subject to publicity. The modern technology of audio-visual recordings are granting that publicity, at very modest costs. When the parties would obtain such video copies, they could reproduce the impact of publicity anytime afterwards. Anyway, we are permanantly monitored everywere by these technics. Only the Judges want to avoid such efficients surveys. A Judge who has nothing to hide will be happy to review after an audience quietly once more the audio-visual recording. This allows him to recheck the flow of the audience. Can you object anything to this logic?*

Et ceterum censeo: The European courts have to reach eventually the reality of modern times, and benefit immediatly of the opportunities which the available technology is offering – to film / record the audiences. I request it in the present case.

4. Unseal the document 154 (mail exchange between **TINGUELY and the hosting provider of my former Websites, c9c)**

*This request is standing in the center of my action. See point 8 and 9 of my catalog of questions dated **May 21st, 2018**.*

*By letter of **December 5, 2011**, **TINGUELY** has submitted forged evidences. I quote the uncontested allegation, recognized as validated of **May 5, 2018**:*

«On **December 5, 2011**, (**TINGUELY**) sent to **NICOLET** 3 sheets of an alleged correspondance with c9c. On the first one, the date of Dec.5, 2011 is printed in the page footer. This cannot be the alleged correspondance (which would have to be dated of November 2010), but a sheet edited at the moment of the preparation of the letter sent to **NICOLET**. On the second and third sheet, you find under « Sent » the hours "20:01" and "20:07" – no date at all. It is obvious that it is a clumsy forging. A Website Hoster would never ommit to specify the date of his dispatched mails. »

*Evidence: attached letter of **TINGUELY** of **December 5, 2011**.*

*Herewith it is evidenced that **TINGUELY** is a forger, a white collar criminal, benefitting from the plot with his fellows. These forgeries are not prescribed and ought to be prosecuted ex officio.*

*In January 2011 I managed to have the mail exchange between **TINGUELY** and the hosting provider of my former Websites, c9c sequestered. Ambushed, he requested instantly these evidences on his charge to be sealed, with the lousy excuse to have to protect the Lawyers' secret. I did constantly request the unsealing. Evidence: in the file. Because of the complicity of the judiciary apparatus with **TINGUELY**, I earned but denials of justice. At a certain point, I decided to be patient, and to demonstrate this lasting dysfunctioning publically during the coming trial.*

Today, I file a complaint for denial of justice, and I request the unsealing of the document 154.

One has to expect you to find in your wizard hat scatterbrained pearls of jurisprudence for evacuating this request, e.g.:

- a) The Judge can renounce to examine witnessings/documents, if he has acquired by anticipated appreciation without arbitrariness the firm conviction ...
- b) The accused did not present this request at the time, he was called to the court. His request comes thus too late.

It is the top of a nonsense to appreciate something in anticipation which is unknown. Complaints for denial of justice do not have a deadline.

5. Psychiatric expertise of *TINGUELY*

*For not having contested my allegations under points 2 and 12 of my catalog of questions of **May 21st, 2018**, they are deemed to be accepted.*

Anyway, one would confine anybody in a psychiatric hospital who is shouting in court:

«Since 5 years I refrain from using my army pistol!»

«You shut down those sites or there will be deads (...)!»

*Only the instrument of the system, **TINGUELY** is getting an exemption. This is a guilty irresponsibility of those Vaudois and Federal Magistrates who did stifle the corresponding penal complaints.*

TINGUELY *remains a risk for the society, in spite or because of the impunity granted to him by his accomplices within the judiciary apparatus. My request for a psychiatric expertise is fully justified.*

6. Postponing the trial / immediate arrest of *TINGUELY*

*This trial has to be postponed, since I have the right to get the document 154 unsealed, evidencing the lies of **TINGUELY**. His forgeries are evidenced by the attached document, i.e. the letter of **TINGUELY** plus enclosures of **December 5, 2011**.*

Obviously there remains the option to have **TINGUELY** put immediatly in pretrial custody, and to acquit me from this umpteenth abusive complaint of a common criminal.

Motivation:

*Your court has to respect my conclusive allegation of **May 21st, 2018**, deemed to be accepted, according to which **TINGUELY** is convicted of frauding, lying, to the judiciary authorities, forgery, threats of death, abuse of rights....*

May 31st, 2018

Gerhard ULRICH of Guntalingen

*Enclosure: Forgery of **TINGUELY** of **December 5, 2011***