

***Report of the appeal trial of Stan MAILLAUD, æ
famous child-abuse whistleblower,
at the Court of Appeal of Poitiers, on June 19, 2020***



The couple Janett SEEMANN + Stan MAILLAUD

www.youtube.com/watch?v=2y1ENHLVrhQ&feature=youtu.be
(video concerning this trial in French – 27 ½ minutes)

Resume and conclusions

Janett SEEMANN and Stan MAILLAUD have been alerting against paedo-satanic networks for years. Their struggle started in 2006, with the Vincent affair, (see Stan's book on the Internet: « L'affaire Vincent, au cœur du terrorisme d'Etat »). Their goal in life is to investigate and expose these crimes, especially in French-speaking territories. They have become the enemies to be shot down for the judiciary, gang-ridden by paedo-criminals in top positions.

In September 2012, Stan escaped a police check (a trap set for him) in Franche-Comté, because he had wanted since 2006 to save little Vincent.

When police failed to catch Stan, they incarcerated his wife Janett in October 2012 on the charge of « conspiracy to abduct minors ». When she was released from prison (provisional liberty, awaiting trial, threatened with 10 years in prison) Janett and Stan found each other again and since 2013 both have been living in the underground. They escaped from France to Venezuela in search of solutions for abused children, where Stan was finally arrested and extradited to France (in July 2019). In fact, it was not a legal extradition. Interpol simply kidnapped Stan, without waiting for the decision of the Venezuelan Supreme Court of Justice. This appeal is still pending.

At the end of January 2020, he was sentenced by the Court of Saintes (Charente Maritime) for alleged membership to a « criminal association with a view to child abduction » to 4 years in prison. Janett currently lives in Germany.

On Friday, June 19, 2020 Stan's appeal trial took place before the Court of Appeal of Poitiers, with a strong mobilization of their supporters. Only about fifteen were admitted to the Court room.

What they heard during this long audience proves with certainty Stan's good faith and innocence. If this trial had been filmed, Stan should have been absolutely acquitted. Alas, the brilliant pleas of his lawyers are nothing but bubbles of air, and the judges will put their procedural truth on paper. Will it be the truth at all? Banning cameras in the Court room is sabotaging the search for truth. That has to change. Also, judges should sign an affidavit on their honour, making it transparent whether they belong to secret societies or not. It is conceivable that trial observers could act as juries of citizens.... Justice must be controlled from the outside,

Guntalingen /Switzerland, June 29, 2020

*Gerhard ULRICH
International trial observer
Author of this report*

Trial report



The monumental Justice Palace of Poitiers

Youcef and I arrived at 8 a.m. in front of the entrance of the monumental Justice Palace in Poitiers. We met half a dozen other observers who had arrived before us. Around 8.30 a.m., we were fifteen on this terrace overlooking the green courtyard in front of the palace. The policemen then closed the front door at the foot of the stairs. We were informed that the President had strictly ordered that access to the Court room be limited to 15 people.



Observers who will be admitted to the audience

A cohort of gendarmes arrived in their service vehicles to reinforce their vanguard.



Arrival of the Police reinforcement

Then followed the usual safety check of the European Courts at the entrance, necessary because of the cowardice of the « magis-rats ». However, there was no identity check.

Waiting in the Salle des Pas Perdus.



The admitted observers wait for the beginning of the trial in the Salle des Pas Perdus.

At 9:10 a.m., the Court room opened. A huge hall, which can normally accommodate 80 people in the public - currently reduced to 40 seats due to the Corona hysteria.

The members of the Court are already on their seats.

Curiously, I counted 21 observers - 11 ladies and 10 men. The only journalist present was Vincent BUCHE from the «Sud Ouest». This enslaved journalist to the kings of the paedo-satanic networks will publish the next day a pamphlet in his News Paper. We have to assume that 6 plainclothes cops were ordered in to keep us in check. Only 6 people in the audience are wearing masks. Are these the 6 government servants incognito between us? Only a few uniformed cops in the room.

9:15 a.m.: President Didier DE SEQUEIRA opens the debates. His appearance is impeccable from head to toe, greying. Bass voice, but he will not exploit the volume of his voice. The 2 assessor judges are 2 young women, showing no emotions - inert.



Didier DE SEQUEIRA, President of the Appeal Court of Poitiers



*Thierry PHELIPPEAU
Prosecutor General at the
Appeal Court of Poitiers*



*Francesca SATTÀ,
Lawyer in Santes*

The place of the Prosecutor on our left is occupied by Thierry PHELIPPEAU, a man without profile, probably coming out of his hairdresser's shop. Hairline on the left. He has a small tenor voice.

On the same side, but closer to the people, sits the lawyer of the civil party, Francesca SATTÀ, representative of the plaintiff, that is to say of the incestuous father of the common daughter he had from the mother of the abused child, Sandrine GACHADOuat. The plaintiff did not have the courage to appear.



The defence lawyers of the accused's choice, Me Jean-Pierre JOSEPH (on the right) and François DANGLEHANT (on the left) are sitting on our right, in front of the accused's glass cage.



There's also a clerk, who doesn't seem too busy taking minutes.

In the dock in the centre of the room is the brave co-accused, Sylvie PEILLERON, who had lent her camper to accommodate Stan and Janett for a period of time.

9 :20 a.m.: Stan MAILLAUD enters the glass box, escorted by 6 gendarmes. Youcef stands up to present his tribute to this hero. The other observers follow his example. Stan MAILLAUD is a man in the prime of life, a slender, tanned athlete, well coiffed and dressed in a white T-shirt and beige trousers. He stands up straight. This grandson of the spokesman of the radio France libre de De Gaulle in London impresses by his physicak appearance. He does not seem to be overwhelmed by the procedure. Youcef and Stan greet each other at a distance by signs.*



Sylvie PEILLERON talks to Stan in his glass box during a break.

The President reads the indictment or the equivalent in relation to this procedure opened in September 2012, naming Janett SEEMANN and Sylvie PEILLERON as accomplices of Christian MAILLAUD, known as Stan. This is followed by a long

monologue by the President, presenting the case from the truncated perspective of the trial « judiciary ». Both defendants must stand up.

9:40 a.m.: The accused are graciously allowed to sit down.

The president continues his monologue. It seems that publications on the Internet pose a great problem for the seraglio.

10:20 a.m., beginning of the instruction.

From 10:40 a.m. onwards, Stan can tell his professional career. He has spent time in French Guiana and Reunion Island in the service of the French Republic. He resigned from the gendarmerie, after he had taken the defence of a woman, who had been gang-raped by 3 of his comrades, who were then covered by the hierarchy. He then entered the army service as a paratrooper.

After 3 minutes, the President interrupts him and monologues again for 3 minutes. And another interruption at 10:49 a.m.

At this point, Stan tells that tracking down child criminality became his specialty which he performed as a patriot.

10 :55 a.m. Break.

11:15 a.m. continuation

Stan tells about his time in the army. Soon a conflict arose with his superiors who resorted to false accusations. He resigned from the army.

In 2004 he founded his own security and protection agency, which was an economic success.

He recounts his misadventures in Madagascar.

*In a free, well-structured speech, he evokes various cases of child abuse. He quotes the names of the abusers and the magistrates who covered them by name, and spells out the precise dates with aplomb, with great eloquence. **His brain is running at high speed.***

Stan talks about the societal scourge caused by pedo-criminality and describes in detail the massive influence of Freemasonry to cover this cancer. «The big problem is justice that doesn't do justice, and covers up pedo-criminals. There is obstruction in the search for truth. Independent organizations are needed to prosecute these crimes. »

His story is gut-wrenching. The sincerity of the man is certain.

Then Stan goes through the trial procedure, linked to the networks of horror. He develops the approach which consists in identifying for the protective parents and in collecting and then publishing their testimonies on the Internet.

The President intervenes. Wants to know, if Stan would never have been plagued by doubts... His subsequent questions will be along the same lines. He insists on

it. This is showing the aims of the president. Stan confidently explains his technique of audio-visual recording.

The president asks again, if Stan would never have had any doubt. The respondent replies, «If I have the evidence, I will do everything I can to save the abused children. There will be magistrates who ought to be arrested.» He's assuming his liability. The President invokes the procedural truth, established by court judgment, which contradicts the findings of the accused.

The lawyer DANGLEHANT intervenes to present his client with a document in front of the box of the accused. After examination, Stan says that he recognises his signature, but denies being the author. « I do not see, how I would have done that. ». Riddle.

Stan complains of being exhausted. Following the visit of his lawyer Me JOSEPH the day before in prison, where the 2 men did not wear masks, he was sanctioned by chicane, and sent to the dungeon for 2 weeks. He complains of his untreated pains. Despite his fatigue, he is an energetic and self-confident man. He comes back to the topic and gets excited about denouncing the crime. Me DANGLEHANT intervenes to calm down. Stan adds that he congratulates himself for his publications on the Internet.

Me JOSEPH intervenes for the first time. He addresses the President: « Do you know the enormous number of abused young girls? ».

Brief intervention of the President to the accused: « On what elements did you base your statement? »

Stan is emotional, but in control. « I have them, the doubts, yes. »

He complains about the justice system's persecution of his wife, Janett, who was thrown in jail for four months. « She has done absolutely nothing illegal. If you want to put people in jail for their commitment, it's really dangerous. » A slight smile touches his face (in thoughts with his wife?).

He dismantles the indictment and vehemently protested that he was accused of being the founder of a criminal organization.

1:15 p.m.: Sylvie PEILLERON must stand up and defend herself. She calmly assumes what she has done for the right cause. She will not bend her knees

1:30 p.m.: The plaintiff's lawyer SATTA questions Ms PEILLERON. Me DANGLEHANT adds a question about a phone call transmitted « between accomplices ».

Then, the « Prosecutor » asks the accused the question:

« Why didn't you come forward after your partner's arrest, to show courage? »

Stan explains, that he wanted to do it, but that Janett had given him the message not to fall into this trap. This response obviously upsets PHELIPPEAU. Stan

blames the system for resorting to the illegal arrest of his wife. The «Prosecutor» gets carried away with saying that anything is o.k. when it comes to catching offenders. On this point, Stan asks, if that was the goal in the Outreau case: to incarcerate innocent people. PHELIPPEAU no longer answers.

The President wants to know again, if the defendant would never have had any doubts. «How do we know there was rape? How do we assess what the children say? »

Stan calmly tells that he doesn't claim to have a monopoly on the truth. In one case (the Vincent case), he had informed the police of his suspicions about the alleged rapist, but the police took no action. (This was clearly covering up a crime).

Me JOSEPH asks his client if the complainant had been marked by something in childhood related to child sexual abuse. Stan answers yes. According to the plaintiff's ex-wife Sandrine GACHADOAT, the father of the children had himself been abused as a child. Says that these victims often become abusers themselves.

1:45 til 2:30 p.m. Break

I ask my colleagues if there is or has been a journalist present. I am told that a representative of France 3 would have come, without entering the palace, and that he would have been outside all morning. On the other hand, a Swiss television would have been outside, having arrived too late to enter the Court yard.

From the terrace overlooking the courtyard in front of the palace, I discover a crowd of Stan's supporters who couldn't enter. A man on the lawn gesticulates, until I notice and recognize him: It's Gerard SCHELLER from Geneva. I go downstairs and learn that he has come to replace David PLATEK, the journalist who is running the youtube platform « What a beautiful world ». So it's Gérard SCHELLER who is the Swiss television. I tell him that there are enough free seats inside, but it is impossible for him to negotiate an authorization to enter with the cops.



Stan's supporters who have been locked outside

Then I discover Youcef giving a briefing to the activists locked outside, sitting in front of him in a semi-circle, to bring them up to date on what happened inside in the morning. He is very optimistic, since Stan was able to present his version of the facts. I tell him I can't share his optimism. Probably, I became too pessimistic during 20 years of watching the court circus.



Youcef WATELI gives a briefing to Stan's supporters who were not admitted to the hearing.

Before going up the stairs, I strongly recommend to Gérard SCHELLER to interview Youcef at the end of the trial.

2:50 p.m., the hearing resumes. Chairman's opening remarks.

3:00 p.m., Plea of the virago, Mr. SATTA, speaking for the missing plaintiff. Her voice is very audible, but unpleasant and screaming.

She maintains that it is her client who is the victim, wrongly accused by Stan of incestuous acts. Stan is not the victim, he's the Zorro. The mother who has been supported by Stan is said to be a psychiatric case. SATTA says to Stan: «The truth is that you were totally wrong. » And there would be other victims of the defendant. «The prosecution and its auxiliaries are charged. This is very serious. - The fact that Lea's mother still wants contact with her daughter is intolerable!» She adds that it is her wish that society shall be protected.

3:20 p.m., Plea of the «Prosecutor General».

He starts by adjusting his glasses. He and his accomplice, Me SATTA, they obviously have no doubt about the guilt of the accused - an attitude that is only blamed on the accused.

His poorly audible speech focuses on the charge that Stan is allegedly the head of a criminal organization.

Parenthesis: when Stan evaded a traffic control, on September 22, 2012 in Franche-Comté, his notebook with annotations of his investigations fell into the hands of the Gendarmes. On this basis, the accusers forged the crime of intent to kidnap a child. Obviously, this makes PHELIPPEAU happy. He keeps invoking the organization of criminals.

This long and boring speech gets on Me DANGLEHANT's nerves. He gets up and goes backwards and forwards. The « Prosecutor » continues to flow his stream of words, continuously rubbing his hands.

Break between 4 :40 and 4 :50 p.m.

I count 60 protesters on the lawn in front of the courthouse.

4 :50 p.m., Plea by Me DANGLEHANT

He stands up straight in front of the judges and uses a flip chart to visualize important landmarks.

He points out two formal flaws:

- 1. Stan is still in pre-trial custody and can apply for release at any time. He did so months ago, and the court system did not make a decision*

within 2 months. The law of the French Republic provides in this case for the imperative and immediate release by incisive decision.

Brief interjection of the principle that doubt must benefit the accused.

2. *The examining magistrate had to investigate charges contained in the referral of September 16, 2012 relating to facts that took place in June 2012. The conviction in first instance did not retain any facts from this original referral. However, the investigator extended the referral beyond that date, without having been mandated to do so. This made it possible to forge a charge of intent to abduct a child (by distorting the notes contained in the notebook, which fell into the hands of police officers on September 22, 2012), giving a false appearance of legality. An investigating judge cannot act on a case, for which he has not been mandated, because he has no valid title to give him jurisdiction.*

Consequently, Me DANGLEHANT is seeking on behalf of his client the annulment of the referral order and the trial judgment - in short, of the proceedings.

According to the lawyer, his client has not been indicted in the classic manner. There is no search record. Documents have disappeared from the file. Moreover, the investigating judge was a trainee. The President rules that this magistrate was competent to investigate.

In conclusion Me DANGLEHANT repeats the request that these decisions be annulled because they are based on incompetence.

6 p.m., plea by Me JOSEPH

First, he defeats the plea of the plaintiff's counsel.

He mentions the fact that France is placed in the penultimate position of European countries with regard to the conditions of detainees, including poor medical care. He castigates that his client, who is used to eating healthy bio and vegan food, cannot have access to this type of food. The lawyer protests against the failure to arrange medical consultations to treat his client's health problems. « I called the prison administration yesterday. I was told that a consultation would be scheduled soon. This after a 6 month of waiting! »

Me JOSEPH denounces the excessiveness of the sanction, for a man who acted without any profit motive. He says that it is ridiculous to have put together a file of 8 boxes, when there is no flesh to the bone in it.

His client was dragged through the mud by the media on behalf of the magistrates, describing him as a guru of a criminal cult, even though he is a much appreciated whistleblower by the victims.

After a brief pause, he added that he had never seen a file where no witnesses had been called for questioning by the examining magistrate.

« The important thing is that Mr. MAILLAUD sincerely believed that these children were victims. And since justice refused to investigate, it was legitimate to presume the guilt of the abusers. »

According to the lawyer, the police faked a photocopy of a key piece of the file.

The lawyer praises his client's commitment to fight paedo-satanic networks. And today, he finds himself being sued for his noble commitment.

«What did one find to charge him with? Not much. There's never been a concerted effort by a criminal organization. He wrote in his notebook (*which fell into the hands of the cops*): "If I had seen an act of paedophilia, I would have acted. " The attorney general twisted that sentence. »

JOSEPH launches into the investigation results established by a United Nations special rapporteur for sexual abuse of children in France. « It leaves a damning picture of France. »

*He's talking about the Vincent case. «We heard from the Prosecutor General, that there was an investigation. It is a fact that the investigation dragged on so long, that the suspect had time to make the objects disappear in the basement of his building (*the scene of the crimes*). »*

The « Prosecutor » scratches his neck, obviously angry.

The lawyer continues: « Why this disproportion? Lenient sentences are handed down for cases of great violence, but a whistleblower is condemned very harshly. »

The civil plaintiff's attorney leaves the court room at 6:35 p.m..

JOSEPH: « The allegations of the civil party are unfounded. Stan's alleged victim, according to the prosecution, a 12 years old girl who was questioned for 6 minutes by my client's girlfriend, shows no symptoms of proven pathology. It was not a traumatic discussion. This is a forged charge by the plaintiff. »

6 :40 p.m., Mr DANGLEHANT presents the conclusions:

« It is not serious that the Public Prosecutor claims that there was a criminal association. There was never the objective of a child abduction. Your jurisdiction has no proof of Mr. MAILLAUD's guilt. » *He repeats that the doubt must benefit the accused and once again asks for immediate relaxation.*

6:45 p.m.: Lawyer SATTA returns to the room.

Finally, Me DANGLEHANT protests that the French authorities have peddled to their colleagues in Venezuela, at the time when Stan was in provisional detention, awaiting extradition to France, that Stan was a paedo-criminal. He requires again immediate relaxation.

6:47 p.m.: The President briefly interrupted the hearing. One can imagine that he went to call his superior to receive instructions.

7:00 p.m. Resuming. No reply, neither by SATTA, nor PHELIPPEAU.

Last words of Sylvie PEREILLON

7:05,p.m. It's Stan's turn. He says he's determined to continue serving society after his release to fight against pedo-criminality.

The President announces that the judgement will be pronounced on July 8, 2020. The request for immediate release has been denied.

We leave the building and are expected by the « Swiss television » who are waiting for us to interview Stan's 2 lawyers.



Convivial meal of the observers

Guntalingen/Switzerland, June 29, 2020

Gerhard ULRICH
International trial observer
Author of the report

The ins and outs of the case of Janett and Stan in French and German (3 ½ hours:

www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ux_cLvHWRgc&feature=em-uploademail

****Observer's report Youcef WATELI :***

«I was at Stan's trial in Poitiers: you had to see and hear him address the court to see that he really investigated cases of child rape, he said very specific things and told the judge that he knew his files by heart and that he still had all the evidence! He even said that he had got into a fight with 3 gendarmes who had announced that they were going to rape a young illegal immigrant whom they were deporting to the border; and that once, Stan had witnessed a rape by several gendarmes of his brigade! When he reported it, he was kicked out of the gendarmerie. The magistrates and the lawyer of the opposing party understood that they were risking a lot for their immatriculation and they didn't want to get involved. They had to be ordered to keep him in detention because lawyer Danglehant (an expert in criminal law) showed them the abusive detention and the multiple abuses, irregularities in this case by saying clearly that if they did not release him immediately they risked serious sanctions and certainly their careers. I think Stan might get shot. He is aware of this because he told them: He is fighting for an ideal at the risk of several years in prison for denouncing international paedo-criminality instead of living a life of rest, secluded with his courageous girlfriend. When the judge asked him why Stan was after «the black robes» and what would he do if he got out of prison? Stan told him that he had nothing against anyone, but what are the magistrates waiting for to finally get moving and do something to save the children from the networks of horror? Stan has already given substantial files to the French justice ministers and he has more material! His need for emergency care is his priority but knowing the obvious crimes of paedo-criminality ... he wouldn't stand idly by. »