

Evaluation of the Judge of the European Court of Human Rights

Helen KELLER

Judge at the European Court of Human Rights

Web page: www.coe.int



Helen KELLER

Role assumed in the affair SÉGALAT

Extract of the book *The Unmasked «Constitutional State» – The scandalous condemnation of Laurent Ségalat*. Gerhard ULRICH, editor Samizdat, 2016

3.11. The usual mess at the European Court of Human Rights

The author has read dozens of decisions taken by this court and written in different languages. With the exception of the decision in the case No 10122/14 of December 16, 2014, published on February 16, 2015 = source V =

http://relevancy.bger.ch/cgi-bin/JumpCGI?id=CEDH-20141216_10122-14
these papers were without exception prefabricated text modules of half a page, containing the decisive sentence: The court reached the conclusion that the conditions of articles 34 and 35 of the Convention (...) are not met. By that way, the European «Judges» do not even demonstrate to have read the complaints at all. It can be presumed that they don't do it in 98 % of the complaints submitted to them. The known Geneva lawyer Rudolf SCHALLER shares this finding (letter dated June 3rd, 2009 by the lawyer SCHALLER to the author of this book).

This time, the European «Judges» had indeed read the complaint (V). This follows from the content of the decision by András SAJÓ (Chairman), Helen KELLER and Robert SPANO (assessor judges). The appellant was even allowed to attend their deliberation and to be accompanied by his lawyer (V, p. 1 *in initio*) – rare privilege!

Since the Swiss woman, KELLER, was the only French-speaking member of this court (the quality of SPANO's alleged knowledge of French is not sure), it must be assumed in this case that she directed the operations. To date, she especially got noticed by the weekly *Die Weltwoche* in actively participating in ECHR's favourite occupation: to legislate without limits to create a hypothetical European jurisprudence without any democratic core mandate.

On the other hand, the study of records does not seem to be KELLER's strong point. Obviously, the numerous blunders produced by the Vaudois [investigators](#)

and forensic scientists, as well by the “over-expert” VIERIA have completely escaped her attention (V). Neither was she really interested in the chronological sequence of events. Without consideration she took over **COTTIER**’s few chronological markers (Attorney General VD). The latter indeed managed to make these relevant falsifications persistent even in front of the ECHR:

- The death of the victim is supposed to have intervened between 3:15 and 9 p.m. (V, p. 2 – 3, paragraphs 7, 9, 12), according to **COTTIER**’s version. As mentioned above, other more competent experts have fixed the time of death more accurately.
- Professor FRIED is said to have declared that the time of death after 6 p.m. is extremely unlikely (V, p. 3, paragraph 14). Following the example of **COTTIER**/VIEIRA, KELLER confuses the time set by FRIED for gastric transit stop due to trauma (No later than 6 p.m.), with the time of death that LECOMTE (French forensic physician) estimated probable to be between 8 and 10 p.m.)
- The emergency doctor is said to have arrived «towards 10 p.m. on the crime scene» (= **COTTIER**’s false version: 9:50 p.m.) V, p. 2, paragraph 4. The correct time of this arrival is however 10:04 p.m. (see above).

The chronology is the most important evaluation criterion in case of a capital crime. In this case, KELLER and her acolytes retained only three of those time markers - and exactly the wrong ones!

The gigantic apparatus of Strasbourg, which is by the way funded by European taxpayers, has given birth to a monstrosity. It only produces denials of justice or sheer stupidities.

Only a beleaguered judicial system succeeds in performing such failures!

The arrival of the emergency doctor, for example, could have been checked by a **simple plausibility test**: to call this lady as a witness. She would certainly have

repeated her statement made in front of **LADOR**'s tables, that is to say, that she arrived in the fateful evening at 10:04 p.m. at the Moulin of Vaux-sur-Morges.

This failure of the file study contrasts with KELLER's fastidious pearls with which she fires away the presented grievances (V, p. 3 – 5). The trial of appeal, which took place without debates imposed by law, simply got justified in repeating the aberrant motivation delivered by the Swiss Federal Court.

Nobody, of course, came to discuss the issues asked by the defence, namely, for example the lawyer PORTEJOIE's question:

«In a constitutional state, is it possible to condemn on appeal, after a sloppy hearing performed in just a few hours, a person who was previously acquitted at the end of a first exemplary trial which lasted more than one week, based on an absolutely identical file, wherein there is no confession, no motive, no weapon, no witness, no serious proof?» (*Les nuits blanches d'une robe noire*. Gilles-Jean PORTEJOIE, éditions du moment, 2015. Page 162)

After all, KELLER had already managed to have Switzerland condemned because, based on the Federal Constitution, our country had attempted to expel a Nigerian drug trafficker from our territory. The trafficker was able to stay in our country. (Previously, this case was documented under the URL: www.blick.ch/news/schweiz/aufstand-gegen-strassburger-richter-id227779.html)

Obviously, one cannot systematically disavow one's employer. In this case, it appears that KELLER was well conscious of where her salary came from, just like all those sled dogs delegated by Berne to Strasbourg (before KELLER it was Giorgio MALINVERNI, previously Luzius WILDHABER, assisted by Mark VILLIGER and previously by Muriel ISELI, etc.

Profile

Born on June 1st, 1964 in Winterthur ZH/CH. Swiss citizen.

Read law at the University of Zurich; then performed a career purely academic international also a Professor for human rights.

«Judge» of the European Court of Human Rights since October 2011.

KELLER obviously participates very actively in the favourite occupation of the Judges of Strasbourg: the creation of a hypothetical judicial system, valid throughout Europe. To this aim, they legislate without having any democratic mandate (*Die Weltwoche* No. 26/2013). The *Blick* reported on April 20, 2013 about Switzerland's condemnation by the ECHR, with the participation of Keller, because Switzerland wanted deport a Nigerian drug dealer, as the Swiss law stipulates. The trafficker was able to stay in Switzerland, also thanks to KELLER. KELLER figures in our database with five negative references. The judicial crime at the expense of Laurent SÉGALAT supported by KELLER, is one of these three.

See:

Une condamnation bâtie sur du sable – L'affaire Légeret. Jacques SECRETAN, Editor Mon Village, 2015

The Unmasked «Constitutional State» or The scandalous condemnation of Laurent Ségalat. Gerhard ULRICH, Editor Samizdat, 2016

In the case of Laurent SÉGALAT the «Judges» of the ECHR issued the decision no 10122/14, published on February 16 2015, taking over the lies of the Swiss Federal Court by copy/paste. This happens only for about 2 % of the decisions issued by Strasbourg. As a rule, the European «Judges» are defeating the applicants with a text module of half a page without any motivation, as KELLER did it in the case of the complaint no 40098/12 of June 9 2012 of Andreas HOPPE against Germany on September 13 2012 (see next page).

See: www.youtube.com/watch?v=3bMwUDSQeOA

One of the text modules by which the plaintiffs at the European Court of Human Rights are abused – issued in the present case by KELLER

Herrn
Andreas HOPPE
Am Sportplatz 5
D-17291 UCKERFELDE/OT FALKENWALDE

ECHR-L.Ger11.00 Decisions Letter.R.(CD10)
AMU/BGR/00a

13. September 2012

Beschwerde Nr. 40098/12
Hoppe J. Deutschland

Sehr geehrter Herr Hoppe,

hiermit teile ich Ihnen mit, dass der Europäische Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte am 6. September 2012 in Einzelrichterbesetzung (H. Keller, unterstützt von einem Berichterstatter in Übereinstimmung mit Artikel 24 Absatz 2 der Konvention) entschieden hat, Ihre am 19. Juni 2012 eingelegte und unter der obigen Nummer registrierte Beschwerde für unzulässig zu erklären.

Soweit die Beschwerdepunkte in seine Zuständigkeit fallen, ist der Gerichtshof aufgrund aller zur Verfügung stehenden Unterlagen zu der Auffassung gelangt, dass die in Artikel 34 und 35 der Konvention niedergelegten Voraussetzungen nicht erfüllt waren.

Diese Entscheidung ist endgültig und unterliegt keiner Berufung an den Gerichtshof sowie an die Große Kammer oder eine andere Stelle. Sie werden daher Verständnis dafür haben, dass die Kanzlei Ihnen keine weiteren Auskünfte über die Beschlussfassung des Einzelrichters geben und auch keinen weiteren Schriftverkehr mit Ihnen in dieser Angelegenheit führen kann. Sie werden in dieser Beschwerdesache keine weiteren Zuschriften erhalten, und Ihre Beschwerdeakte wird ein Jahr nach Datum dieser Entscheidung vernichtet werden.

Das vorliegende Schreiben ergibt nach Artikel 52 A der Verfahrensordnung des Gerichtshofes.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen
Für den Europäischen Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte

A. Müller-Elschner
Rechtsreferent

KELLER is professor of Law at the University of Lucerne.

Reference List (observations collected since the year 2000):

Number of negative references 5

Number of positive references: 0

Helen KELLER is a reckless Judge.

29.05.17/GU

Evaluation of Lawyers