

Jens Gordon Gerbracht

(Jeschua, without residence)

Uli Sommer

Uli Sommer

81245 München

Deutschland

Uli Sommer; Lucia-Popp-Bogen 23; 81245 München

**Bundesregierung
11044 Berlin**

München, den 18.02.2021

Subject: legal uncertainty - open letter to the administration of Germany appointed by the victorious powers

Dear Sir or Madam, Dear Members of the Federal Republic for and in Germany (**Bundesrepublik für und in Deutschland - BfiD**), Dear Mr. Steinmeier, Dear Ms. Merkel,

1. As you should know, the so-called BfiD has legally / judicially expired at least since July 17, 1990 (Paris Treaties) through the repeal of your Art. 23 Basic Law (GG) old version "de jure".
2. For the same reason that the scope of your GG was abolished, the Courts Constitution Act (Gerichtsverfassungsgesetz - GVG), the Code of Civil and Criminal Procedure (Zivil- und Strafprozessordnung - ZPO / StPO), as well as their introductory laws, the so-called BfiD, also became void.
3. The Administrative Offenses Act (Ordnungswidrigkeitengesetz - OWiG) was resolved by your "Bundestag" of the so-called BfiD on October 11, 2007 for retroactive repeal because on that day the introductory act for the OWiG was repealed retrospectively. Since the announcement in the so-called "Federal Gazette" on November 29, 2007, there is no longer any legal basis for the OWi in the so-called BfiD. The following applies: If you repeal an introductory law, then the old or previous law applies again, if this is not also changed or repealed. However, since the "old law" are the laws of the German Reich, they cannot be repealed or changed by a so-called BfiD, as there is no legal basis for this. In addition, as your own BVerfG has determined, the so-called BfiD is not the successor to the German Reich, but only represents an administrative unit of the Allies, based on the Military Law (AHK), and that to this day.
4. In the same way and for the same reason, the StPO, the ZPO and the GVG of your so-called BfiD were repealed in April 2006 by repealing the Introductory Act. According to your legal opinion, the law became legally effective on April 25, 2006 (<http://dejure.org/gesetze/EGGVG/1.html> BGBl. P.866) with the announcement in the so-called "Bundesgesetzblatt (BGBl)". And again statutes were retroactively repealed. § 5 of the ZPO, the StPO and your GVG have also been dropped. This § 5 contained the scope of these laws, based on your GG Art. 23 old version .. (old version)

Now the following applies, also understandable for every layperson:

A law that does not apply anywhere has no legal effect. No criminal prosecution without the law.

Thus there is respectively there was no legal reason for an indictment in whatever form in the so-called BfiD. All your "officials", whether judges, bailiffs, police or other "officials", act without any legitimacy.

You have just been informed of the legal uncertainty within the so-called BfiD with this explanatory note and should act accordingly, because you are subject to §63 BBG / LBG, the remonstrance obligation according to your own laws and you are fully responsible for your legal action, because there is no state liability within the so-called BfiD, since the so-called BfiD, as already mentioned, cannot be a state.

Instruction

Every "civil servant" and every "public official" must convince himself / herself before any legal act that what he / she is doing is also legal, that means he / she must ensure that his / her official acts are legal in accordance with your civil service law. The obligation to remonstrate applies (see Section 38 of your Civil Service Framework Act (Beamtenrahmengesetzes - BRRG)). This duty of remonstrance is the obligation of every civil servant and public servant to raise an objection to an instruction if there are concerns about the legality of this order.

Otherwise there is justified suspicion, for example, of the:

1. Perversion of the law (§339StGB)
2. Reinterpretation of injustice to justice (§138 ZPO)
3. Coercion in office (§240 StGB)
4. Deception in legal transactions (§123,124,125,126 and 136 and 138 StGB)
5. Fraud in legal transactions (§267 StGB)
6. Menace and presumption (§132 and 241 StGB)

and some more...

Every public service employee who takes notice of even one case of arbitrary judicial decision-making or perversion of the law and who does not do everything necessary to preserve the constitutional order is an accomplice according to § 25 of the Criminal Code (Strafgesetzbuch StGB), even if he merely looks the other way or approves tolerance.

According to §138 StGB, the public servant, but also every other citizen, is threatened with punishment in cases of high treason, genocide, crimes against personal freedom, serious robbery and extortion, if not reported. As is well known, high treason is already every perversion of justice and obstruction of punishment according to your §25 StGB.

Let's come to your own "federal laws" ("Bundesgesetzen"):

§52 (1) "The civil servant serves the whole people ..."

§56 (1) "The civil servant bears full personal responsibility for the legality of his official acts .."

§185 "Reich territory within the meaning of this law is the territory of the German Reich until December 31, 1937 within its limits, after this point in time within the limits of December 31, 1937 ..."

§ 190 "this law applies to federal police officers, unless otherwise stipulated by law ..."

And now the fundamental question arises for me at this point whether the certificates of appointment of the so-called BfiD officials have really been issued and signed by the "Reichs-Minister" of Justice?

Otherwise, all civil servants and officials of the so-called BfiD are to be regarded as private persons from a purely legal point of view!

On the basis of the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights", "Resolution 217 A (III) of December 10, 1948" and the Basic Law established by the Allies for the West German Bonn Republic in Germany, established by the Allies and not freely elected by the German people in May 23, 1949, which was created by the Allies for the West German Bonn Republic of Germany and to which the so-called BfiD politicians still refer, the following rights and laws must be observed:

1. General Declaration of Human Rights (Declaration) Art. 1 to 30
2. International Covenant for Civil Rights and Duties, Art. 1 to 4, in particular Art. 2, Art. 5 to 26
3. Basic Law (Grundgesetz - GG) for the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), current BfID of May 23, 1949 Art. 3,9,18,20,25,146

For the legal security of my person, the following applies:

"Laws without scope are invalid and void because of a violation of the requirement of legal security." (Judgment of your BVerwGE 17, 192 = DVBl 1964, 147) (BVerfGE 3, 288 (319f.) 6.309 (338.363)).

Due to my legal uncertainty, I politely request you to dispel my existing legal uncertainty legally and judicially and to inform me immediately on which legal basis (legal norm) you govern this state and take orders that grossly violate our fundamental rights and our universal right to life.

I also request your personal details and address, as well as your legitimation, to be presented immediately so that I can take legal action against you under international law. According to your own laws, you are obliged to comply with the above requirement.

We, the senders of this message and many more people who share this, are not acting alone in our own interests. We stand and act for all plants, animals and humans on earth, for the one who created all these plants, animals and humans out of and by love and we stand for a life in loving connection with all dear living beings.

We consider all human-made "legal systems" to be fundamentally impermissible from a larger perspective. For ourselves we rely, among other things, on the universal right to life and on the universal native right.

The legal systems established worldwide are based on the legal system of the Roman emperors and later popes. They cannot be seen through by outside people and they primarily secure the power of a worldwide elite and an unjustifiable claim of power of this elite over every living being on earth. In a world with differently powerful and violent people and in a world with money, factories, cities, high technology and civilization, anyway human-made legal systems could in principle obtain a limited justification in that they are applied in the same way without distinction between humans, protecting people from exploitation, injuries and from other attacks and crimes and by granting people as much freedom as is possible within the framework of a peaceful coexistence.

At present, however, you are going to ignore any legality, to leave even the established questionable legal system and to do immeasurable damage to the German people and to the world in the name of the German people.

You have forfeited all justification at all levels and in all aspects. Your actions can now only be regarded as arbitrary and as directed against any life.

With best regards

Jens Gordon Gerbracht (Yeschua) and Uli Sommer (drawing for himself and on behalf of Yeschua)

Attachment

- a few notes in the margin

<p>Judge at the district court (in the name of the people) is only the question in whose people * formerly in the German people * 3 C 2052/08 Issued by a judicial clerk as "document officer" of the office (signature not recognizable), breaking ZPO § 315. Document officers may only countersign the acceptance of goods. For resolutions / execution or in the name of the people (however) she was not involved in the process and is therefore null and void!</p>
<p>Bailiff turns injustice into justice! A judge according to GG 101 and GG 103 can only clarify the legal text, a bailiff cannot and must not. He / she is only a vicarious agent of the judge. These also have to catch up the missing signatures with first and last name, at least 2 letters must be recognizable ...</p>
<p>According to your ZPO § 315, copies may only be made / made if the judge has signed the original with your first and last name, this in fact is a criminal act of the "document officer" of the office!</p>
<p>Note the signature of the registry clerk cannot be read / recognized! The signature is only for the best regards and nothing else! Doing so on judicial order is not possible!</p>
<p>Without signature, no legal validity! From a juridical point of view, it cannot be legally that a judgment or notice without a signature can ever become legally valid.</p>
<p>Enforcement authority There is no such thing! There is no legitimation document according to BGB § 179. Nobody in the FRG-Germany has it. In fact, yes, legally no!</p>

Your §§ 850 a-k ZPO are "officially" to be observed and indispensable, as ZPO § 850c pledges of accounts are closed without a title!

<http://dejure.org/gesetze/ZPO/315.html>

** Code of Civil Procedure

Book 2 - Procedure at first instance (§§ 253 - 510c)

Section 1 - Proceedings at the regional courts (§§ 253 - 494a)

§ 2 - Judgment (§§ 300 - 329)

§ 315 Signature of the judge

(1) The judgment must be signed by the judges who participated in the decision. If a judge is prevented from adding his signature, this will be noted under the judgment by the presiding judge and, if he is prevented from doing so, by the oldest associate judge.