

## **UPDATE Days 6 and 7 of the Reiner Fuellmich Trial before the Göttingen Regional Court.**

Report on Reiner Füllmich's 6th day of trial before the Göttingen Regional Court. 05.03.2024 / 14:49

@wearegreeekja

We are Grεεεκ - what's your Superpower ?, [05.03.2024 14:49]

More than just a water level report

The 6th day of proceedings in the Reiner Füllmich trial, is today, Tuesday, March 5, 2024, from 9:15

a.m., at the Göttingen Regional Court, began with the questioning of Göttingen notary Stephan

Kleinjohann. He described the contract mandate between Dr. Reiner Füllmich and the two buyers of

his property and house in Göttingen.

He was commissioned by Reiner Füllmich and the buyers.

The timeline was discussed, which will be reproduced in detail by Jiota in her audio report. Füllmich's

house had been sold on 3.10.22, with time running out until 18.11.22 to obtain an extract from the

land register.

It was only then that he saw that Marcel Templin was registered in it and therefore continued the

process with him.

Kleinjohann had only provided a sample contract. He had received the instructions for the amounts

to be transferred to Templin from the latter with instructions as to when, how much money was to

be transferred and where.

It had not been his task to check why Marcel Templin was now in the land register, he had merely

been responsible for the processing.

Kleinjohann confirmed a telephone call with Justus Hoffmann, although this did not seem strange to

him, as he had looked around on the port lawyers' website and Justus Hoffman was listed there as

Templin's colleague, who was not authorized in this matter, but he nevertheless concluded that he

could talk to Hoffmann.

Defense lawyer Katja Wörmer asked Klausjohann whether he was aware of the two people who

were present at the meeting with Marcel Templin?

No, he did not know them.

Had he checked their personal details?

He denied that as well, saying that he only had Marcel Templin's ID presented to him because he had

to check his signature.

Objection from the defense:

Strangers were coming in who he did not know personally and whose identity he had not checked.

Wasn't that strange for him?

According to Kleinjohann, it was not his job to check the identity of the people Templin brought

along as his "buddies".

To this end, he grabbed his cell phone and quoted from the German Civil Code what his duties were.

He was repeatedly asked by Wörmer and Füllmich whether these inconsistencies did not strike him

as odd?

Kleinjohann answered in the negative.

He was presented with an email which he did not have in his files but which he had received and in

which Füllmich pointed out via his defense that "things were not going according to plan". According

to the notary, he had seen it but not realized it.

He emphasized that it was not his job and that he was only responsible for processing the contract.

He was also confronted with letters that Füllmich had written to him, as he reproached Füllmich

during the hearing for not actively objecting.

The defense then asked what else their client should have added?

Füllmich added that he could not have actively objected, as he did not even know that Templin had

ordered him to receive this sum (note: and more, details later).

Kleinjohann answered the question as to why he accepted the inconsistencies by saying that Templin had said so and that he was in the land register.

After a 5-minute break, the questioning of Viviane Fischer was to continue.

However, Füllmich's statement, which had already been postponed on the 5th day of the trial, was

read out freely. He merely pulled evidence from the files.

He began with Section 266 of the Criminal Code, which is to be applied restrictively and as a whole.

He underlined the deviation in his case with legal commentaries.

Note: Reiner Füllmich also recently recorded his own audio on this topic, which has already been

published.

He quoted comments from a well-known law professor who does not wish to be named at this time.

We are Græek - what's your Superpower ?, [05.03.2024 14:49]

Note: This is not about Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab. Füllmich continued: the donations were earmarked

for a specific purpose, to whom was the breach of trust? The three complainants seem to want to

appropriate funds to which they are not entitled. He again referred to the need for a detailed overall

view.

The judge replied that the embezzlement was against the holding company.

Füllmich pointed out that Fischer & Fischer and Hoffmann were acting as plaintiffs in adhesion, i.e.

against them. Silence.

Regarding the credibility of Justus Hoffmann, Füllmich began to state facts:

Contrary to Hoffmann's account of having worked as a lawyer, Hoffmann had initially worked as a

trainee lawyer for attorney Antonia Fischer.

It was also a lie that Füllmich had transferred funds to the grassroots, that he had threatened Hoffmann, as well as (note: which Viviane Fischer even confirmed on the 5th day of the trial) that

the party had been radicalized by Füllmich.

Hoffmann often disappears and is nervous and tense - as even trial observers recently witnessed and

commented on.

Hoffmann spread lies about Füllmich, such as that he and his wife Inka had met in a psychiatric clinic.

Füllmich explained that he had never been a patient in a psychiatric ward, then asked whether this

could have been a projection by Hoffmann?

He quoted from the file a chat with Antonia Fischer that Justus Hoffmann's therapist had died and

the new one had not yet started and that it was "therefore somewhat difficult".

He added that his wife had once taught seriously ill children in a university clinic and that he had met

her there.

These and other statements by Hoffman had ultimately led to him being investigated for a year and

three months without him being informed, let alone given a legal hearing to establish exonerating

evidence.

According to Füllmich, Hoffman was the driving force.

Hoffmann had written his dissertation in Bielefeld with a half-time position under his doctoral supervisor Prof. Dr. Martin Schwab. (Note: which could explain the failed attempts at mediation at

the time.)

Füllmich also mentioned his abduction and the means used to achieve it.

With these very means, a person was completely destroyed, both financially and professionally and,

above all, prevented from doing his job.

Overall, it was strange.

He no longer had access to anything.

This is not a plea today, he wanted to point out § 266 StGB and how it was dealt with.

He still had questions for Viviane Fischer and Antonia Fischer.

Viviane would be questioned after the break regarding her statements about her financial circumstances.

It had been clearly discussed that the money should be secured in such a way that it could not be

accessed so easily.

Füllmich adds that Justus Hoffmann had financial problems in that he was unable to pay his health

insurance and therefore issued invoices to the committee.

Once again, Füllmich insists on the big picture.

He deeply regrets that human tragedies have come to light here, that it must have happened this

way and that everything is now being made public.

Lunch break

To be continued....

Note: Thank you to those working at high speed, changing notes to text, publishing and translating

(not all one person)!!!

Part Two of Day 6 of Reiner's trial.

Second part of the report on Reiner Füllmich's 6th day of trial before the Göttingen Regional Court.

@wearegreeekja

We are Grεεεκ - what's your Superpower ?, [05.03.2024 17:50]

More than just a water level report

Continuation, 6th day of trial against Dr. Reiner Füllmich before the Göttingen Regional Court.

Addendum:

In his statement, Füllmich also stated that Justus Hoffmann had taken legal action against his then

defense lawyer Dagmar Schön so that she would stop claiming that the money from the house sale

had ended up with Marcel Templin. According to Füllmich, Hoffmann was trying to prevent anything

that would not do justice to his reputation.

Note: In the appeal instance of this matter, lawyer Dagmar Schön has now been fully vindicated.

After the break, the questioning of Viviane Fischer continued.

The chamber asked her questions about her own loan, chat histories, financial difficulties, her financial situation, her inheritance and her own safekeeping account.

The presiding judge noted that with her stated liquidity, but with the repayment of her loan and this

in different tranches, she had needed from August to October.

Fischer went on to talk about the sale of books and an inheritance, which turned out to be an unsettled inheritance from 2013, i.e. she had an amount to expect, but it was still not ready for

disbursement.

She repeated her statement that she had only agreed to a liquidity reserve, but never to a store of

value.

She was then confronted with an email in which the store of value was communicated.

In a large Zoom meeting, Füllmich reminded her, there had also been talk of a value store.

Fischer stated that she could not remember either.

Finally, she was presented with a preliminary profit and loss statement for consulting costs from

Füllmich's law firm, which she had co-signed and which she claimed to have signed between "door

and door" - as managing partner (note).

Füllmich asked Fischer why she had prevented the gold from being accessed when she was short,

which he had offered to do several times.

Fischer replied that it was because he (Füllmich) was the buyer and the proceeds could only be paid

out to his account, but that it was 'impossible to know...!.

She did not mean to say that she assumed he could disappear with it, but that there were adverse

circumstances in which one had to keep an eye on everything, which is why she had not agreed to it.

During the interview, one got the overall impression that she found it difficult to give clear answers

to specific questions. She sometimes got lost in her explanations, so that even Chairman Richer had

to admit at one point that he could not follow her in terms of content.

In conclusion, Fischer stuck to her statement that she had never had any financial problems and had

always been solvent.

The questioning of Viviane Fischer will continue on Friday, March 8, 2024, i.e. on the 7th day of the

trial.

@wearegreeekja

We are Grεεεκ - what's your Superpower ?, [05.03.2024 18:23]

Supplement to Reiner Füllmich's 6th day of trial before the Göttingen Regional Court.

Reiner Füllmich presented a chat history in which the store of value was mentioned, which Viviane

Fischer has repeatedly denied so far. In that chat, he asked about her store of value, whereupon

Fischer allegedly stated that it also concerned real estate.

Füllmich then went on to say that this was not true, as Viviane Fischer had a marriage contract.

Viviane Fischer replied that Füllmich was not allowed to mention that there was a marriage contract!

Füllmich informed Fischer that he was indeed allowed to do so because it concerned the protection

of his personal interests.

In summary, it can be said that Viviane Fischer first brought this whole matter to public attention

and is now demanding silence from Reiner Füllmich about her marriage contract.

The Chamber has left this uncommented.

Note from Alkmini:

You can't make this stuff up! @wearegreeekj

### **Report on Reiner Füllmich's 7th day of trial before the Göttingen Regional Court. 08.03.2024 / 14:49**

Here is the update from wearegreeekja for Day 7, Friday, March 8.

Γιώτα and Αλκμήνη for the Telegram channel @wearegreeekja water level report - that means a short (!) summary of today's events in the courtroom, which do not claim to be comprehensive or could be in this format.

Jiota's following audios are detailed and remain the highlight! Precisely because they will be so extensive and detailed, they will take time. Our contribution here is a concession from us to the people who follow Reiner's fate and would like to be informed promptly. This is an account of Jiota's personal impressions and feelings. She has recounted what she heard in the meetings as she personally understood it, and she makes no claim to know all the context and legal details or the whole truth. This report must not be taken out of context!

Brief report on the 7th day of the trial on 8.3.2024 in the case of Dr. Reiner Füllmichs before the Regional Court of Göttingen: The courtroom was full of press and trial observers today. That is why we are giving the numerous journalists present today the opportunity to report here competently and, above all, in detail. This will be easy for everyone, as today was half a trial day on Friday and a large part of today's discussions have already been set out by us in the water level reports of the 5th and 6th day of the trial, which can be accessed if necessary. Therefore, today only news that could point to an exciting finale.

The questioning of witness Viviane Fischer continued today. Antonia Fischer, like Justus Hoffmann, was not present. The hearing began with an overview of the financial development of the committee account, which Viviane Fischer presented. Both Viviane Fischer and Reiner Füllmich agreed that nobody had expected the committee to be so successful. An email from Füllmich was read out in which he expressed his concern at the time that Viviane Fischer might be working for the committee for nothing. The statutes were not yet available at the time.

Füllmich was concerned about Fischer's situation, as he himself already had a well- running law firm, unlike Viviane Fischer and the port lawyers. However, Fischer insisted on the honorary and unremunerated work of the managing directors, which was finally laid down in the statutes. In the other statements (see WSM 5 and 6), Ms. Fischer had complained that she would work on a voluntary basis, but then wanted to be involved in mandates, as this was no longer possible.

He goes on to read out that it was clear that he was running a law firm and had income. "I was worried about you, you had no income," says Füllmich. She replied that it was not the case that she had no income at all, that she only had a few clients, but that she also looked after her children.

Then, turning to Füllmich, she says: "We didn't discuss it to the end either." In addition, it had not been ruled out at the time that she could earn money in other ways. Füllmich explained that her point was that she had no income as a lawyer. Fischer replied that she had worked almost exclusively for the Corona Committee. It was repeatedly discussed who had brought in which service providers to conduct the committee meetings and whether this had always been coordinated.

The tasks "just came up," explains Fischer and lists the tasks she has completed herself. All of this arose from the ongoing work process. Füllmich agreed that they had to work "out of the flow". The defense submitted two invoices from Fischer to the chamber, one dated 1.1.2021 and the second dated 1.1.2022. The invoice text read: "Recurring legal advisory services" These invoices were issued by Viviane Fischer to the "Corona Committee" and were also signed by her. The amount was nebo 800 euros per month + 19% VAT.

Fischer now claims that she did not issue these invoices. She starts again with the statements regarding the rent payments for her office premises and complains that this topic is "very exhaustive". She then mentions again that she had paid the rent in advance and had received it back with the two invoices. She had therefore written down other reasons for the invoices because she did not want to burden the landlord with a subletting constellation. However, it turned out today that the landlords were her parents-in-law.

A further invoice dated 3.7.21 lists the Corona Committee's "extension and alignment". Viviane Fischer denies having written the first two invoices. Jens Kuhn (the accountant) had written them with her Briezopf and she explained that the invoice text was also a misnomer. Jens Kuhn will still be questioned as a witness (note) Fischer continues: "I don't even know why he has the Briezopf."

Füllmich reminded her that she herself had insisted that no invoices should be written for lawyers' fees, as this was not in accordance with the articles of association. However, as in the present case, she had written such invoices herself. He continues: "That's dangerous, because if you write invoices for fees, they would also have to be taxed." She replied that she had also paid tax on them. Füllmich said that the truth was that only she and he had worked and asked if that was correct? Yes, Fischer

admits, from the end of 2020, there were only two of them and meeting 69 was the last one that either of them (Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer) attended.

"We never knew whether they were coming or not," says Fischer about Antonia Fischer and Justus Hoffmann. "

The communication was only between the two of us, right?" said Füllmich. Fischer answered in the affirmative. Füllmich reads out an email in which Tobias Weissenborn, Füllmich's colleague, repeatedly pointed out that they had to have a different account and that they had to be registered as a company. He points out all the potential dangers. Finally, he asked who would take care of the registration? Viviane Fischer had never replied. Füllmich also presents an email in which his colleague also referred to proper bookkeeping. "Do you remember that Jens Kuhn always reminded you of this too?" She complained that Jens Kuhn received so much money per month, she didn't understand what for. He didn't seem to have kept detailed accounts, according to Fischer.

In October 2020, Füllmich wrote an email to all employees involved in the Corona Committee stating, among other things: "We are drowning at all levels!". At least he had managed to activate the international lawyers for the planned class action. "There were requests from lawyers from all over the world".

Fischer again thematized that she could not understand what the law firm Füllmich was supposed to have done for 25,000 euros a month. "Do you really think that your friend Steffi could have done all this on her own?" Füllmich asks Viviane Fischer, who maintains that she sometimes worked on customer relation with her friends at Drib. Yes, because the port lawyers had received all client inquiries.

On 30.8.22, Füllmich's lawyer colleague Kathrin Behn wrote an email that helped to pacify the differences of opinion. This contained a detailed overview of all the services provided by Füllmich's law firm with regard to customer relations. It states a number of 358,700 emails received over the period of two years that were processed. Deleted and irrelevant emails excluded. Would Viviane still claim that these figures are fictitious, asks Füllmich? Fischer: "I can't judge this truthfulness, only my own perception." Fischer had been to Füllmich's office a total of three or four times. She had not seen that the employees there had written emails or made phone calls exclusively for the Corona Committee.

She is of the opinion: "You could have used the synergy effects with the Berlin team."

The presiding judge asks to return to the actual questioning.

A chat from 6.7.22 is read out. In it, Fischer writes: "We can no longer process the emails, we only have EUR 37,000 left in our account, and the payments to the Füllmich law firm can no longer be paid." Füllmich replies: "But if you write here, 'can no longer be paid', then that means that they were paid beforehand and you knew about it. No, that was a rhetorical expression, clean language, and it didn't mean that it had been like that before and that she had known about it. As the hearing progresses, the viewer learns that there had been an attachment on Fischer's hat business account regarding rent payments and an attachment on her husband's account by the GmbH. Fischer replied that it didn't matter because she had paid her rent.

The defense lawyer points out that Viviane Fischer, as the temporary account holder of the committee account, would have had access to it at all times. Fischer replied that the account statements were always sent to the Online Pos.ach and that Jens Kuhn had the access data.

Attorney Katja Wörmer asks whether she had never looked at the account movements? Yes, but only sporadically (note: she was the managing partner, as she always emphasized). There were too many movements, too many individual donations, she hadn't seen everything. "I assumed that it was all in the best hands with Jens Kuhn" (note: the same Jens Kuhn for whom she had previously wondered aloud why he actually received so much money each month). The defense summarized the expenses of the Corona Committee from the accountant's Excel spreadsheet: IT costs. Did the service provider come from Viviane Fischer? He was an acquaintance. Had these invoices been submitted to Reiner Füllmich for approval?

No, the transfers were made by Jens Kuhn. According to the Excel list, the IT company received a total of 325,399 euros. Oval Media received EUR 128,000, which was also approved by Ms. Fischer. However, these invoices were never submitted to Reiner Füllmich for approval.

Attorney Katja Wörmer wants to know whether there was a formalized approval process for the payments to be made to Dribe. Fischer denies this, because the projects for which funds were paid were always clear.

There were neither reciprocal approval processes nor information about the payment of service providers or projects. Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer were not involved or even informed in any way. It is alleged that Oval Media could have earned around 1 million euros through its collaboration with the Corona Committee, through duplicate fundraising appeals and service invoices.

"As an economist, you have never seen the account movements?" asks Füllmich. Fischer: "It's not my job to see that, because Jens Kuhn did it." It was only when Jens Kuhn said that he had to transfer an invoice to Füllmich's law firm that she felt compelled to check everything. "That's when I noticed that there was only 37,000 euros left in the account, and then I reacted," Fischer continues.

Füllmich asked her: "You claim to have seen nothing and to have known nothing even though you signed the provisional balance sheet?" She replied: "There were no individual receipts." She would not have been able to assign the figures without supporting documents. She was asked whether she remembered that Tobias Weissenborn had received a release from her for payment to the Füllmich law firm. She denies this. She had only issued releases for other invoices, but never for the Füllmich law firm.

And where was the proof that she had issued the release, a signature or something similar?

The next item on the Excel list is queried by lawyer Katja Wörmer. It turns out that 107,267.79 euros were paid to the media portal 2020news.de. Reiner Füllmich asks about the reason for the committee's move: "Why did we have to leave?" "Because we had to get out of there!" replies Fischer flippantly and continues: "Because I wanted to use my rooms for other purposes." Füllmich: "Or because you wanted to be with Robert Cibis?" Fischer replies that that's a funny question. Füllmich started again with the question of what Fischer's concrete liquidity reserve for her loan of EUR 100,000 had been. This was secured by a family securities account held by her husband, Fischer stated once again. Why hadn't she accessed it?

Fischer is evasive and does not answer the question specifically.

Füllmich says: "I would like to establish that you had no liquidity reserve and were dependent on your husband's money." Attorney Wörmer asks how much her husband's deposit was at the time? 160,000 euros, replies Fischer. Attorney Wörmer asks further: "Were you separated from your husband during this time?" Fischer: "No." Attorney Wörmer: "Do you have a relationship with Robert Cibis (from Oval Media, author's note)?" Fischer is confused and asks the court whether she has to answer this private question. The defense explained that the question was relevant because it was questionable whether Fischer's husband had helped her with his securities account at the time, if this had been the case. The question was deferred because the Chamber would have to deliberate on whether it was absolutely necessary to clarify the facts.

Fischer's liquidity reserve was also discussed. It emerged from a chat that Fischer requested EUR 59,250 from Jens Kuhn as an immediate transfer to 2020news.de, as she had to pay her health insurance contributions from this. Reiner Füllmich claims that Robert Cibis had enormous financial problems and that creditors claimed to have claims totaling EUR 3 million from him. Füllmich asks whether it is true that Fischer had been on vacation with Cibis and all his children in India, France and Italy? She says yes, and adds that another family would also have been there, Füllmich: "Stefan Kohn's?" Fischer leaves the answer open. Attorney Wörmer asks whether her husband would also have been present? "No, he had other commitments," says Fischer. The defense continues: Was it true that she had been with Robert Cibis in Italy, in Israel, in Austria on "AUF1"? "Yes," says Fischer. Both had given an interview there. Would they have been in Brussels with Professor Van Den Bossche and stayed with him privately? She tries to explain all these visits in detail.

Finally, the night-time gold pick-up with Robert Cibis at the Füllmich family friend's house in Göttingen comes up. She is asked: "Did you spend the night in a room with Robert Cibis at the girlfriend's house?" A discussion arises as to whether she had to answer this question and it is also postponed for the time being.

Public prosecutor John now also speaks up and makes a motion to have it recorded that Reiner Füllmich had uttered the word "morons" at 9:50 a.m. in relation to Justus Hoffmann and Antonia Fischer. Lawyer Katja Wörmer immediately counters: "While we're at it, we would like to have it recorded that Justus Hoffmann claimed in his statement that Reiner Füllmich and his wife had met in a psychiatric ward".

Viviane Fischer now stands by the absent Justus Hoffmann by requesting that it be recorded that the second lawyer for the defense, Dr. Miséré, had asked Justus Hoffmann whether he was taking drugs. In response, Dr. Miséré told her that he had never said this, but had asked Hoffmann whether he was under medication and fit to be questioned. He also told her that she had been summoned as a witness and had no motions to make.

Reiner Füllmich asked Viviane Fischer why she had gone public without him on 2.9.22 and why she had not directly filed a complaint under social law. Fischer replies that she just wanted to send a signal and hoped that everything would be sorted out afterwards and that they could work together again. Füllmich: "You presented me to the public with the accusation of financial inconsistencies." It was just a sign that she was trying to get things moving in order to clarify things so that they could then work together again, says Viviane Fischer, explaining her actions. And there was some movement afterwards: the gold was secured. What's more, she didn't make fun of him, she merely hinted at it. Füllmich asks why she didn't confront him on camera right away? She had no interest in a full discussion with him at that moment, replied Fischer. She again vehemently emphasized that she had not been involved in the charges against him on 2.9.2022 and that the date was a coincidence. She then complained that it was Füllmich who had exposed her in public during a live broadcast.

At this point, the chairman interrupts the hearing. The 8th day of the trial will take place on 12.03.2024 at 9.15 a.m. with the continuation of the questioning of Viviane Fischer before the Göttingen Regional Court.

"I cannot judge this truthfulness, only my own perception." Quote from Viviane Fischer.

To be continued ...