

1 Crystal Schultz  
2 Attorney in Pro Se  
3  
4

5 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY  
6 FRANKFURT am MAIN COURT OF APPEALS  
7 STATE OF HESSEN  
8

9 \_\_\_\_\_ ) Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
10 John E. Doel, Crystal L. Schultz, )  
11 Jerry D. Burling, Jean N. Ott, )  
12 J. Bogus, B. Bassi, L. Cluff, B. Harris, )  
13 J. Scarborough, D. Higgins, V. Higgins, ) 4<sup>nd</sup> AMENDED  
14 R.T. Gordon, M. Henninger, B. Beach, ) FORMAL CRIMINAL  
15 M. Cooper, B. Dawson, W. Wangler, ) COMPLAINT  
16 P. Edvardsson, R. Jonsson, E. Gold, )  
17 G. Graham, J. Hinton, J. Kane, )  
18 C. Kenway, M. Nagahiro, E. Young, )  
19 P. Hoffman, T. Klovholt, J. Player, )  
20 M. Techmeier, P. Alfonzo, V. Benson, )  
21 T. Kastle, H. Dougal, P. Duncan, )  
22 D. Churchland, M. Elson, A. Emerson, )  
23 M. Evans, M. Fanto, W. Fessenden, )  
24 N. Fessenden, B. Fisher, S. Fox, )  
25 D. Fredriksz, R. Fuller, R. Geller, )  
26 J. Ginther, D. Gonzales, C. Grandpre, )  
27 K. Hall, A. Haile, G. Harris, )  
M. Harrison, P. Harrison, P. Harwood, )  
T. Haynes, R. Heggen, K. Helin, )  
P. Hoffman, R. Housner, P. Howard, )  
C. Hurley, A. Hurley, M. Hurley, )  
J. Hurley, S. Jankord, D. Jaynes, )  
C. Johnson, E. Johansson, B. Johnston, )  
J. Kane, B. Kane, G. Keily, G. Kent, )  
H. Kraaboel, A. Kristoffersen, V. Kumar, )  
G. Kurzhals, J. Lederhandler, )  
J. Lonewski, D. McCardell, J. Macklin, )  
M. Malack, J. Mann, H. Martinez, )  
W. Martinoli, W. Mathewson Jr., )  
J. Meitler, A. Miller, I. Milne, )

1 F. Mitchell, J. Morse, J. Mosley, )  
2 L. Moyle, D. Mundy, I. Murray, )  
3 C. Oldham, E. Olson, J. Omir, )  
4 T. O'Neill, J. Ostlund, G. Pender, )  
5 S. Penicka, A. Pieterse, J. Pinkstone, )  
6 J. Pinto, J. Player, K. Porteous, )  
7 K. Price, G. Pritchard, J. Purdy, )  
8 W. Raleigh, J. Robinson, I. Röser, )  
9 J. Salzano, C. Sanders, D. Sanders, )  
10 J. Sandvoss, A. Schone, D. Schoonover, )  
11 E. Schrobach, M. Scott, G. Sinclair, )  
12 H. Smith, R. Smith, L. Stalick, )  
13 M. Stalick, J. Stalick, D. Stevenson, )  
14 J. Stoutley, P. Stoyanov, D. Stuercke, )  
15 B. Sullivan, A. Surles Jr., C. Surles, )  
16 L. Surles, L. Surles, O. Thiede, )  
17 F. Thome, S. Tie, T. Tran, D. Trottier, )  
18 M. van Paare, G. Vessey, M. Vessey, )  
19 A. Vorias, D. Webb, A. Wesley, F. Willer, )  
20 K. Willer, D. Willey, J. Williams, )  
21 K. Williams, G. Williamson, N. Wills, )  
22 J. Wilson, A. Yatsenko, N. Zafran, )  
23 A. Aleksandrovich, A. Alexander, )  
24 D. Alexander, D. Alexander, C. Arterbury, )  
25 C. Le Bail, T. Batvik, A. Bell, R. Bell, )  
26 G. Bell, L. Bensimon, W. Benton, )  
27 R. Beverly, C. Blair, L. Bohlman, )  
28 M. Bonsaeil, D. Bortel, U. Bortel, )  
29 K. Brothers, R. Campbell, E. Carandang, )  
30 C. Carson, E. Cespedes, C. Chery, )  
31 R. Clabburn, E. Clare, B. Click, )  
32 L. Collins, I. Coulson, S. Cousins, )  
33 Creyd Foundation, K. Anderson, )  
34 S. Anderson, J. Baird, N. Baker, )  
35 B. Baron, R. Bayley, B. Beach, )  
36 P. Blanche, D. Booz, C. Borris, )  
37 G. Boyko, M. Boyko, S. Boyko, Z. Boyko, )  
38 R. Broekman, C. Brown, M. Brown, )  
39 P. Brown, G. Cagle, J. Cales, W. Clark, )  
40 A. Cornwall, M. Cornwall, J. Cummins, )

1 J. Davies, S. Devenney, J. Dilavore, )  
2 M. Dunlap, C. Fillion, M. Fine, R. Fuges,) )  
3 C. Glenn, D. Golding, G. Golding, )  
4 H. Gustafsson, B. Hadwin, B. Handley, )  
5 F. Hassany, W. Haussler, I. Haussler, )  
6 B. Hawthorne, J. Hawthorne, K. Hegge, )  
7 R. Cummings, H. Dautel, R. DeBruyn, )  
8 J. De Souza, L. Emms, L. Doel, G. Doel, )  
9 A. Hepworth, J. Hinton, J. Holmes, )  
10 B. Horton, H. Horton, R. Horton, A. Isa, )  
11 M. Jardan, R. Jarvis, G. Jenkin, )  
12 D. Jessup, P. Jessup, R. Jonsson, )  
13 P. Edvardsson, S. Khalil, L. Kennedy, )  
14 D. Kent, A. Klos, S. Lantz, J. Larderello,) )  
15 R. Lee, S. Lopez, L. Lucio, S. Lucio, )  
16 J. Massey, A. Matchett, S. May, )  
17 J. Meadors, S. Milak, W. Mitchell, )  
18 R. Modin, V. Modin, M. Nagahiro, )  
19 M. Nickel, O. Nordlien, L. Norman, )  
20 S. Palanee, R. Paredes, R. Parry, )  
21 D. Paxton, E. Pearce, A. Pearce, )  
22 G. Pender, L. Pollard, J. Prasad, )  
23 H. Revolus, Y. Rosenberg, D. Rowley, )  
24 R. Shaw, M. Shindler, W. Smith, )  
25 W. Stalismsmith, J. Stankewich, D. Stewart, )  
26 J. Stewart, G. Stewart, S. Stewart, )  
27 S. Sousa, S. Talbot, B. Tidd, )  
A. Tomlinson, C. Totten, H. Tremblay, )  
W. Turner, W. Ploeg, C. Pyneeandee, )  
A. Vorias, E. Wade, A. Waldrop, )  
K. Waldrop, M. Wicktorin, )  
Wildin Financial, J. Wolper, K. Wood, )  
J. Woodroff, E. Aaslid, J. Amstutz, )  
P. Ancelot, C. Ancelot, E. Anderson, )  
M. Azzopardi, G. Bailey, S. Bakar, )  
J. Beaugendre, W. Beimer, C. Becerra, )  
L. Becerra, R. Beresford, )  
D. Bowen, S. Buchanan, F. Buchanan, )  
J. Cope, R. Cope, J. Couture, L. Couture, )  
C. Crawford, S. Cruz, S. Cunningham, )

1 M. DeMass, N. Doel, A. Doft, G. Eade, )  
2 T. Fitness, M. Fox, S. Fox, R. French, )  
R. Ganderton, E. Gold, D. Gooley, )  
3 B. Gordon, C. Gordon, G. Gordon, )  
4 L. Gordon, R. Gordon III, R. Gordon IV, )  
J. Harris, V. Haberlach, L. Haji, )  
5 K. Hall, S. Harmon, C. Haugan, )  
6 H. Hemphill, M. Iberg, W. Johnson, )  
R. Kenneally, T. Khorteikkim, D. McCleery, )  
7 G. McDougall, M. McDougall, )  
8 S. McDougall, M. Maillet, )  
9 T. Tuaga, P. Maillet, M. Mosley, )  
S. Nash, P. Nolan, E. Nolan, )  
10 B. Portmann, C. Portmann, )  
11 R. Portmann, C. Puig, B. Raleigh, )  
M. Ratliff, G. Ratliff, B. Roberts, )  
12 J. Russell, M. Sairam, E. Salas, )  
13 N. Salas, H. Samnoy, I. Schmidt, )  
J. Schreiber, Y. Setyawan, P. Shepherd, )  
14 E. Solier, G. Spencer, B. Syme, )  
15 M. Thoars, N. Thoars, H. Vickery, )  
W. Wagner, M. Wenning, A. Williams, )  
16 S. Young, S. Allen, C. Burke, D. Havens )  
17 B. Knell, M. Lynn, S. May, D. Paxton, )  
C. Ashton Porter, A. Smith, J. Uchoa, )  
18 T. Sullivan, C. Sullivan and Does 1 )  
19 Through 34988 )  
Plaintiffs, )  
20 )  
v., )  
21 )  
22 )  
DR. ROMAN POSECK, DR. THOMAS AUMÜLLER, )  
23 DR. JÜRGEN-PETER GRAF, )  
24 SABINE LEUTHEUSER-SCHNARRENBERGER, )  
HEIKO MAAS, KATARINA BARLEY, )  
25 WOLFGANG SCHÄUBLE, )  
26 OLAF SCHOLZ, ANGELA MERKEL )  
27 Defendants. )  
)

1 **STANDING**

2 All of the Plaintiffs are beneficiaries under the September  
3 2007 settlement agreement signed by Dr. Jürgen-Peter Graf.  
4 Crystal L. Schultz and John E. Doel are two of the three  
5 Plaintiffs on a UK high court order signed by Lord Alan F.  
6 Rodger in May 2011. The Defendants consist of the previous and  
7 current President, Frankfurt am Main Court of Appeals, presiding  
8 judge of Civil Senate 26 and judicial trustee on both actions; a  
9 Federal Judge of Criminal Panel 1; the previous and current  
10 Federal Republic of Germany Minister of Finance; the previous  
11 and current Minister of Justice and Consumer Protection; and the  
12 current Chancellor. Therefore, we have standing, and the need to  
13 make our petition to this court.

14 **NATURE OF ACTION**

15 As a result of the September 2007 decision by the German  
16 Federal Criminal Court 1 signed by Dr. Jürgen-Peter Graf, and  
17 the May 2011 UK high court order signed by Lord Alan F. Rodger,  
18 The Federal Republic of Germany, State of Hessen, Frankfurt-am-  
19 Main Court of Appeals was charged with, and voluntarily  
20 accepted, global jurisdiction and the judicial duty to protect  
21 the rights of the beneficiaries and ensure all court decisions  
22 be enforced. Beside copious documentary evidence, this  
23 acceptance can be substantiated by the computer monitor  
24 installed in the office of the president of the Frankfurt-am-  
25 Main Court of Appeals per the 2011 UK court order.

26 **NONCONFORMANCE**

27 Plaintiffs acknowledge the nonconformance of their motions  
with normal court protocols. However, we ask that the

1 international nature of the matter and its beneficiaries may  
2 allow for some latitude. Also, the acceptance of previous  
3 actions have already set a precedence in this case. Such  
4 acceptances include, but are not limited to:

- 5 A. The 2011 UK High Court order submitted in English and  
6 Latin.
- 7 B. Acceptance of English legal decisions used as the basis for  
8 the creation of a virtual jurisdiction.
- 9 C. Current oversight of the escrow accounts in an Austrian  
10 Bank.
- 11 D. The lack of German legal credentials for the current  
12 administrator's legal counsel.
- 13 E. Payment of over US\$20T in international wire transfers from  
14 British banks with all remittance in English.
- 15 F. Motions filed against the current fiduciary administrator,  
16 Simon J. Church in the Frankfurt-am-Main Court Of Appeals  
17 in January 22 and February 26, 2018 respectively using the  
18 same format.
- 19 G. Filing of the "Judicial Notice: Intent to File Formal  
20 Judicial Complaint" and "Formal Judicial Complaint" filed  
21 April 23 and May 14, 2018 respectively in the Frankfurt-am-  
22 Main Court of Appeals and with the State of Hessen.
- 23 H. Filing of a "Formal Criminal Complaint" on July 23, 2018 in  
24 the Frankfurt-am-Main Court of Appeals and the State of  
25 Hessen.
- 26 I. Filing of a "Demand for Reference Numbers" on August 13,  
27 2018 in the Frankfurt-am-Main Court of Appeals and the  
State of Hessen.

1 J. Filing of an "Amended Formal Criminal Complaint" on August  
2 27, 2018 in the Frankfurt-am-Main Court of Appeals and the  
3 State of Hessen.

4 K. Filing of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> "Amended Formal Criminal Complaint"  
5 on September 10 and October 8, 2018 respectively.

6 L. The receipt, to date, of 401 claims for payments per the  
7 terms of the 2007 settlement agreement equaling  
8 \$US46,224,918,484.09.

9 Plaintiffs used the same format with all filings (see fax  
10 confirmation attached.) No response has been received from  
11 either the court or the State of Hessen objecting to the  
12 filings or the format.

### 13 HISTORY

14 A formal complaint was filed in the Criminal High Court,  
15 Frankfurt Germany on September 6, 2006, by Brad Haskins against  
16 numerous entities including Sam Colins, Solid Investments, Alex  
17 Polyakov, and Jungle Ventures. The subsequent investigation  
18 found numerous criminal activities and charges were filed.

19 In September 2007, in lieu of criminal charges, a  
20 settlement agreement was reached between entities controlled by  
21 Schroeder Asset Management and representatives of over 50,000  
22 investors.

23 Judicial oversight of a 2007 settlement agreement signed by  
24 Dr. Jürgen-Peter Graf, Criminal Panel 1, Federal German Court,  
25 was assigned to Dr. Thomas Aumüller, President Frankfurt am Main  
26 Court of Appeals and presiding judge of Civil Senate 26.

27 Immediately, Dr. Aumüller approved an administrative  
request by Schroeder Asset Management to sequester all documents

1 of the settlement agreement from the beneficiaries and to remove  
2 them from the official court records. Barclays was appointed  
3 Paymaster who then contracted RBS and Lloyds to assist. All  
4 payments were to be completed within 30 days.

5 Detailed transaction listings received daily from the  
6 special wire department of the Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS),  
7 specifically created to manage the settlement agreement  
8 payments, prove \$US20T in wire transfers were processed from  
9 early 2008 to mid-2010. Each wire was accompanied by "clean and  
10 clear" documents authorized by the Federal Republic of Germany.

11 By mid-2008, RBS management grew concerned by the nature of  
12 the wire requests. Though the daily requests for payment were  
13 purported to be sent to thousands of unique individuals, the  
14 wire transfers were being sent to the same few entities and in  
15 many cases the exact same account name and number.

16 Because of a previous relationship and their access to the  
17 investor network, RBS made contact with Mr. Simon Church and Ms.  
18 Crystal Schultz. Over the course of the following years, RBS  
19 transmitted the daily wire information to them and they reported  
20 actual received investor payouts back to RBS. In early 2010,  
21 RBS, using the combined transaction file, initiated a formal  
22 review of the wire transactions. Over 90% of the wire transfers  
23 were being sent to the same small group of account numbers.  
24 Further investigation verified the claim. Less than 500 of the  
25 authorized investor accounts were verified as paid.

26 Some of the over 100,000 transactions from the daily  
27 transaction file presented as evidence included:



- 1 a. May 8, 2009, RBS processed 79 wires within a range of  
2 US\$92-340M. A Japanese investor received a wire of  
3 US\$94M into a bank in Hong Kong.
- 4 b. June 26, 2009, RBS processed 95 wires within a range  
5 of US\$96-195M. 21 wires were received by American  
6 investors.
- 7 c. November 19, 2009, RBS processed 104 wires within a  
8 range of US\$42-504M. Payments were received by;
- 9 i. 2 Canadians of US\$77M and US96M respectively.  
10 ii. 3 Americans of US\$57M, 63M and 101M.  
11 iii. 1 Mexican of US\$97M.  
12 iv. 1 Caribbean of US\$108M.  
13 v. 1 Singaporean of US\$78M.  
14 vi. 1 Hong Kongese of US\$69M.  
15 vii. 1 Russian of US\$102M.  
16 viii. 1 Lithuanian of US\$86M.  
17 ix. 1 Australian of US\$71M.
- 18 d. February 5, 2010, RBS processed 120 wires within a  
19 range of US\$75-125M. Payments were received by;
- 20 i. 1 Belgian.  
21 ii. 1 American.  
22 iii. 1 Canadian.
- 23 e. March 10-11, 2010, RBS processed 277 wires within a  
24 range of US\$64-94M. 1 German investor was paid.
- 25 f. June 4, 2010, RBS processed 214 wires within a range  
26 of US\$37-179M. Payments were received by;
- 27 i. 3 Hong Kongese ranging from US\$37-97M.

1           ii. 2 Singaporeans of US\$149M and US\$217M  
2           respectively.

3           g. June 9, 2010, RBS processed 48 wires within a range of  
4           US\$43-500M. Payments were received by;

5           i. 1 German of US\$267M.

6           ii. 1 Italian of US\$67M.

7           h. July 23-24, 2010, RBS processed 276 wires ranging from  
8           US\$29-250M. Payments were received by;

9           i. 1 European of US\$25M.

10          ii. 1 American of US\$146M.

11          iii. 1 Canadian of US\$108M.

12          iv. 1 Singaporean of US\$117M.

13          i. November 26-27, 2010, RBS processed 1,780 wires  
14          ranging from US\$13-405M. Payments were received by;

15          i. 2 Australians of US\$108-226M.

16          ii. 1 Spaniard of US\$87M.

17          iii. 1 Hong Kongese of US\$67M.

18          iv. 1 Caribbean of US\$126M.

19          v. 1 German of US\$86M.

20          vi. 1 Singaporean of US\$56M.

21           In late 2010, upon the demand of RBS, Standard Chartered,  
22           and other select large institutional investors, Dr. Aumüller  
23           approved the movement of administration from Schroeder Asset  
24           Management to Dexia, Belgium.

25           Payments were to begin immediately. However, after several  
26           attempts failed, a technical evaluation of the database found  
27           several corrupting "trojans" had been installed just prior to  
          the transfer of the database, from Schroeder Asset Management to

1 Dexia, damaging selected portions of the court approved investor  
2 data file. Further investigations proved that while select  
3 accounts could be processed properly, over 35,000 investor  
4 accounts were being blocked.

5 In April 2011, John E. Doel, Crystal L. Schultz and Simon  
6 J. Church filed a formal complaint with the UK High Court  
7 demanding payments recommence and to clarify conflicting  
8 jurisdictional disputes that had been used as justification for  
9 noncompliance and lack of judicial oversight. As a result, the  
10 Federal Republic of Germany confirmed its acceptance of global  
11 jurisdiction in an order signed by The Honourable Lord Alan F.  
12 Rodger. Oversight was again granted to Dr. Thomas Aumüller.

13 Per the court order, the UK Plaintiffs assisted in  
14 installing matching, linked computer monitoring stations in the  
15 UK and in the antechamber of the office of the President  
16 Frankfurt am Main Court of Appeals. However, citing fictional  
17 national security concerns, Schroeder Asset Management again  
18 convinced the court the order should be purged from the court  
19 records and hidden from all beneficiaries. Lord Rodger died on  
20 June 26, 2011 and all demands for copies made by the plaintiffs  
21 were ignored.

22 On November 25, 2011, in direct violation of the 2011 UK  
23 court order and with the approval of the Federal Republic of  
24 Germany, an additional 42 accounts including one owned by James  
25 S. Freeman were paid after additional legal action filed in a  
26 New York USA federal court directly threatened certain principle  
27 Schroder Asset Management and Permira Holdings executives and  
investors.

1           In February 2012, after payments continued to be delayed  
2 for a myriad of suspicious reasons, a formal judicial complaint  
3 was filed by the UK High Court against Dr. Thomas Aumüller. Two  
4 of the judges presiding over the formal hearings were Dr.  
5 Jürgen-Peter Graf and Dr. Roman Poseck.

6           Legal representatives from several banks and large  
7 institutional investors presented evidence of thousands of  
8 counts of theft, money laundering, and conspiracy amongst other  
9 criminal actions. However, the criminal charges dropped in lieu  
10 of the 2007 settlement agreement were not reinstated.

11           In March 2012, Dr. Aumüller retired and Dr. Roman Poseck  
12 was appointed President Frankfurt am Main Court of Appeals,  
13 presiding judge of Civil Senate 26 and judicial trustee of both  
14 the 2007 settlement agreement and the 2011 UK High Court order.  
15 He also requested the computer monitoring station be moved to a  
16 small closet outside his office.

17           Immediately, Dr. Poseck appointed Lord Fraser A. Milverton  
18 the new administrator, with John D. Walden and Simon J. Church  
19 as alternates.

20           Concurrent with his appointment, Lord Fraser A. Milverton  
21 aka Fraser A. R. Richards aka unknown, representing a large  
22 investor group, became engaged in negotiations with several  
23 representatives of the European Union and the Federal Republic  
24 of Germany. The purpose of the negotiations were the immediate  
25 need for collateral to back over US\$6 trillion in emergency  
26 bonds to forestall the financial collapse of the euro.

27           In late April 2012, the "EU Bailout Agreement for the  
Federal Republic of Germany" and an ancillary agreement we call

1 the "Agreement to Facilitate Payments" were approved by  
2 Chancellor Angela Merkel and signed by Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble.

3 Due to the immediate need for cash, Lord Milverton pledged  
4 the US\$300 billion in beneficiary escrow accounts as collateral  
5 as a 30 day bridge. After 30 days the escrow funds were to be  
6 substituted and the payments to the beneficiaries would  
7 immediately commence.

8 The second part of the agreement defined the origination  
9 and purpose of the substitute funds. 90% of the replacement  
10 funds would be provided by Lord Milverton's investment group,  
11 with the remaining 10% provided by the Federal Republic of  
12 Germany and several of its financial partners.

13 Because it is unlawful to directly combine the beneficiary  
14 escrow funds (Pool 'A') with other funds, a second pool (Pool  
15 'B') was created and used as the formal collateral.  
16 Specifically, using US\$270 billion of Pool 'A' funds as  
17 collateral, Pool 'B' was created. Germany and partners then  
18 contribute their contribution of US\$30 billion to Pool 'B'.

19 Pool 'B' was then used to create over US\$6 trillion in  
20 fresh cut government and bank bonds, therefore adding emergency  
21 liquidity to the EU financial markets.

22 The 10 year agreement meant that Pool 'B' would then be  
23 made available to specific Designated Primary Market Makers  
24 until 2022.

25 *A Designated Primary Market Maker is a specialized financial*  
26 *institution approved to guarantee the security and integrity of the*  
27 *marketplace. These financial institutions are allowed to create and issue*  
*'fresh cut' or new bonds for corporations and governments. There are very few*

1 such institutions in the world. According to their website, the bank  
2 currently holding the beneficiary escrow accounts, Svenska Handelsbanken, is  
3 one such Designated Primary Bond Market Maker.

4 As governments or corporations expand their need for debt they must  
5 issue new bonds. At the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2014, the global government  
6 bond market was measured at approximately US\$58 Trillion. An increase of  
7 US\$25 Trillion since January 2007.

8 Printed new bonds have no value until they are sold. At a Tier 1  
9 capital rating of 3%, governments would need to find buyers with a minimum of  
10 \$750 Billion in cash or equivalent collateral to fund their needs.

11 According to several bank experts familiar with the government bond  
12 market, the single most difficult problem and only limiting factor to  
13 virtually unlimited profits to a Designated Primary Market Maker is finding  
14 sufficient capital or highly rated collateral to satisfy the growth. Ready,  
15 available and guaranteed cash reserves allow the greatest opportunity for  
16 profit.

17 These same experts have suggested that profits of 3%-5% weekly is quite  
18 normal, given that a single transaction can be completed electronically in  
19 seconds, and several transactions can be performed in a single day using the  
20 same capital.

21 This arrangement provides numerous governments, institutions and  
22 private parties a very profitable investment vehicle.

23 However, 30 days came and went, the payments were not restarted  
24 and the escrow funds are still being used by Pool 'B'.

25 In direct violation of the 2011 UK court order placing  
26 global jurisdiction with the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr.  
27 Poseck approved and signed a request by Lord Milverton to move  
global jurisdiction of the matter into a fabricated virtual

1 jurisdiction. Dr. Poseck appointed himself exclusive  
2 representative of this new artificial, fabricated and  
3 illusionary virtual jurisdiction.

4 A virtual jurisdiction can best be described as creating a  
5 fictional world such as Camelot or World of Warcraft. In such a  
6 jurisdiction, there are no established executive, administrative  
7 or judicial guidelines, norms, rules or laws. It is what the  
8 creator chooses it to be. It therefore made a perfect hiding  
9 place for secret agreements including the 2,000 page tome Lord  
10 Milverton had written for its creation.

11 This unauthorized move allowed both the court and the  
12 Federal Republic of Germany to declare no knowledge of the:

- 13 1. 2007 settlement agreement.
- 14 2. Beneficiary escrow accounts.
- 15 3. Investor database.
- 16 4. 2008-2011 transactions files.
- 17 5. Evidence of bank investigations, including proof of  
18 fraud, theft and money laundering under German oversight.
- 19 6. Evidence of database tampering.
- 20 7. Evidence of violations of international banking laws and  
21 tax evasion.
- 22 8. 2011 UK court order.
- 23 9. Evidence presented during the judicial hearing, including  
24 proof of conspiracy, judicial misconduct, malfeasance,  
25 misfeasance, obstruction of justice, suppression of  
26 evidence and violations of the oath of office.
- 27 10. Evidence of fraud, theft, conspiracy, money  
laundering, tax evasion, and the violation of numerous

1 international banking laws by court appointed  
2 administrative trustees.

3 11. All information required of the beneficiaries  
4 necessary to make valid claims including:

5 a. Name and contact information of current  
6 administrator.

7 b. Whereabouts of investor escrow funds.

8 c. Detailed instruction for making valid claims.

9 12. Requests by the beneficiaries for assistance.

10 Unfortunately for the Federal Republic of Germany, the  
11 creation of "Camelot" also prevented the judiciary from holding  
12 any of the appointed administrators, including Lord Milverton,  
13 John D. Walden and Simon J. Church, accountable for non-  
14 performance.

15 In August 2012, Lord Milverton stepped aside due to health  
16 concerns. Dr. Poseck appointed John D. Walden new administrator.

17 In September 2012, Mr. Walden died suddenly and Dr. Poseck  
18 appointed Simon J. Church (a 31 year old embroidery consultant)  
19 new administrator.

20 According to contemporaneous notes written by the  
21 Plaintiffs, Dr. Poseck's office was in weekly contact with Lord  
22 Milverton, then Mr. Walden and finally Mr. Church. These calls  
23 usually occurred on Friday mornings, and usually consisted of  
24 Dr. Poseck demanding to know when the payments would be  
25 restarted and the administrator replying they needed a few more  
26 days for preparation. Both parties were clearly aware that Dr.  
27 Poseck had forfeited his punitive authority for non-performance  
by virtue of the virtual jurisdiction. Mr. Church ceased



1 communications with all beneficiaries and Plaintiffs in August  
2 2013.

3 From the fall of 2013 until the summer of 2014, numerous  
4 informal attempts, by several investors, failed to persuade Dr.  
5 Poseck to get the payment process restarted. When all attempts  
6 failed the Plaintiffs hired German representation. On August 22,  
7 2014, a letter was sent to Dr. Roman Poseck requesting  
8 information on the matter. The response, albeit prompt, can only  
9 be described as both dismissive and intimidating. He did not ask  
10 for clarification but contended to know nothing of the matter.  
11 This after he spent weeks on the investigative panel, months in  
12 possession of the monitoring station and years in communication  
13 with the numerous court appointed administrators. A similar  
14 response was given via unofficial email to our Australian legal  
15 counsel, and no response was given to our American counsel. His  
16 tactic of professing ignorance balanced with thinly veiled  
17 intimidation accomplished the intended result of creating  
18 significant reluctance on the part of both our German and  
19 Australian counsel to pursue the matter further.

20 However, Mr. Church suddenly resurfaced, with his legal  
21 representative, at the Frankfurt am Main Court of Appeals  
22 starting in November 2014.

23 Since May 2014 to October 2018, the Plaintiffs and 513  
24 other named investors, including many German citizens, made 94  
25 (see exhibit 1) documented attempts to make discrete claims for  
26 our funds. All attempts were rebuffed or ignored.

27 From the chatter that numerous beneficiaries have heard in  
coffee houses, restaurants and around water coolers from the

1 international banking community and government officials over  
2 the years, it would appear the only parties without the official  
3 necessary information to make a claim in this matter are the  
4 legal beneficiaries.

5 The more the beneficiaries made this matter public, the  
6 more the story changed.

7 The Federal Republic of Germany argued this is a "private  
8 litigation matter" to defend doing nothing when questioned about  
9 the whereabouts of court documents.

10 However, they argue their acceptance of global jurisdiction to  
11 stop anyone from speaking with the Plaintiffs and maintain their  
12 right to control all aspects of the matter.

13 The Federal Republic of Germany argued that all payments  
14 were made when questioned about the beneficiaries' claims of  
15 nonpayment. However, admit that the escrow accounts are fully  
16 funded and available when questioned about invoices and UCC  
17 liens filed by beneficiaries, stating the only reason for  
18 nonpayment is lack of claims by the beneficiaries.

19 The Federal Republic of Germany claims it is the  
20 beneficiaries' responsibility to prove nonpayment when in fact  
21 it is the responsibility of the court appointed administrators  
22 and judicial trustee to protect the rights of the beneficiaries  
23 and ensure all court decisions are enforced.

24 Most recently, when the government press offices have been  
25 asked about this matter, the response has been that the suit is  
26 frivolous and the Plaintiffs misinformed.

1 As one journalist said, "US\$300B is anything but frivolous"  
2 and another suggested "the Plaintiffs are either the best  
3 fiction writers that ever lived, or there is a huge story here."  
4

#### 5 **GERMAN INVESTORS**

6 Though the exact number of German citizens represented by  
7 the 2007 settlement agreement is unknown, at least 100 have been  
8 identified. One specifically has been severely impacted by the  
9 egregious behavior of the German government.

10 Mr. Jean N. Ott was charged in the *Weimar Amtsgericht, case*  
11 *#121 Js 16976/09* with crimes directly related to his website  
12 accounts. Without the documents proving a settlement agreement  
13 was in place, he was unable to mount a defense. In essence, one  
14 German court, that was duty bound to ensure all beneficiaries  
15 had proper notice, was allowing the fiduciary trustees to defy  
16 their administrative duties while allowing another German court  
17 to convict an innocent man. To add insult to injury, the  
18 infractions Mr. Ott was convicted of would never have taken  
19 place if payments had been made according to the 2007 settlement  
20 agreement governing his funds instead of being stolen for the  
21 second time.

#### 22 **PLAINTIFFS COMPLAINT**

23 Plaintiffs contend that Dr. Jürgen-Peter Graf, Dr. Thomas  
24 Aumüller, Dr. Roman Poseck, Minister Sabine Leutheusser-  
25 Schnarrenberger, Minister Heiko Maas, Minister Wolfgang  
26 Schäuble, Minister Olaf Scholz, Minister Katarina Barley and  
27 Chancellor Angela Merkel with full knowledge, did intentionally  
violate their specific sworn duties by knowingly allowing:

- 1 1. Theft
- 2 2. Theft of funds.
- 3 3. Forgery.
- 4 4. Misapplication of fiduciary property.
- 5 5. Fraudulent destruction, concealment or removal of
- 6 writings.
- 7 6. Commercial bribery.
- 8 7. Obstruction or retaliation.
- 9 8. Perjury.
- 10 9. Tampering with or fabricating physical evidence.
- 11 10. Interference with public duties.
- 12 11. Preventing execution of civil process.
- 13 12. Abuse of official capacity.
- 14 13. Official oppression.
- 15 14. Misuse of official information.

16  
17 These actions are best seen in the administrations:

- 18 1. Appointment of unqualified administrators.
- 19 2. Agreement to allow court appointed administrators to
- 20 withhold critical documents from beneficiaries.
- 21 3. Allowing court records to be removed from authorized court
- 22 approved databases.
- 23 4. Allowing the administrators to hide all relevant documents
- 24 from court recognized beneficiaries in a fabricated,
- 25 illusionary virtual jurisdiction.
- 26 5. Allowing nonpayment of beneficiaries to continue.
- 27 6. Allowing the administrators to not communicate with
- beneficiaries for over a decade.

- 1 7. Allowing the administrators control over the escrow funds  
2 with no oversight.
- 3 8. Allowing the administrators use the escrow funds for the  
4 benefit of others.
- 5 9. Refusing to disclose location of administrator to  
6 beneficiaries.
- 7 10. Refusing further investigation into documented  
8 criminal activity.
- 9 11. Ignoring requests from court approved beneficiaries  
10 for contact information of court approved administrators.
- 11 12. Ignoring requests from court approved beneficiaries  
12 for documents pertaining to the whereabouts of their funds.
- 13 13. Ignoring requests from court approved beneficiaries  
14 for access to their court approved funds.
- 15 14. Violating the guidelines, rules and regulations of the  
16 court by ignoring motions filed by Plaintiffs on January  
17 24, 2018 and February 26, 2018, April 23, 2018, May 14,  
18 2018, July 23, 2018, August 13, 2018, August 27, 2018,  
19 September 10, 2018 and October 8, 2018.

21 **CURRENT ADMINISTRATOR**

22 Through extensive research and private investigation, the  
23 beneficiaries have located the current administrator, and  
24 his legal companion.  
25

26 We found that our current administrator, Simon J. Church  
27 has employed several tactics to avoid both detection and

1 his responsibilities as fiduciary administrator for over 6  
2 years.

3 1. The use of several aliases, such as John Smith, Robin  
4 Richards and Theo Freidrichs, amongst others. Under these  
5 guises, he was able to hide his involvement in both the  
6 EU Bailout "Agreement to Facilitate Payments" and the  
7 2007 Settlement Agreement."

8 a. The primary purpose of this deception has been to  
9 make it difficult to tie the use of the settlement  
10 escrow accounts to the collateral for the EU Bailout  
11 Fund.

12 b. Secondly, he has been able to hide from the  
13 beneficiaries and ensure no demands for payment  
14 could be made against the settlement administration.

15 2. The use of a doppelganger in Chesterfield, Derbyshire UK  
16 to obscure his movements in Germany.

17 3. Moving regularly in jurisdictional disputed locations  
18 such as Reichenau Island, the peninsula between Obersee  
19 Bodensee and Untersee Bodensee and the coast of Lake  
20 Bodensee.

21 4. The use of unofficial legal associates. We believe the  
22 current legal companion is Mr. Neil D. Hughes, Barrister,  
23 Linenhall Chambers, Chester.

24 a. The beneficiaries first made contact with Mr. Hughes  
25 on July 15, 2018 explaining the legal obligations of  
26 Mr. Church.  
27

1           b. Several communiques including copies of court  
2           documents and the address of the beneficiaries  
3           public website have been sent with no response.

4           This new information raises many new questions. Such as

5           1. Does the use of aliases change a fiduciary  
6           administrator's obligations and legal requirements to the  
7           beneficiaries?

8           2. Is Reichenau Island, the peninsula between Obersee  
9           Bodensee and Untersee Bodensee and the coast of Lake  
10          Bodensee really disputed territory?

11          3. Would a German court have any difficulty serving a  
12          subpoena to a court appointed fiduciary administrator  
13          located in this region of Germany?

14          4. What is the role of Mr. Neil D. Hughes?

15                a. Can he be an unofficial legal companion to Mr.  
16                Church related to the 2007 settlement beneficiaries

17                b. and the official legal representative representing  
18                Mr. Church before Dr. Roman Poseck in relation to  
19                the same settlement agreement.

20          5. What are the legal obligations for Mr. Hughes upon  
21          receiving documents implicating Mr. Church in an ongoing  
22          criminal conspiracy?

23                a. Does the crime of aiding and abetting apply as one  
24                count or for each of the 35,000 beneficiaries  
25                remaining to be paid?

1 **SETTLEMENT CLAIMS**

2 As of this filing over US\$46B in claims have been filed  
3 with the Frankfurt am Main Court of Appeals using accepted court  
4 procedures. These claims have been made in accordance with the  
5 format used by the 100,000 claims paid between 2008 and 2012.  
6 All previous claims were honored with 48 hours of receipt.

- 7 1. Given the courts acceptance of global jurisdiction in this  
8 matter, what is the courts obligation to ensure these  
9 claims are honored?
- 10 2. How long must the beneficiaries wait for payments to be  
11 made?
- 12 3. If contact is not made by either the court or the fiduciary  
13 administrator immediately, have the beneficiaries fulfilled  
14 all obligations of administrative remedy, allowing criminal  
15 complaints to be filed in any and all beneficiary  
16 jurisdictions against Mr. Church, Mr. Hughes, Dr. Poseck  
17 and the Federal Republic of Germany?

18  
19 It is the duty of all government officials to protect the  
20 rule of law and the judicial trustees to protect the rights of  
21 the beneficiaries and ensure all court decisions are enforced.

22 These duties include:

- 23 1. Being fully acquainted with the terms of the settlements  
24 and rulings of the courts.
- 25 2. Ensure that the assets in trust are vested in accordance  
26 with such rulings.
- 27 3. Never delegate or ignore the duties entrusted.



1 4. Act impartially and solely in the interest of all  
2 beneficiaries.

3 5. Management of assets of the trust with prudence and  
4 professionalism.

5 We demand a formal investigation into this matter,  
6 specifically the conduct of the Defendants and generally, any  
7 other suspicious conduct by other parties that may surface as a  
8 result of this investigation. We also demand this matter be  
9 transferred to another judicial trustee, all documents be made  
10 available to Plaintiffs and payment recommence immediately.

11 Plaintiffs also demand:

12 1. Immediate payment of all claims currently filed with the  
13 court.

14 2. A procedure be created, implemented and communicated to  
15 all beneficiaries to enable all authorized payments can  
16 recommence.

17 3. Crystal Schultz be contacted to discuss terms for her  
18 appointment as part of a fiduciary administration team.

19 4. A reference number be immediately assigned to Plaintiffs  
20 "Formal Criminal Complaint", "Amended Formal Criminal  
21 Complaint" "2<sup>nd</sup> Amended Formal Criminal Complaint" and  
22 "3<sup>rd</sup> Amended Formal Criminal Complaint" filed via court  
23 designated fax numbers on July 23, 2018, August 27, 2018,  
24 September 10, 2018 and October 8, 2018 respectively.

25 5. A reference number be immediately assigned to Plaintiffs  
26 "Formal Judicial Complaint" filed via court designated  
27 fax numbers on May 14, 2018.

- 1           6. The reference numbers assigned to Plaintiffs "Formal  
2           Criminal Complaint" and all subsequent Amended Formal  
3           Criminal Complaints be immediately communicated to  
4           Plaintiff representative, Crystal L. Schultz.
- 5           7. The reference number assigned to Plaintiffs "Formal  
6           Judicial Complaint" be immediately communicated to  
7           Plaintiff representative, Crystal L. Schultz.
- 8           8. The reference numbers assigned to Plaintiffs "Petition to  
9           Enforce Court Orders", "Petition to Appoint Oversight"  
10          and "Intent to File Formal Judicial Complaint" filed  
11          January 24, 2018, February 26, 2018, and April 23, 2018,  
12          respectively, be communicated to Plaintiff  
13          representative, Crystal. L. Schultz.
- 14          9. An immediate investigation begin into both Plaintiffs  
15          "Formal Criminal Complaint" and the "Formal Judicial  
16          Complaint" filed May 14, 2018 and July 23, 2018  
17          respectively.
- 18          10. The reference number and subsequent case number,  
19          current dispensation and all details related to the  
20          investigation of the "Formal Criminal Complaint" filed  
21          September 6, 2006 against numerous Defendants including  
22          Sam Colins and Solid Investment be immediately  
23          communicated to Plaintiff representative, Crystal  
24          Schultz.
- 25          11. The reference number (case number) of the court order  
26          signed in September 2007 by Dr. Jürgen-Peter Graf, German  
27          Federal Court, Criminal Panel 1, in lieu of criminal  
            charges filed against Sam Colins and Solid Investment be

1 immediately communicated to Plaintiff representative,  
2 Crystal Schultz.

3 12. A reference number be immediately assigned to the  
4 Plaintiffs "Demand for Reference Numbers" filed via court  
5 designated fax numbers on August 13, 2018 and be  
6 immediately communicated to Plaintiff representative,  
7 Crystal L. Schultz.

8 For over a decade the beneficiaries have been mistreated,  
9 ignored, abused and robbed (thrice) while supposedly under the  
10 protection of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German  
11 Judicial system. After 10 years, all of what has and continues  
12 to happen cannot be the result of simple error.

13 Plaintiffs do hereby complain, hence the filing of this  
14 official criminal complaint.

15 I swear, under penalty of perjury, that the information  
16 contained in this petition is accurate and correct to the best  
17 of my knowledge.

18  
19 Date: 26 November 2018  
20  
21

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 Crystal L. Schultz  
24 Attorney in Pro Se for Plaintiffs  
25  
26  
27