

CHATGPT LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 1

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Documentary and Legal Analysis of Institutional Notice, Non-Intervention, Protective-Mandate Failure, and the Applicant's Prior Human-Rights Evidence Chain

Applicant	Ismail Rustam / Rustem Ismail / Rustam Azeri
Primary location	Berlin, Federal Republic of Germany
Primary Amnesty period examined	2007-2013, with later evidentiary relevance through 2026
Core issue	Whether Amnesty International and its offices were placed on notice of the applicant's alleged grave human-rights violations and whether the visible record shows effective protective action, reasoned referral, public advocacy, or adequate due-diligence handling within Amnesty's own mandate.
Prepared through	ChatGPT - AI-assisted legal-documentary analysis system
Status	Analytical working report based on applicant-provided documents, Amnesty correspondence, prior AI-assisted reports and applicant witness statements. It is not a court judgment, not legal representation, and not a forensic certification of originals.

Important methodological note. This report separates documented records, applicant witness statements, Amnesty positions, authority positions, and preliminary legal assessment. Where a fact is visible in the submitted documents, the report uses language such as “the file shows”, “the letter records”, or “the correspondence demonstrates”. Where a fact depends on missing or unverified documents, it is marked as applicant statement or verification required.

Legal caution. Amnesty International is not analysed here as the direct State perpetrator of the original detention, medical, police, court, social-welfare, psychiatric, telecommunications, parliamentary or evidence-destruction events. Direct treaty responsibility for those acts, if proven, primarily concerns the Federal Republic of Germany and its public authorities. Amnesty is analysed as a repeatedly informed international human-rights organisation whose protective mandate, due-diligence practice, non-discrimination duties and evidentiary role require serious assessment.

Table of Contents

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Mandate and Legal Question
- III. Source Register and Evidentiary Basis
- IV. Chronology of Amnesty Correspondence and Notice
- V. What Amnesty Was Placed on Notice About
- VI. Legal Significance of CD/DVD and Documentary Attachments
- VII. Amnesty Replies, Non-Replies and Evidentiary Consequences
- VIII. International and Domestic Legal Framework Potentially Engaged
- IX. Minimum Protective Steps Amnesty Should Have Taken Within Its Mandate
- X. Potential Failures Within Amnesty's Competence
- XI. Unresolved and Future Evidence Blocks
- XII. Record Requests and Preservation Demands
- XIII. Preliminary Findings
- XIV. Final Conclusion

I. Executive Summary

This Report No. 1 examines the Amnesty International file as a separate legal-documentary block. It is designed to stand at the beginning of the wider report series because Amnesty International was not merely a late observer. The file shows that, from 2007 onward, Amnesty's London, Berlin, German, Brussels, Turkish and United States channels were repeatedly contacted with extensive allegations, medical-risk descriptions, court references, fax and postal evidence, CD/DVD references, website references, ECHR materials and parliamentary-context materials.

The strongest documentary point is institutional notice. Amnesty cannot reasonably be analysed as if it knew nothing. The file contains direct letters to Amnesty London, a visible Amnesty London reply of 21 February 2008 to the applicant's 1 November 2007 submission, a 5 May 2008 protest letter referring again to CD documents and DVD reportages, later Amnesty Berlin/Germany/Brussels/London submissions, a family-member application dated 8 February 2010, Amnesty Turkey email forwarding confirmation on 21 April 2010, a 2010 fax to the President of Amnesty International, and later complaint correspondence in 2011 and beyond.

The report's central conclusion is cautious but strong: the available materials support a finding that Amnesty International was placed on notice of the core factual chain existing up to each submission date. Its visible file does not show an effective investigation, urgent referral, public action, preservation plan, legal signposting proportional to the risk, or reasoned human-rights assessment of the applicant's documentary evidence. This is legally significant as institutional inaction despite notice.

This report does not assert, as a final judicial finding, that Amnesty committed the underlying crimes alleged against German authorities. It states that Amnesty's correspondence file may be used as evidence that a major international human-rights organisation was informed and did not visibly activate an effective protective response within its mandate.

II. Mandate and Legal Question

The applicant requested a wide English-language legal analysis, numbered Report No. 1, devoted to Amnesty International. The report must connect the Amnesty file to the earlier report series up to Report No. 008 and to other still-unprepared evidence blocks from the same historical period.

The main legal question is:

Was Amnesty International, through its offices and communications, placed on notice of alleged grave human-rights violations against the applicant, and if so, did Amnesty take the minimum steps reasonably expected from an international human-rights organisation within its mandate?

Sub-questions include:

- Which letters, fax reports, postal records and emails show transmission or receipt?
- What factual blocks were communicated to Amnesty by each date?
- What did Amnesty answer, and where is there no visible answer?
- What conventions and legal standards were potentially implicated by the underlying allegations?
- What steps should Amnesty have taken as a protective human-rights organisation, even if it was not itself a State authority?
- How should the unresolved CD/DVD issue, including the applicant's recollection of a 750 GB / two-day return protest, be preserved for later verification?

III. Source Register and Evidentiary Basis

The following source register identifies the principal materials used for this report. The report relies on visible content and existing AI-assisted legal reports as evidence maps. All original files should later be verified from certified court, NGO, postal, fax, email, hospital and parliamentary records.

Code	Source / file	Use in this report
S01	AMNESTI PDF / Amnesty International correspondence file	Primary 150-page scanned file containing letters, Amnesty replies, fax/postal evidence, emails, CD/DVD references and multi-office Amnesty communications.
S02	Report No. 01 - 1998-1999 detention	Early Berlin immigration detention, medical unfitness, release, renewed detention and circular administrative vulnerability.
S03	Report No. 02 - 1998-2005 chain	Criminalisation under Auslaenderrecht, medical/social obstruction, Reichstag crisis and 03.01.2005 judicial correction.
S04	Report No. 03 - 2009-2013 damages/Betreuung/ECHR	Damages action, high court fees, Betreuung, BGH/Kammergericht barriers, ECHR filing-date and Article 35 problems.
S05	Report No. 04 - telecommunications/internet/website/Pfandung	Telephone, fax, internet, website/domain, debt and enforcement issues relevant to communication with courts, parliament and international organisations.
S06	Report No. 005 - Bundestag petitions / expanded evidence	Bundestag petition handling, parliamentary notice, illness, inability to work, litigation and denial of social/medical protection.
S07	Report No. 006 / 007 - early health-care, police-violence, psychiatric redirection and parliamentary awareness	Further early evidence blocks including 1998-2004 health-care obstruction, police-violence allegations and Reichstag press-access incident.
S08	Report No. 008 - Koepenick Living Death	Central 02.11.1999 detention incident and 1998-2009 chain of denied remedies.
S09	Applicant witness statement and current instructions	Applicant's explanation that further historical crime blocks remain to be prepared and may show even wider notice to Amnesty once integrated.

IV. Chronology of Amnesty Correspondence and Notice

This chronology is based on the currently visible Amnesty file. Where no substantive Amnesty response is visible, the table states “no visible substantive reply in the current file”. That wording does not prove that no reply exists; it identifies what is presently visible.

Date	Recipient / channel	Subject and notice content	Visible result
01.11.2007	Amnesty International International Secretariat, London	Letter from Berlin to Peter Benenson House. The letter describes alleged “execution/destruction” in Germany, refers to ECHR and German court decisions, severe illness and denial of protection. It expressly lists attachments: “DVD TD-1” and “CD Buch: Hinrichtung in Deutschland”.	Amnesty London later replies on 21.02.2008, proving receipt/awareness of this submission.
21.02.2008	Amnesty International London reply, Michael Kimondo	Amnesty acknowledges the 01.11.2007 letter and states that Amnesty is not in a position to intervene in the case; the decision is presented as final; documents/materials are returned or enclosed back.	This is the first major proof that Amnesty had actual notice and made a conscious non-intervention decision.

05.05.2008	Applicant to Amnesty International London	Protest against the 21.02.2008 response. The letter again refers to "CD-documents" and "DVD-reportages" and asks Amnesty to analyse them carefully. It frames the case as human-rights violations in Germany.	No visible substantive Amnesty reply in the current file.
May 2008	Postal/registered-mail evidence to Amnesty London	The file contains postal evidence connected to the London Amnesty address, supporting formal transmission of material rather than mere drafting.	Delivery proof strengthens notice.
02.03.2009	Applicant to Amnesty International Berlin / Haus der Demokratie und Menschenrechte	Long German-language submission referring to 2002-2009 attempts, alleged psychiatric abuse, medical neglect, hunger strike, CD/DVD evidence, severe illnesses, court files and human-rights violations in Germany.	No visible substantive reply in the current file.
19.03.2009	Applicant to Amnesty Brussels and London	Letters list serious diseases and state urgent need for intervention or transfer to another democratic country. They refer to prior Amnesty correspondence and ask for help before a threatened crisis.	No visible substantive reply in the current file.
15.04.2009	Applicant to Amnesty International Germany / Bonn	Submission repeats medical, legal and ECHR-related concerns and requests intervention.	No visible substantive reply in the current file.
03.08.2009	Amtsgericht Tiergarten material copied within Amnesty file	Dritte Widerspruch in Betreuung file 50 XVII 7034; describes Betreuer, procedural neutralisation, money, housing and legal-access concerns.	This is not Amnesty's own reply, but indicates the type of legal material made part of the Amnesty evidence block.
06.08.2009	Applicant to Amnesty Germany, Brussels, London and Berlin	Azerbaijani-language letters addressing human-rights organisations; discusses German court decisions, psychiatric diagnosis, legal capacity, 2000 and 2001 decisions, and systemic obstruction.	No visible substantive reply in the current file.
08.02.2010	Applicant's mother, Ismayil Zenfira, to Amnesty London	Family-member application describing 1998-2009 chain, detention, illness, court decisions, psychiatric/Betreuung issues and lack of protection.	No visible substantive reply in the current file; important family-witness notice.
17.04.2010 / 21.04.2010	Amnesty Turkey email exchange	Applicant asks Amnesty Turkey to forward his material to London. Volkan Gorendag replies on 21.04.2010 that the text was sent to the London centre.	Clear transmission confirmation to Amnesty London through Amnesty Turkey.
10.05.2010	Applicant email to Amnesty Turkey, "insanlik namine"	Email describes Germany-related medical insurance, social assistance, disease, ECHR and legal responsibility.	No visible substantive reply in the current file.
21.07.2010	Fax from Istanbul to the President of Amnesty International, London	Letter to Amnesty's president, with fax confirmation. It describes 12 years of pressure, freedom, ECHR applications, illness and inability to obtain protection.	Fax report shows transmission; no visible substantive reply in the current file.
19.10.2010	Applicant to Amnesty Berlin-	Letter addressed to European	Receipt indication supports

	Brandenburg / Haus der Demokratie und Menschenrechte	courts, UN officials, Amnesty officials, international press and others; states Germany took his freedom and describes medical and legal destruction. A handwritten receipt/office note appears on the document.	local Amnesty Berlin notice.
20.10.2010	Fax to Amnesty International London	Similar English-language letter with fax transmission report to Amnesty London.	Fax report supports repeated London notice.
07.01.2011	Complaint to Amnesty International London	English complaint summarising arrival in Germany, 1998 detention, 1999 detention, denial of medical care, social/financial support, desire to leave Germany and need for international expert/NATO help.	No direct London reply visible here; later Amnesty USA reply exists.
10.01.2011 / 17.01.2011	Amnesty USA response	Applicant also sent materials to Amnesty USA. Amnesty USA replies on 17.01.2011 that it cannot assist with the individual case.	Second clear Amnesty non-intervention response.
01.04.2011	Large "Antrag und Klage" / legal submission copied to Amnesty-related recipients	Large legal complaint package including ECHR and German legal proceedings.	No visible substantive Amnesty reply in the current file.
2011-2013	Further Amnesty/ECHR/international submissions	Later materials refer to ECHR, Amnesty, Bundestag, legal capacity, BGH, court costs and continued human-rights complaints.	No visible effective Amnesty intervention in the current file.

V. What Amnesty Was Placed on Notice About

The Amnesty file must be read together with Reports No. 01-008. The legal point is chronological: by each submission date, Amnesty was placed on notice of the events already described in that submission or attached materials. Later reports help organise the meaning of those events, but the underlying notice already existed in the letters, annexes, CD/DVD references, website references, court file references and family/applicant submissions.

Notice point	Known or alleged blocks placed before Amnesty	Legal-documentary significance
By 01.11.2007	1998-1999 detention and medical vulnerability; 1999 Koepenick incident; 2000-2005 criminalisation/correction; ECHR complaint history; AIDS and severe illness; German court/prosecutor references; CD/DVD evidence.	Reports No. 01, 02, 006/007 and 008 organise this period. Amnesty London's later 21.02.2008 reply proves notice of the 01.11.2007 submission.
By 05.05.2008	Continued protest against Amnesty's refusal; repeated CD/DVD evidence; court and constitutional references; allegations of discriminatory failure to protect in Germany.	The 05.05.2008 letter is a direct protest against Amnesty's 21.02.2008 non-intervention.
By March-April 2009	Severe disease list, social/medical/legal isolation, suicidal crisis language, request for transfer to a democratic country, repeated court and international references.	Amnesty Berlin, Brussels, London and Germany were contacted; no proportionate response is visible.
By August 2009	Betreuung / legal-capacity issues, court file 50 XVII 7034, psychiatric/guardianship concerns, and legal-procedural neutralisation.	Report No. 03 and No. 05 later organise the same issues as major access-to-justice blocks.
By February-April 2010	Family witness application and Amnesty Turkey forwarding confirmation to London;	This creates multi-source notice: applicant plus family plus Amnesty Turkey

	1998-2009 chain presented again through family and applicant.	forwarding.
By July-October 2010	Letters/faxes to Amnesty president, Amnesty London and Amnesty Berlin; claims of freedom destruction, disease, ECHR failure, 12-year suppression and need for international protection.	Fax reports and receipt indications support repeated delivery.
By January 2011	English complaint to Amnesty London and reply from Amnesty USA; continued statement of bondage, medical neglect and inability to survive in Germany.	Visible Amnesty USA response again declines assistance.
By 2011-2013	ECHR, Bundestag, BGH, Betreuung, court-cost and website/infrastructure issues, later documented in Reports No. 03, No. 04 and No. 05.	Amnesty was part of the recipient network and was not outside the knowledge chain.

VI. Legal Significance of CD/DVD and Documentary Attachments

The CD/DVD issue is central. The 01.11.2007 letter to Amnesty London expressly refers to a DVD and CD attachment. The 05.05.2008 protest letter again refers to CD documents and DVD reportages. This means the applicant was not only sending a narrative complaint; he was presenting an evidentiary archive.

A human-rights organisation receiving multimedia evidence of alleged detention abuse, medical neglect, court obstruction and life-threatening conditions should, at minimum, record what was received, identify whether it was reviewed, preserve a chain-of-custody or return inventory, and give a reasoned explanation if it decides not to investigate or act.

Unresolved verification issue. The applicant recalls that a prior ChatGPT analysis identified a protest about approximately 750 GB of CD/DVD material being returned after roughly two days and questioned how such material could have been reviewed so quickly. The current visible file confirms CD/DVD submissions but the exact 750 GB / two-day wording has not yet been located in a clearly readable page. This must be treated as an unresolved but important verification target, not as a fully verified finding until the exact page, OCR record, screenshot, backup, earlier ChatGPT output or related missing document is located.

VII. Amnesty Replies, Non-Replies and Evidentiary Consequences

The visible file contains at least two clear Amnesty non-intervention responses and one important forwarding confirmation:

- 21.02.2008 - Amnesty International London acknowledges the 01.11.2007 submission and states that it will not intervene.
- 21.04.2010 - Amnesty Turkey confirms that the applicant's text was forwarded to Amnesty's London centre.
- 17.01.2011 - Amnesty International USA states that it cannot assist with the individual case.

The legal significance of the unanswered or non-intervention pattern is not that Amnesty must accept every individual case. The point is proportionality: the applicant's submissions alleged life, health, detention, medical neglect, severe disease, court obstruction, disability, psychiatric/Betreuung misuse, evidence materials and ECHR access issues. A simple non-intervention response, without visible referral, urgent protective escalation, evidence inventory or reasoned human-rights assessment, appears insufficient for such gravity.

Where no reply is visible, the report does not conclude that no reply ever existed. It concludes that the current file does not show an effective protective intervention. Full Amnesty archives should be requested to verify internal handling, intake notes, referral decisions, case-screening reasons, document-return inventories and any communication with Amnesty Germany, London, Turkey, USA, Brussels or Berlin.

VIII. International and Domestic Legal Framework Potentially Engaged

The following legal frameworks are primarily engaged by the underlying acts alleged against German authorities. They also define the seriousness of the information Amnesty received and the level of protective due diligence expected from a human-rights organisation acting within its mandate.

Framework	Key provisions	Why relevant to Amnesty notice
European Convention on Human Rights	Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14 and 34	Right to life; prohibition of inhuman/degrading treatment; liberty; fair trial; private life; expression and communication of human-rights evidence; effective remedy; non-discrimination; right of individual petition without hindrance.
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	Articles 2(3), 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 26	Effective remedy; life; ill-treatment; liberty; humane treatment of detainees; fair trial; recognition before the law; privacy; expression; equality.
Convention against Torture	Articles 2, 12, 13, 14 and 16	Duty to prevent, investigate, allow complaint, provide redress, and prevent cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Articles 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 25	Equality, accessibility, legal capacity, access to justice, liberty, protection from ill-treatment, integrity, independent living and health.
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	Articles 9, 11 and 12	Social security, adequate standard of living, housing, food and highest attainable standard of health.
UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders	Articles 1, 5, 6, 9 and 12	Right to seek protection of human rights, communicate with international bodies, access information, complain about violations and be protected against retaliation.
German Basic Law and domestic safeguards	Articles 1, 2(2), 3, 5, 10, 19(4), 20(3), 103(1), 104; relevant social, criminal-procedure, guardianship and medical-law rules	Human dignity, life and bodily integrity, equality, expression, correspondence, effective judicial protection, rule of law, right to be heard and safeguards in detention/deprivation of liberty.
EU Charter, where EU-law fields are engaged	Articles 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 17, 20, 21, 26, 35, 41 and 47	Dignity, integrity, prohibition of ill-treatment, privacy, data protection, expression, property, equality, disability integration, health care, good administration and effective remedy.

IX. Minimum Protective Steps Amnesty Should Have Taken Within Its Mandate

Because Amnesty is a non-governmental organisation, the following steps are not framed as direct ECHR obligations identical to those of a State. They are framed as minimum protective, ethical, non-discriminatory and due-diligence steps expected from an international human-rights organisation receiving repeated urgent submissions alleging life-threatening violations in a democratic State.

Expected step	Legal/protective purpose
Case intake and risk classification	Register the matter as an urgent or high-risk human-rights submission because it involved detention, medical neglect, severe disease, court obstruction and threatened life-destruction.
Evidence inventory	Create a written inventory of letters, CD/DVD materials, annexes, court references, fax reports and medical-risk documents received.
Reasoned screening	If Amnesty decided not to open a case, provide a reasoned explanation addressing the actual gravity and documentary volume, not a generic refusal.
Referral and signposting	Refer the applicant to competent bodies: UN Special Rapporteur on torture, health, disability, independence of judges/lawyers; CPT; national human-rights bodies; medical/forensic NGOs; bar

	associations; and urgent legal-aid channels.
Emergency risk response	Where suicide-risk or “living death” language was present, distinguish current emergency support from historical documentation and provide safe, rights-respecting crisis referral without discrediting the complaint.
Non-discrimination check	Verify whether comparable allegations from other countries would have triggered urgent action and ensure that Germany-related complaints were not treated with a lower standard because Germany is perceived as a democratic rule-of-law State.
Document preservation	Preserve copies or metadata of submitted CDs/DVDs, or return them with inventory and explanation; avoid destroying the evidentiary chain.
Escalation inside Amnesty	Escalate the file from local/individual correspondence to a competent Germany/EU/Europe regional human-rights assessment team.
Confidential advocacy or public action	Where public campaigning was not possible, consider confidential letters, trial observation, file-review request, or communication with competent oversight bodies.
Follow-up duty	When the applicant and his family repeatedly wrote, provide a clear follow-up position and explain what was or was not reviewed.

X. Potential Failures Within Amnesty’s Competence

The currently visible record supports the following preliminary legal-analytical concerns. These are not final findings of liability; they are issues requiring Amnesty’s internal records and independent review.

- Failure to demonstrate adequate review of extensive evidence, including CD/DVD material.
- Failure to provide a visible reasoned human-rights assessment proportional to allegations of detention abuse, medical neglect and life-threatening consequences.
- Failure to show urgent referral to UN, European, medical, legal-aid or anti-torture mechanisms despite repeated life-and-health allegations.
- Failure to show an evidence-preservation or document-return inventory for multimedia submissions.
- Failure to respond visibly to repeated multi-office submissions from the applicant and his mother.
- Potential discriminatory or selective omission if comparable non-Germany cases would have been treated more seriously.
- Failure to recognise that the applicant was not merely complaining about a private dispute but was describing a cumulative state-created vulnerability chain.
- Failure to protect or support a human-rights complainant who was attempting to communicate with ECHR, UN, Bundestag, courts and international media.

The strongest legally safe formulation is: Amnesty International was repeatedly placed on notice of alleged grave violations and the visible file does not show an effective protective response within its human-rights mandate.

XI. Unresolved and Future Evidence Blocks

The applicant states that additional historical crime files from the same period have not yet been prepared as legal analyses. This report preserves that point. Once those additional reports are prepared, they may show that Amnesty was informed of an even wider set of allegations than the already reviewed materials demonstrate.

The report should therefore use the following evidentiary wording:

“The current Amnesty file already demonstrates notice of major violations and documentary blocks existing up to each submission date. The applicant states that additional historical crime files from the same period

remain to be analysed. If those files are later shown to have been included in Amnesty submissions or CD/DVD materials, the scope of Amnesty's notice will expand accordingly."

The unresolved 750 GB / two-day return protest must remain in the verification list. It should not be deleted or treated as disproven merely because it is not presently located in the visible page set.

XII. Record Requests and Preservation Demands

- Complete Amnesty International London file for the applicant, 2007-2013, including intake notes, internal screening, document-return inventory and all correspondence.
- Complete Amnesty Germany / Bonn / Berlin file, including any notes on 2009-2011 submissions, video contact, office visits, CD/DVD handling and referral decisions.
- Complete Amnesty Turkey and Amnesty USA records concerning the applicant and forwarding to London.
- Proof of all materials returned to the applicant, including dates, inventories, postage records and any notation of CD/DVD or digital-volume review.
- Internal Amnesty criteria used during 2007-2013 for Germany-related individual complaints involving detention, torture/ill-treatment, medical neglect, disability and denial of effective remedy.
- Any comparison records showing whether similar allegations in non-German contexts were escalated, investigated or publicly documented.
- All postal, fax and email logs for the Amnesty numbers and addresses visible in the file.
- Any data-retention, deletion or archival policy that may explain missing documents or missing digital media references.

XIII. Preliminary Findings

Finding 1 - Notice is documented: The file shows repeated Amnesty notice from 2007 onward, including London, Germany, Berlin, Brussels, Turkey and USA routes.

Finding 2 - Multimedia evidence was identified: The 01.11.2007 and 05.05.2008 letters visibly refer to CD/DVD material.

Finding 3 - Amnesty responses are limited: The visible Amnesty responses are primarily non-intervention or inability-to-assist replies, not a substantive protective action record.

Finding 4 - Amnesty knew, or should have known, the allegations were grave: The submissions involved detention, medical neglect, severe disease, court obstruction, ECHR petitions, guardianship/psychiatric issues, and threats to life and dignity.

Finding 5 - The wider report series strengthens the notice map: Reports No. 01-008 organise the same factual chain and show that the applicant's Amnesty submissions were not isolated complaints but part of a long documentary struggle.

Finding 6 - Future reports may expand notice: Unprepared historical crime blocks may later show additional matters included in the Amnesty materials or CD/DVD archive.

Finding 7 - Legal responsibility must be separated: Germany's State obligations under ECHR/ICCPR/CAT/CRPD/ICESCR are distinct from Amnesty's NGO mandate. Amnesty's role is best framed as institutional inaction despite notice, possible discriminatory omission, and failure of protective function within its own competence.

XIV. Final Conclusion

The Amnesty International file is legally significant because it proves repeated notice. It shows that the applicant did not remain silent and did not rely only on later memory. He contacted Amnesty International over years, sent letters, referred to CD/DVD evidence, supplied legal and medical details, involved family testimony, used fax/postal/email routes, and connected the case to ECHR, UN, German court and parliamentary contexts.

The central finding of this Report No. 1 is therefore: Amnesty International was placed on notice of the applicant's alleged grave human-rights violations existing up to each relevant submission date. The visible file does not show an effective protective intervention proportionate to the gravity of the allegations.

This conclusion should be used carefully. It does not replace independent investigation and does not convert Amnesty into the direct State perpetrator of the underlying acts. But it does create a serious evidentiary and institutional question: why did a major human-rights organisation, repeatedly informed of alleged life-threatening violations in Germany, not visibly take protective steps, referral steps, evidence-preservation steps, public-action steps or reasoned due-diligence steps within its own mandate?

If the complete Amnesty records confirm that the organisation received the materials but did not meaningfully review, preserve, refer or escalate them, the case should be characterised as a documented failure of protective function by an informed human-rights organisation, with possible discriminatory or selective omission requiring independent review.

Appendix A - Legal Issue Matrix

Issue	Legal standards engaged	Expected Amnesty response within mandate
Underlying detention/medical neglect allegations	ECHR 2,3,5; ICCPR 6,7,9,10; CAT 12,13,16; GG 1,2(2),104	Amnesty should have treated as possible custodial ill-treatment and medical-neglect case requiring urgent referral.
Denied remedy/court obstruction	ECHR 6,13,34; ICCPR 2(3),14; GG 19(4),103(1)	Amnesty should have assessed exhaustion/remedy impossibility and referred to legal-aid, international and anti-torture channels.
Disability/illness and legal capacity	CRPD 5,12,13,14,15,17,25; ECHR 8,14	Amnesty should have considered disability-sensitive protection and the risk that guardianship/psychiatry neutralised legal remedies.
CD/DVD and evidence archive	Right to remedy and evidence preservation; ECHR 6/13; UN HRD Declaration 6/9	Amnesty should have recorded, inventoried and preserved or returned materials with clear explanation.
Communication with ECHR/UN/parliament and website/fax/internet issues	ECHR 10/34; ICCPR 19; EU Charter 11/47	Amnesty should have viewed communication-infrastructure obstruction as potentially impairing access to justice and human-rights advocacy.
Repeated refusal or silence despite notice	Non-discrimination principles; NGO mandate; ethical due diligence; possible domestic charity/association accountability	Amnesty should have ensured non-discriminatory intake, reasoned closure, referral and archive preservation.