

CHATGPT LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT - NO. 02

REVISED EXPANDED EVIDENCE EDITION

The 1998-2005 Causal Chain: Immigration Detention, Winter Homelessness, Medical-Access Obstruction, Criminalisation, Reichstag Crisis, Press Exposure and Judicial Correction

Prepared through ChatGPT - AI-Assisted Legal Analysis System

07 June 2026

Supersedes the earlier short Report No. 02 where inconsistent or incomplete

FINAL FULLY CONSOLIDATED VERSION - LATEST AND STRONGEST REPORT NO. 02

Field	Content
Reference No.	GPT-HR/DE/IR-CRIM-MED-DET-002-REVISED/2026
Applicant / Petitioner	Ismail Rustam / Rustem Ismail / Ruestem Ismail
Primary period examined	1998-2005, with later evidentiary relevance through 2007-2012 and 2026 submissions
Main proceedings analysed	AG Tiergarten (251a/251b Ds 349/00; 52 Js 7/00), LG Berlin 28 Qs 49/03 and 528 Qs 12/05, immigration/social-administrative proceedings, ECHR submissions, Reichstag/Bundestag crisis and press context
Core issue	Whether a state-created or state-tolerated vulnerability chain was criminalised and then used to deny health, social and legal protection until a later court correction occurred after years of harm.
Status	AI-assisted documentary and legal analysis. Not a judgment, not legal representation, and not a forensic certification of originals.

This fully checked consolidated version keeps the strongest revised expanded Report No. 02 as the main report and integrates both later strengthening materials: (1) the Official-Source Verified Special Section as Appendix C, and (2) the Special Insert Section on the 01.09.2003 Strasbourg/ECHR complaint, the 07.01.2004 Reichstag crisis and the 03.01.2005 judicial correction as Appendix D. The Official-Source Verified section is the source-visible legal section; the Special Insert section preserves additional narrative/legal-human framing. These sections are complementary and should be treated as the current working/final Report No. 02 version for marking, submission preparation and PDF use.

Important qualification: This report classifies evidence cautiously. "Documented fact" means that a fact is visible from a submitted document, court record, legal letter, scanned page or official-source text reviewed for this report. "Applicant statement" means the applicant's own account where the full original file is not yet visible. "Legal assessment" means a preliminary analytical evaluation requiring competent review. The report does not claim final judicial findings, but it also does not reduce documented court records, lawyer submissions, medical records, or press materials to mere unsupported allegation.

Table of Contents

- 1. Executive Summary
- 2. Mandate, Method and Limits
- 3. Documentary Corpus and Source Classification
- 4. Chronological Reconstruction, 1998-2005
- 5. Attorney and Court-Process Map
- 6. The 2005 Applicant Reply Letter as a Key Human and Legal Document
- 7. Causal Chain Analysis: From Release to Criminalisation and Social/Medical Exclusion
- 8. German Law Potentially Engaged
- 9. International Human-Rights Law Potentially Engaged
- 10. Legal Issue Matrix
- 11. Apparent Deficiencies Requiring Independent Review
- 12. Required Records and Verification Requests
- 13. Conclusions and Findings
- 14. Source Register
- Appendix A. Chronological Evidence Table
- Appendix B. Key Passages for Translation / Quotation
- Appendix C. Integrated Official-Source Verified Special Section: Strasbourg/ECHR, Reichstag Crisis and 03.01.2005 Judicial Correction
- Appendix D. Integrated Special Insert Section: Strasbourg/ECHR Complaint, Reichstag Crisis and 03.01.2005 Judicial Correction

1. Executive Summary

This revised and expanded Report No. 02 analyses the 1998-2005 chain in the case of Ismail Rustam / Rustem Ismail. It replaces the earlier short version because the earlier version did not adequately address the depth, chronology and cumulative legal significance of the submitted 392-page bundle and related documents. The main issue is not a simple administrative mistake later corrected in 2005. The documentary record raises a much more serious question: whether a person released from detention due to medical vulnerability was left without status, shelter and effective medical access, then criminalised for that unresolved vulnerability, and then subjected to years of social, medical and legal consequences until public exposure and renewed court review forced correction.

The uploaded Haz 6, Belge 51.pdf has 392 pages in the current PDF form. It contains multiple scanned documents, including the 2000 indictment and judgment, later Wiederaufnahme and acquittal materials, compensation-cost decisions, immigration/status correspondence, legal letters, and later materials. It should be treated as a compiled dossier rather than as one single homogeneous court file.

The most important documentary points are these:

- The 28 March 2000 indictment by the Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin, file 52 Js 7/00, charged the applicant with staying in Germany from 19 January 1999 to 12 October 1999 without a residence permit or Duldung under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG.
- The Amtsgericht Tiergarten judgment of 19 July 2000, file 251 a Ds 349/00, convicted the applicant under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG and imposed 120 daily rates of 10 DM. The reasoning was abbreviated and relied on the assertion that the applicant had no Duldung between the refusal of 18 January 1999 and the police finding of 12 October 1999.
- The applicant's later Wiederaufnahmeantrag of 22 May 2003, through counsel, argued that he had a Duldung claim because he could not be deported for lack of valid return papers. The Amtsgericht initially rejected the reopening on 4 July 2003, but the Landgericht Berlin, 28 Qs 49/03, declared the reopening admissible on 17 December 2003.
- The Amtsgericht Tiergarten decision of 3 January 2005 set aside the 19 July 2000 judgment, acquitted the applicant, ordered publication of the annulment in the Bundesanzeiger, recognized entitlement to compensation and shifted costs to the state treasury.
- The applicant's 2005 reply letter to the court is a central document. It records that he had to search for people to translate the decision; that the key point he learned was that he was innocent; that he had repeatedly explained from the beginning that he could not leave Germany because he lacked travel documents; that these explanations were not recorded; and that the situation felt as though someone had broken a worthless toy, although he was not a toy but a human being.
- The 1 September 2003 Strasbourg/ECHR submission, now supplied, documents that the applicant had already presented the early detention, winter homelessness, 1999 renewed detention, medical neglect, police-violence allegations, social-assistance/Krankenschein obstruction and degrading dependency narrative to the European Court of Human Rights before the Reichstag crisis and before the 2005 judicial correction.

- The 7 January 2004 Reichstag/Bundestag crisis and press context should be analysed as an escalation after years of perceived legal and medical obstruction, not as an isolated psychological event. The applicant's account and existing report sources identify Der Tagesspiegel and Hürriyet as relevant press archive targets.

Core preliminary finding: The records support a serious need for independent legal review of a "circular vulnerability mechanism": a person was allegedly released into untreated, undocumented vulnerability; the resulting lack of status and papers was later treated as his criminal fault; and the criminal judgment then became a basis or background for later administrative, social and medical restrictions. The 2005 correction did not automatically restore the years lost between 1998 and 2005.

2. Mandate, Method and Limits

The applicant requested a broad, formal legal report in DOCX and PDF format, in the style of the stronger earlier reports, with a clear chronology, attorney roles, court file numbers, German-law and international-law analysis, and a full treatment of the 2005 reply letter. The report therefore uses an evidence-classified method similar to Reports No. 004, No. 005 and No. 06-00-07.

Category	Meaning in this report
Documented fact	A fact visible from a submitted primary document: court decision, indictment, legal letter, ECHR submission, fax sheet, medical note, or official source.
Applicant statement	A factual explanation supplied by the applicant where the primary document is not yet visible or where the document only partially verifies the point.
Authority position	A position taken by a court, prosecutor, immigration authority, social authority, health office or other institution in a visible document.
Legal assessment	The report's analytical evaluation of potential rights, duties, deficiencies and necessary verification. It is not a final legal judgment.
Verification required	A matter requiring the complete official file, certified original, archive record, hearing transcript, medical file or press archive.

Limits: The report does not have the complete certified files from all courts and authorities. Some scans are fragmented or reproduced inside larger compilations. The report therefore identifies strong documentary anchors and marks missing records precisely. The fact that a matter is marked "verification required" does not mean it is weak; it means the original file should be demanded from the authority or archive.

3. Documentary Corpus and Source Classification

Code	Document / source	Use in this report
D1	Haz 6, Belge 51.pdf, 392 pages	Principal large bundle; includes 2000 indictment/judgment, 2003-2005 reopening/acquittal/costs, immigration/social/legal correspondence and later materials.
D2	01) - Strasburg - 01.09.2003.pdf, 9 pages	Applicant's German-language submission to the European Court of Human Rights dated 01.09.2003, narrating the 1998-2003 chain.
D3	1-1(2).pdf, 26 pages	Key 2005 court and lawyer materials: 03.01.2005 acquittal, von Planta letters, applicant reply letter, 09.02.2005 and 14.03.2005 costs decisions, later correction letters.
D4	16.02.26-ENGLISH(3).docx, 7 pages	Mother's UN-oriented complaint / summary; provides later family witness statement and consolidated court-number list.
D5	Report No. 06-00-07 Revised Corrected Edition	Prior AI-assisted report covering early medical/police/parliamentary awareness and record requests; used as a methodological and evidence cross-reference, not as a substitute for primary documents.
D6	Report No. 005 Bundestag Expanded Evidence Edition	Prior AI-assisted report on Bundestag petition handling; used for methodological continuity and later parliamentary-awareness context.
W1	Official German Basic Law / Grundgesetz source	German constitutional provisions: dignity, physical integrity, equality, remedies, hearing and detention safeguards.
W2	Official Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz source	Historical/current statutory framework for benefits and medical help under AsylbLG §§ 3,

		4 and 6; historical version must still be verified for each date.
W3	ECHR official Convention text	European Convention rights potentially engaged: Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 18.
W4	OHCHR ICCPR / ICESCR / CAT texts	UN treaty standards potentially engaged: ICCPR, ICESCR and Convention against Torture.
W5	StPO / StrEG official sources	German criminal procedure reopening, acquittal without new hearing, and compensation framework; exact historical law must be checked.

4. Chronological Reconstruction, 1998-2005

This section reconstructs the chain in chronological order. It is deliberately broader than a criminal-case summary because the applicant's central position is that the 2000 criminal judgment cannot be understood without the 1998 detention, winter homelessness, 1999 medical crisis, 2000-2002 medical-access litigation, 2003 Strasbourg complaint, 2004 Reichstag crisis and 2005 correction.

Date	Event	Evidence	Legal relevance
05-07 Aug 1998	Applicant enters Germany / is arrested in early Berlin period	D1/D2 + earlier Report No. 01	Applicant states he fled Azerbaijan and was arrested in the first days in Berlin; prior records show August 1998 detention. Legal relevance: deprivation of liberty, translation, health and vulnerability.
Late 1998 / Dec 1998	Release from detention while medically vulnerable	D2; earlier detention records	The Strasbourg submission states he was released with leg pain and difficulty walking. Applicant position: he was released into winter without documents, housing, health insurance, work or effective medical access.
Winter 1998/1999	Homelessness, cough, fever, lack of stable treatment	D2 p.2; applicant statement	Strasbourg submission states he spent the cold winter searching for food and shelter; cough worsened and he frequently had fever. Legal relevance: foreseeable health risk after custody release.
18 Jan 1999	Residence permit refused	D1/D3; earlier files	This date became the beginning point in the later criminal charge period. Legal issue: whether the state ignored impossibility of departure and medical vulnerability.
11/12 Oct 1999	Second arrest / renewed Köpenick detention	D1/D2	Strasbourg submission says he was arrested at a street identity check and brought for a second time to Köpenick prison. Prior police/court records show 12.10.1999 arrest.
02 Nov 1999	Medical crisis / complaint in detention	D2; D5; prior 1999 bundle	Applicant describes ringing for help, vomiting/health crisis, cutting veins to save himself, asking to telephone and being beaten; this requires full detention file and witness-list verification.
Nov-Dec 1999	Detainee witnesses, hunger strike and alleged cover-up	D2 p.3; prior 1999 bundle	Applicant states 480 detainees signed a protest regarding detention conditions and that his 02.11.1999 complaint received no answer.
Jan 2000	Release from 1999 detention and registration with Turkish family	D2 p.3; D1 registration pages	Strasbourg submission states he was released in January 2000 and could register with a Turkish family. This is part of the bridge from detention to criminal prosecution.
28 Mar 2000	Indictment by Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin, 52 Js 7/00	D1 pages 1-3	Charge: stay in Germany from 19.01.1999 to 12.10.1999 without residence permit or Duldung, under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG.
02 May / 30 Jun 2000	Duldung extension notes / status restrictions	D1 pages 12-13	LEA notes indicate Duldung extensions to 01.07.2000 and 01.10.2000, with residence restricted to Berlin, no work, no study/training and passport requirement.
19 Jul 2000	Amtsgericht Tiergarten judgment, 251 a Ds 349/00	D1 pages 26-27	Conviction under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG; 120 daily rates of 10 DM; costs imposed on applicant. Later corrected in 2005.
02 May / 12 Sep 2000	Social assistance / Krankenschein request described	D2 p.4	Applicant states he sought Sozialhilfe and Krankenschein, faced interpreter obstacles, and was allegedly asked to sign voluntary departure instead of receiving medical-help handling.
17 Jan 2001	OVG Berlin, OVG 6 S 52.00 / VG 32 A 594.00	D5/D4 summary	Prior report identifies formal court handling of AsylbLG interim relief concerning subsistence and sickness benefits. Full original decision required.

16 Aug / 04 Sep 2001	VG 32 A 487.01 psychiatric-redirection issue alleged	D4/D5	Mother's UN submission states the court response to internal-organ treatment was redirected to psychiatric reporting. Full court file required.
15 Nov 2001	Berlin Senate / Ausländerbeauftragte medical-access letter	D5	Prior report records official notice of failed efforts to obtain continuing medical care certificate and need to assess acute danger.
29 Nov 2001	Gesundheitsamt correspondence lists medical certificates	D5	Prior report records health-office awareness of multiple medical certificates.
30 May-18 Jul 2002	Gastroscopy / limited Krankenschein / refusal sequence	D5	Prior report reconstructs a sequence in which specific examination costs were accepted but ongoing Krankenschein access remained limited or refused, allegedly by reference to VG decisions.
25 Jul 2002	Acute febrile infection / suspected lung involvement alleged	D5	Prior report records a certificate described as acute fever infection with suspected lung involvement and urgent internistic care. Original certificate needed.
12 Aug 2002	RA Harald Lilge §123 VwGO / Krankenschein filing	D2 p.5; D5/D19	Applicant's ECHR submission states he instructed counsel to seek court action on 12.08.2002. Prior report and earlier synthesis treat Lilge as warning of foreseeable/irreversible harm; exact original wording must be taken from the filing.
22 Jan 2003	Request to Ausländerbehörde for status change and work permit	D2 p.5	Applicant states he wrote to immigration authority asking for status change and work permission due to misery; request was refused.
21/22 May 2003	Wiederaufnahmeantrag against 2000 criminal judgment	D3/D1	Court decision records Wiederaufnahmeantrag on 22.05.2003; some applicant materials say new lawyer filed on 21.05.2003. This discrepancy should be noted and verified.
04 Jul 2003	Amtsgericht rejects reopening as inadmissible	D3 p.5	03.01.2005 decision states the Amtsgericht rejected the reopening on 04.07.2003.
01 Sep 2003	ECHR / Strasbourg submission	D2	Applicant submits 9-page German account to the European Court of Human Rights, documenting 1998-2003 events and asserting evidence, witnesses and documentary proof.
17 Aug / 23 Oct 2003	Heart attack / hospital treatment / Aras application alleged	D4; D5	Mother's submission states a heart attack on 17.08.2003 and that lawyer Muharrem Aras submitted a four-page application with hospital report on 23.10.2003 in VG 32 A 599.03; full file required.
17 Dec 2003	Landgericht Berlin 28 Qs 49/03 allows reopening	D1/D3	Landgericht sets aside the 04.07.2003 Amtsgericht rejection and declares reopening admissible. This was before the 07.01.2004 public crisis.
07 Jan 2004	Reichstag/Bundestag self-immolation / press-access crisis	D5; D4; press archive needed	Applicant states the event occurred directly at the Parliament/Reichstag area and was a demand for press access after years of failed remedies. Tagesspiegel/Hürriyet archives are key.
18 Oct 2004	Second ECHR complaint / police-vehicle process alleged	D3/D5	Applicant's 18.01.2005 letter states a second Strasbourg complaint was made on 18.10.2004; prior report identifies an ECHR-oriented complaint that date concerning police-vehicle and procedural issues.
03 Jan 2005	Amtsgericht Tiergarten acquittal / annulment	D3 pp.4-5	Wiederaufnahme ordered; 19.07.2000 judgment set aside; applicant acquitted; publication in Bundesanzeiger; compensation entitlement and costs to state treasury.
18/26 Jan 2005	Applicant letters to Justizkasse / court after correction	D3 pp.1,8	Applicant invokes Strasbourg proceedings and writes a key reply letter thanking the court but explaining the human consequences and unrecorded explanations.
23 Jan 2005	von Planta requests lifting of expulsion decision	D3 pp.6-7	RA Christoph von Planta asks LEA to lift the 15.07.2001 expulsion decision after the acquittal and re-decide in light of new facts.
09 Feb / 14 Mar / 18 Apr 2005	Cost decisions after acquittal	D3; D1	AG initially sets 678.77 EUR; LG Berlin 528 Qs 12/05 increases to 1,035.47 EUR; later AG 18.04.2005 implements 31.32 EUR differential.

5. Attorney and Court-Process Map

The 1998-2005 chain should not be reduced to a single criminal file. It involved criminal court proceedings, immigration files, administrative/social proceedings, medical-access disputes, and international submissions. The following map identifies the main legal actors visible in the supplied materials.

Actor	Period / file	Evidence	Analytical relevance
Svenja Schmidt-Bandelow	1999 detention matter	Earlier 1999 bundle	Represented/challenged detention-health situation; wrote that detention fitness was in doubt or absent due to bleeding and serious illness. Full correspondence already analysed in Report No. 01.
Levent Göktekin	1999 detention support / witness communication	Earlier 1999 bundle	Visited applicant, wrote to lawyer, reported medical crisis and witness signatures. Not counsel in all matters but significant third-party document source.
Harald Lilge / Kewenig & Lilge	2000 criminal defence; 2002 Krankenschein; later status matters	D1 p.18-19; D2 p.5; D5/D19	Entered the 2000 criminal case seeking Akteneinsicht and date change. Later, according to applicant and earlier reports, filed §123 VwGO material on 12.08.2002 regarding Krankenschein/medical access. In 2005/2006 also wrote on residence-status classification and SGB implications. Exact 2002 filing must be extracted and quoted in a corrected 06-00-07.
Christoph von Planta / vpmk	2003-2005 reopening and post-acquittal matters	D3 pp.3-7; D1/D3 costs decisions	Visible as defence counsel in 03.01.2005 acquittal. Sent decision to applicant, requested LEA lifting of expulsion decision, sought costs. Central attorney for the successful criminal correction.
Muharrem Aras / Bümlein law office	2003 urgent application after heart attack alleged	D4; D5	Applicant/mother state that after heart attack/hospital treatment, Aras submitted a four-page application with hospital report in VG 32 A 599.03. Original filing and court refusal required.
Amtsgericht Tiergarten	Criminal judgment and later acquittal	52 Js 7/00; 251 a/251 b Ds 349/00	Issued 19.07.2000 conviction; rejected reopening on 04.07.2003; later on 03.01.2005 ordered reopening, set aside judgment, acquitted, ordered publication and compensation.
Landgericht Berlin, 28th Criminal Chamber	Reopening admissibility / cost appeal	28 Qs 49/03; 528 Qs 12/05	On 17.12.2003 declared reopening admissible; on 14.03.2005 increased reimbursable defence costs to 1,035.47 EUR.
Verwaltungsgericht Berlin / OVG Berlin	AsylbLG, Krankenschein, status and social/medical access	VG 32 A 594/00, OVG 6 S 52/00, VG 32 A 487/01, VG 32 A 599/03, etc.	These proceedings are alleged to have relied on or been affected by the criminal-status framework and to have limited social and medical access. Complete decisions needed.
European Court of Human Rights / Strasbourg	International complaint submissions	01.09.2003; 02.01.2004 / 18.10.2004 referenced	Applicant submitted early human-rights complaints before/after the public Reichstag crisis. Original registry correspondence and application files required.

6. The 2005 Applicant Reply Letter as a Key Human and Legal Document

The applicant's 2005 reply letter to the Amtsgericht Tiergarten and RA Christoph von Planta must be treated as one of the central documents in Report No. 02. It is not only a "thank you letter." It is a contemporaneous human and legal response to the official correction. It explains what the correction meant to a person who had lived through years of proceedings, translation barriers, social dependency and unrecorded explanations.

Documented content: The letter states that the lawful decision dated 03.01.2005 was delivered to the lawyer's office on 19.01.2005 and received by the applicant on 20.01.2005. The applicant immediately began searching for people who could translate the decision. Although the translators were not lawyers, they conveyed the key point: that he was innocent. The letter then explains that when he was convicted on 19.07.2000, he had repeatedly told the court that after 1998 he had attended several appointments at the Ausländerbehörde; at the last appointment he was ordered to leave the country; he immediately stated this was impossible because he did not possess the necessary travel documents; and the authority employee became nervous and threatened renewed arrest for a longer period. The letter states that he also explained this in 1999 in Köpenick at all court appointments and before several decision-makers, but that his remarks were never recorded in the protocols.

Key legal meaning: If the 2005 acquittal was based on the fact that, at the relevant time, he could not be deported for lack of valid return papers and therefore had a Duldung claim, then the applicant's repeated explanation from 1999/2000 was not a

minor personal complaint. It was the factual core of the later acquittal. The letter therefore supports the argument that the failure lay not in a later new factual development, but in the earlier failure to hear, record and legally evaluate facts already being asserted.

Key human meaning: The letter uses the image that it appeared as though someone had broken a worthless toy and nobody cared or was held responsible. It then states that he was not a toy but a human being. This passage should be quoted in any final public version because it expresses the cumulative injury of legal fragmentation: each office may have treated a file, but no authority took responsibility for the living person affected by the combined file consequences.

The letter further states that after the erroneous conviction there were about ten different court proceedings concerning his matters in which he was, in his view, absolutely unjustly convicted; that repeated misunderstandings caused him to suffer rather than the officials who failed to follow the law; and that he was expected to pay for those misunderstandings with his health and life. It ends with the powerful point that to recover everything he lost, he would first have to be born again. This language is legally relevant because it connects judicial error with non-monetary, irreversible life damage: health, dignity, time, family life, social autonomy and trust in legal remedies.

Theme	Letter content	Legal significance
Translation access	The applicant had to search for people to translate the decision.	Shows isolation, language barrier and lack of accessible judicial communication.
Innocence recognition	He understood the key point: he was innocent.	Shows that the correction was not abstract; it reversed the core accusation.
Consistent explanation	He had repeatedly stated he could not leave because he lacked travel documents.	This fact later became the basis for Duldung entitlement and acquittal.
Protocol failure	He says his remarks were never taken into the protocols.	Raises right-to-be-heard and fair-procedure concerns.
Toy metaphor	"I am not a toy, but a human being."	Human dignity and state-responsibility significance.
Irreversible loss	To get everything back, he would have to be born again.	Supports damages/restoration analysis beyond court costs.

7. Causal Chain Analysis: From Release to Criminalisation and Social/Medical Exclusion

The central analytical question is whether the authorities created, tolerated or failed to remedy a chain of vulnerability and then used the legal consequences of that vulnerability against the applicant. The following chain must be tested by the complete files:

1. Custodial vulnerability: In 1998 the applicant was detained soon after arrival and became seriously ill, according to the Strasbourg submission and earlier detention documents.
2. Release without effective stabilisation: He states he was released while sick, in winter, without housing, documents, insurance, social assistance, work permission or a realistic path to regularise or leave.
3. Document and departure impossibility: The later criminal judgment treated lack of Duldung/residence status as criminal fault. The 2005 acquittal recognized that lack of valid return papers created an Abschiebungshindernis and a Duldung claim.
4. Renewed detention in 1999: The unresolved status and paper problem led to renewed arrest and detention; the 1999 detention block then generated additional medical crisis and alleged mistreatment.
5. 2000 conviction: The criminal court used the formal absence of a Duldung to convict, without the independent examination later required by constitutional jurisprudence and applied in the reopening reasoning.
6. Social-medical consequences: The applicant states and related documents suggest that social and administrative bodies relied on this legal status/judgment framework to deny or restrict social assistance, accommodation, work, health insurance and Krankenschein access.
7. Psychiatric redirection / medical-access trap: The applicant and family submissions state that physical/internal-organ complaints were redirected toward psychiatric reporting while somatic treatment access remained blocked or conditional.
8. International complaint and public crisis: After years of failed domestic remedies, the applicant submitted to Strasbourg and later reached the Reichstag/Bundestag crisis, attracting press attention.
9. Judicial correction without restoration: The 2005 acquittal corrected the criminal conviction but did not automatically restore the applicant's health, years of homelessness, lost work opportunity, social autonomy or dignity.

Legal assessment: This pattern, if confirmed by the full files, is more serious than an isolated error. It would indicate a failure of integrated state protection. Each authority may have acted within a narrow file logic, but the cumulative result may have placed the applicant in a foreseeable situation of homelessness, untreated illness, legal dependency and degrading survival conditions. The primary legal failure may therefore lie in fragmentation: criminal court, immigration authority, social authority, health office and administrative courts each treated one fragment without addressing the whole risk to life, health and human dignity.

8. German Law Potentially Engaged

This section uses current official sources for orientation. The historically applicable wording for 1998-2005 must be verified for each date. However, the constitutional principles and procedural duties remain central to assessing the chain.

German legal area	Potential relevance
Grundgesetz Art. 1(1) - human dignity	The alleged treatment of a sick person as a file problem rather than a human being, release into degrading survival conditions, and failure to restore dignity after correction may engage human dignity.
Grundgesetz Art. 2(2) - life, physical integrity, liberty	Detention despite illness, medical-access obstruction, homelessness during winter and failure to prevent worsening health may engage positive duties to protect life and bodily integrity.
Grundgesetz Art. 3(1) - equality before law	If foreign status, language, poverty or illness led to inferior access to protection, translation, medical care or remedies, equality concerns arise.
Grundgesetz Art. 19(4) - effective legal remedy	Repeated narrow decisions that did not examine the core facts or cumulative harm may raise effective-remedy concerns.
Grundgesetz Art. 103(1) - right to be heard	The 2005 letter's claim that key explanations were not recorded goes directly to the right to be heard.
Grundgesetz Art. 104 - deprivation of liberty safeguards	1998/1999 detention, translation, medical fitness and court review must satisfy strict constitutional safeguards.
Former AuslG § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1	Criminal conviction was based on the formal absence of residence permit/Duldung. The 2005 acquittal indicates this was unlawfully applied because a Duldung claim existed.
StPO § 359 Nr. 5 / § 371 Abs. 2	Reopening and acquittal without new hearing were used in the 2005 correction; the case illustrates the importance of new facts and independent legal review.
StrEG § 1 Abs. 1	The 03.01.2005 decision recognized compensation entitlement, but later documents show reimbursement was limited to legal costs and did not restore life/health consequences.
AsylbLG §§ 3, 4, 6	Subsistence and medical benefits under AsylbLG are central to the allegations. § 4 concerns necessary treatment of acute illness and pain; § 6 concerns other benefits necessary for health and special needs. Historical wording must be checked.
Administrative proportionality / Amtsermittlung	Administrative and court bodies should investigate material facts sufficiently, especially where life and health are at stake.
State liability / Amtshaftung	If state actors unlawfully deprived the applicant of liberty, medical access or legal status and caused damage, state-liability questions arise. Separate civil analysis needed.

9. International Human-Rights Law Potentially Engaged

International standard	Potential relevance
ECHR Article 2 - right to life	Foreseeable life and health risk from detention, homelessness, medical denial and suicide crisis may engage positive obligations to protect life.
ECHR Article 3 - prohibition of inhuman/degrading treatment	Detention conditions, alleged beating/forced degradation, medical neglect, release into severe winter homelessness and prolonged untreated illness may reach the Article 3 threshold depending on proof.
ECHR Article 5 - liberty and security	1998/1999 detention and any detention based on unresolved state-created vulnerability require strict lawful and non-arbitrary basis.
ECHR Article 6 - fair trial	2000 conviction, alleged failure to record explanations, translation barriers and later correction raise fair-trial concerns.
ECHR Article 8 - private life and physical/psychological integrity	Severe social/medical/legal restrictions affecting autonomy, health, family formation and dignity may engage private life.
ECHR Article 13 - effective remedy	Years of proceedings without effective integrated remedy for medical and detention harm may raise Article 13 issues.
ECHR Article 14 / Article 18	Discrimination and improper-purpose allegations require strong proof but are potentially engaged if unequal treatment or hidden purpose is shown.
ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 26	Right to life, prohibition of cruel treatment, liberty, humane treatment of detainees, fair procedure and equality before law are potentially engaged.
ICESCR Articles 9, 11, 12	Social security, adequate standard of living and highest attainable standard of health are relevant to homelessness, denial of subsistence and denial of medical care.
UN Convention Against Torture Articles 2, 11, 12, 13, 16	Where alleged ill-treatment in custody and degrading treatment are raised, the state duty to prevent, review detention, investigate, allow complaints and prevent cruel/inhuman/degrading treatment becomes relevant.
Refugee Convention Article 33 and access-to-court principles	Non-refoulement and access to courts become relevant if the applicant's fear of return and inability to leave were not properly examined.
CRPD later relevance	Later disability consequences and barriers to remedies may engage CRPD principles, but the temporal scope must be clearly separated from 1998-2005 events.

10. Legal Issue Matrix

Issue	Documented record	Applicant position	Preliminary assessment
Release into winter homelessness after detention	D2; earlier detention release records	Applicant says he was left without shelter, papers, insurance or medical access.	Potential Art. 1/2 GG, ECHR 2/3, ICESCR 11/12 issue if state knew vulnerability and failed to secure minimum protection.

Criminalisation for lack of Duldung	D1 2000 indictment/judgment; D3 2005 acquittal	Authority initially treated absence of Duldung as criminal violation.	2005 correction shows this basis was legally defective because a Duldung claim existed due to return-paper impossibility.
Failure to record core explanation	D3 applicant 2005 letter	Applicant states he repeatedly explained lack of travel papers but it was not recorded.	Right to be heard / fair trial issue; central because the same fact later led to acquittal.
Medical-access obstruction / Krankenschein	D2; D5; D4	Applicant claims Krankenschein/medical access was blocked and physical illness redirected or minimized.	Potential violation of bodily integrity, AsylbLG medical-help duties, ECHR 3, ICESCR 12.
Use of prior judgment in later social/administrative files	D4; D5; file list	Applicant/mother state later courts and offices relied on the erroneous decision to deny support.	Needs complete file review. If true, the 2005 correction has retroactive significance for chained harm.
Reichstag crisis and press exposure	D5; D2; D4; archive needed	Applicant says public crisis followed Strasbourg complaint and domestic failure.	Raises institutional notice and urgency; press archives should verify timing and public awareness.
Limited compensation after acquittal	D3 costs decisions; D1	Court recognized compensation entitlement and legal costs, but life/health damage was not restored.	Need StrEG file, compensation assessment, damages proceedings and medical causation analysis.
Language and translation barriers	D3 2005 letter; D2	Applicant had to find informal translators; requested Russian/Turkish communication.	Fair-trial, access-to-justice and effective-remedy concerns.

11. Apparent Deficiencies Requiring Independent Review

- Fragmentation: criminal, immigration, social, medical and administrative authorities apparently addressed isolated file questions without integrated examination of life/health consequences.
- Protocol and hearing defects: the applicant states that the key inability-to-leave explanation was repeatedly made but not recorded; the later acquittal makes that omission legally significant.
- Medical-care access trap: the applicant needed medical evidence to obtain care, but lack of Krankenschein/insurance allegedly prevented adequate medical examination needed to prove the need.
- Inadequate restoration: the 2005 acquittal corrected the criminal file, but the records do not show a comprehensive review of all dependent social, immigration, medical and damages consequences.
- Press and international complaint timing: the 2003 Strasbourg complaint, 2004 Reichstag crisis and press coverage should be treated as institutional-notice events, not irrelevant background.
- Compensation narrowness: reimbursement of legal costs and formal StrEG entitlement do not address the applicant's central complaint that years of health, dignity, work opportunity and family life were lost.

12. Required Records and Verification Requests

Record category	Specific records needed
Criminal court file	Complete AG Tiergarten file 251a/251b Ds 349/00 and prosecutor file 52 Js 7/00, including hearing protocols from 19.07.2000, all interpreter notes and defence submissions.
Reopening file	Complete Wiederaufnahme file including Antrag of 21/22.05.2003, AG rejection 04.07.2003, LG Berlin 28 Qs 49/03 decision 17.12.2003, prosecution consent and internal notes.
StrEG / compensation file	All decisions and payments following 03.01.2005, including Bundesanzeiger publication proof and any assessment of compensation beyond costs.
Immigration file	Full LEA/LABO file 1998-2006, including January 1999 refusal, Duldung notes, travel-document attempts, expulsion decision 15.07.2001, Widerspruchsbescheid 22.05.2003, VG 10 A 330.03 settlement and 2005 review.
Social / medical assistance files	All Sozialamt, Bezirksamt, Gesundheitsamt, AsylbLG and Krankenschein files from 2000-2004, especially VG 32 A 594/00, OVG 6 S 52/00, VG 32 A 487/01 and 12.08.2002 Lilge filing.
Medical files	Urban-Krankenhaus, DRK/Köpenick, Charité, Franziskus, Dr. Baumgarten/Carganico/Dupke and 2003 infarct/myocarditis hospital records.
ECHR files	Strasbourg application dated 01.09.2003; submissions reportedly dated 02.01.2004 and 18.10.2004; registry correspondence and inadmissibility/decision materials.
Press archives	Der Tagesspiegel 08.01.2004 issue no. 18352/2004 page 014; Hürriyet Europe archive from September 2003 to January 2004; TV/radio archives including Russian Berlin and any Bundestag/Reichstag footage.
Parliamentary/security records	Bundestag/Bundespolizei deployment records, camera/security footage retention index, incident reports and press-access records for 07.01.2004.
Later damages and guardianship files	86 O 633/09, 50 XVII 7034, 91,456 EUR cost materials and guardian correspondence to analyse whether the 2005 correction was effectively neutralised later.

13. Conclusions and Findings

Finding 1 - The 2000 conviction cannot be assessed in isolation. The conviction was based on the formal absence of a Duldung, but the 2005 acquittal found that the applicant had a Duldung claim because he could not be deported without valid return papers. The applicant says he had explained this repeatedly from the beginning. This makes the case a potential hearing and record-failure problem, not merely a later legal technicality.

Finding 2 - The 2005 correction came too late to be treated as harmless. By the time the conviction was set aside, the applicant alleges and documents a chain of detention, winter homelessness, social and medical-access disputes, dependency, health deterioration, Strasbourg submissions, public Reichstag crisis and press exposure. Therefore the legal question is not only whether the conviction was corrected, but what damage the erroneous framework caused while it remained in force.

Finding 3 - The applicant's 2005 reply letter must be central. It provides a contemporaneous explanation of isolation, translation difficulty, unrecorded explanations, humiliation, and irreversible life loss. It is both a legal document and a human-dignity document.

Finding 4 - The 01.09.2003 Strasbourg submission materially strengthens the record. It shows that before the 2004 Reichstag crisis and before the 2005 correction, the applicant had already set out the detention, homelessness, medical and social-assistance chain in a formal human-rights submission. This undermines any suggestion that the causal chain is only a later reconstruction.

Finding 5 - The case requires integrated review. Separate court files, social files, immigration files, medical files and press archives must be read together. A narrow review of only the 2000 criminal conviction or only the 2005 acquittal would miss the central human-rights issue: the cumulative effect of state decisions on a living person's health, dignity, liberty, social existence and legal identity.

14. Source Register

Submitted documentary sources

- D1: Haz 6, Belge 51.pdf, 392 pages, uploaded in this conversation; principal bundle for the 2000-2005 criminal/reopening/costs and related materials.
- D2: 01) - Strasbourg - 01.09.2003(1).pdf, 9 pages, uploaded in this conversation; ECHR/Strasbourg submission.
- D3: 1-1(2).pdf, 26 pages, uploaded in this conversation; 2005 acquittal and applicant reply letter bundle.
- D4: 16.02.26-ENGLISH(3).docx, uploaded in this conversation; mother's UN-oriented complaint / later consolidated account.
- D5: 007-ChatGPT_Legal_Analysis_Report_No_06-00-07_REVISED_CORRECTED_EDITION.pdf, uploaded in this conversation; prior early-evidence report used for cross-reference and record requests.
- D6: ChatGPT_Legal_Analysis_Report_No_005_Deutscher_Bundestag_EN_FINAL_COMPLETE_SUBMISSION_EDITION(1).pdf, uploaded in this conversation; prior Bundestag report used for methodology and later institutional-awareness context.

Official legal sources used for legal framework orientation

- German Basic Law / Grundgesetz official text: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_gg/englisch_gg.html
- Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz official text, including §§ 4 and 6: <https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/asylblg/>
- ECHR Convention text, Council of Europe / ECHR: https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/convention_ENG
- OHCHR International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>
- OHCHR International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-economic-social-and-cultural-rights>
- OHCHR Convention against Torture: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-against-torture-and-other-cruel-inhuman-or-degrading>
- German Strafprozessordnung official text: <https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stpo/>

Appendix A. Chronological Evidence Table

The following compressed table can be used as a checklist when ordering the full files. It is not a substitute for the full chronology in section 4.

Date	Event	Primary source
------	-------	----------------

Late 1998 / Dec 1998	Release from detention while medically vulnerable	D2; earlier detention records
Winter 1998/1999	Homelessness, cough, fever, lack of stable treatment	D2 p.2; applicant statement
18 Jan 1999	Residence permit refused	D1/D3; earlier files
11/12 Oct 1999	Second arrest / renewed Köpenick detention	D1/D2
02 Nov 1999	Medical crisis / complaint in detention	D2; D5; prior 1999 bundle
Nov-Dec 1999	Detainee witnesses, hunger strike and alleged cover-up	D2 p.3; prior 1999 bundle
Jan 2000	Release from 1999 detention and registration with Turkish family	D2 p.3; D1 registration pages
28 Mar 2000	Indictment by Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin, 52 Js 7/00	D1 pages 1-3
02 May / 30 Jun 2000	Duldung extension notes / status restrictions	D1 pages 12-13
19 Jul 2000	Amtsgericht Tiergarten judgment, 251 a Ds 349/00	D1 pages 26-27
02 May / 12 Sep 2000	Social assistance / Krankenschein request described	D2 p.4
17 Jan 2001	OVG Berlin, OVG 6 S 52.00 / VG 32 A 594.00	D5/D4 summary
16 Aug / 04 Sep 2001	VG 32 A 487.01 psychiatric-redirection issue alleged	D4/D5
15 Nov 2001	Berlin Senate / Ausländerbeauftragte medical-access letter	D5
29 Nov 2001	Gesundheitsamt correspondence lists medical certificates	D5
30 May-18 Jul 2002	Gastroscopy / limited Krankenschein / refusal sequence	D5
25 Jul 2002	Acute febrile infection / suspected lung involvement alleged	D5
12 Aug 2002	RA Harald Lilje §123 VwGO / Krankenschein filing	D2 p.5; D5/D19
22 Jan 2003	Request to Ausländerbehörde for status change and work permit	D2 p.5
21/22 May 2003	Wiederaufnahmeantrag against 2000 criminal judgment	D3/D1
04 Jul 2003	Amtsgericht rejects reopening as inadmissible	D3 p.5
01 Sep 2003	ECHR / Strasbourg submission	D2
17 Aug / 23 Oct 2003	Heart attack / hospital treatment / Aras application alleged	D4; D5
17 Dec 2003	Landgericht Berlin 28 Qs 49/03 allows reopening	D1/D3
07 Jan 2004	Reichstag/Bundestag self-immolation / press-access crisis	D5; D4; press archive needed
18 Oct 2004	Second ECHR complaint / police-vehicle process alleged	D3/D5
03 Jan 2005	Amtsgericht Tiergarten acquittal / annulment	D3 pp.4-5
18/26 Jan 2005	Applicant letters to Justizkasse / court after correction	D3 pp.1,8
23 Jan 2005	von Planta requests lifting of expulsion decision	D3 pp.6-7
09 Feb / 14 Mar / 18 Apr 2005	Cost decisions after acquittal	D3; D1

Appendix B. Key Passages for Translation / Quotation

These passages should be translated carefully into English, German, Azerbaijani or Turkish for external submissions. They should not be paraphrased so weakly that their legal meaning disappears.

Source	Passage / theme	Why it matters
2005 reply letter	"Ich bin aber kein Spielzeug, sondern ein Mensch."	Human dignity and responsibility. This sentence should remain prominent.
2005 reply letter	The applicant's statement that he had repeatedly explained he lacked travel documents and could not leave Germany.	Right to be heard and causal link to later acquittal.
2005 reply letter	The statement that his remarks were never taken into protocols.	Procedural fairness and record accuracy.
2005 reply letter	The statement that to recover what was lost, he would have to be born again.	Irreversibility of harm.
01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint	The winter 1998/1999 passage: search for food and shelter, worsening cough and fever.	Causal link from detention release to health deterioration.
01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint	The 02.11.1999 detention crisis questions: emergency call, vomiting, help not given, cutting veins to save himself, beating allegation.	Detention medical-care and ill-treatment issue.
03.01.2005 AG Tiergarten decision	Acquittal and recognition that lack of valid return papers meant an Abschiebungshindernis and Duldung claim.	Central legal correction.

EXPANDED CORRECTIVE ADDENDUM TO REPORT NO. 02

Detailed evidentiary and legal analysis requested after review of the first revised draft

15. Corrective Purpose of this Expanded Addendum

This addendum is incorporated into Report No. 02 because the applicant objected that the earlier version still risked treating the 1998-2005 chain as a narrow criminal-law mistake rather than a multi-year life, health, dignity and access-to-justice collapse. The correction is accepted. The report must state that the 2005 acquittal was not a harmless technical amendment. It came after a chain of detention, winter homelessness, renewed detention, medical-access obstruction, social exclusion, Strasbourg submissions, public Reichstag/Bundestag crisis and press exposure.

The analytical focus is therefore not merely whether § 92 AuslG was wrongly applied. The focus is whether multiple state institutions failed to recognize that the applicant's inability to leave Germany, lack of papers, lack of social protection and lack of medical access were interconnected consequences of the same unresolved situation, and whether that unresolved situation was then used against him.

16. The 01.09.2003 Strasbourg Submission - Detailed Relevance

The newly supplied Strasbourg/ECHR submission dated 01.09.2003 materially strengthens Report No. 02 because it shows that before the 07.01.2004 Reichstag/Bundestag crisis and before the 03.01.2005 acquittal, the applicant had already placed the same core chain before an international human-rights body. The submission is not a later reconstruction. It is a contemporaneous pre-correction document describing the 1998-2003 facts while the alleged consequences were ongoing.

Location in 01.09.2003 submission	Content summarized	Report No. 02 significance
Page 1	Initial detention in Berlin/Köpenick after arrival in 1998; fear of removal; isolation, communication and food problems; illness, blood discharge, hunger strike; prison doctor allegedly accused simulation; more than 40 detainees allegedly signed that he was seriously ill.	This supports that the medical-detention issue was already documented as early as 2003 and was not invented after the 2005 acquittal.
Page 1-2	Release in December 1998 with leg pain and difficulty walking; repeated visits to the Ausländerbehörde requesting Duldung; alleged attempt to obtain signature for voluntary departure; threat of renewed imprisonment; winter 1998/1999 spent searching for food and shelter with worsening cough and fever.	This is central to the causal chain: release from detention did not create safety; it allegedly created homelessness and medical deterioration.
Page 2-3	Second arrest on 11.10.1999; second placement in Köpenick; chronic illness worsened; 02.11.1999 medical/emergency incident; questions about whether first aid was called, why the bell was switched off, why vomiting was ignored, why he had to cut his veins to save himself, and why he was allegedly beaten and placed in solitary confinement.	This anchors the 1999 detention crisis and shows that the applicant linked physical illness, emergency neglect and punishment.
Page 3	480 detainees allegedly signed a protest/hunger-strike announcement for 20.12.1999; applicant was in a council of detainees of seven nationalities; he asked the director whether physical violence against detainees was lawful; the director acknowledged receipt of his 02.11.1999 letter and asked for time.	This requires production of prison files, protest papers, director correspondence, witness lists and any internal investigation records.
Page 3	January 2000 release; registration with a Turkish family; 19.07.2000 conviction for illegal stay; monetary penalty allegedly enforced despite lack of income; new lawyer filed challenge on 21.05.2003.	This links detention to the later criminal conviction and the reopening path.
Page 4	02.05.2000 and 12.09.2000 social-assistance/Krankenschein attempts; alleged request to sign voluntary departure instead of processing medical help; lawyer efforts and court action; applicant states the Social Court continued to rely on the judgment and played with his health.	This is one of the strongest points for "criminal judgment as administrative-medical barrier."
Page 4	16.08.2001 renewed court attempt for Krankenschein; alleged failure to seek independent expert evidence; reference to Frau Beyer of the Senate office and to Urban-Krankenhaus visits with fever, dizziness, vomiting and increased leukocytes.	This supports medical-access obstruction and the need to obtain court files and medical records.
Page 5	12.08.2002 court action by counsel for hearing / Krankenschein; applicant says the Krankenschein to which he was entitled arrived only after five months and that illnesses became chronic; 22.01.2003 request to change status and grant work permit.	This makes the 2002 legal intervention and the chronic-harm allegation central to the report.
Page 5-6	The submission describes dependency on others, being turned into a "Spielball", lack of work permission, lack of social assistance, and the question whether authorities were driving him toward suicide.	This is relevant to dignity, autonomy, work/social protection and Article 3 ECHR degradation analysis.
Page 6-8	The applicant explains that if he died or committed suicide, it should not be reduced to personal psychology; he links suffering to legal/social restrictions and denial of medical help; he also mentions police vehicle collision on 01.10.2002 and a first-degree	This is a warning document: authorities and international bodies were on notice before the 2004 crisis.

Page 8-9	concussion. 17.08.2003 hospitalisation with 40-degree fever at DRK Klinik Westend; diagnosis references include febrile infection, suspected myocarditis, chronic prostatitis, gastritis/oesophagitis/colitis and recommended physical rest.	This is directly relevant to the immediate pre-Reichstag medical crisis and must be connected to any 23.10.2003 urgent legal filing by attorney Aras/Bümlein.
----------	---	---

17. The 392-Page Bundle - What Must Be Treated as the Core File Map

The file Haz 6, Belge 51.pdf is a 392-page scanned compilation. It should not be summarized as “the 2000 case.” It contains a sequence of legal papers showing how the criminal judgment, reopening, costs/compensation, immigration status and other later proceedings interacted. The following map identifies the most important visible clusters for Report No. 02.

Bundle location / cluster	Visible or reported contents	Why it matters
Pages 1-6	28.03.2000 indictment, repeated copies: Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin, 52 Js 7/00, against Hasanov Hyesjm alias Rustem Ismail, alleging stay in Berlin from 19.01.1999 to 12.10.1999 without residence permit and without Duldung, punishable under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG.	This is the formal criminalisation point. It starts the charge period immediately after the 18.01.1999 refusal and ignores the earlier release/medical vulnerability chain.
Pages 8-11	BZR extract and Amtsgericht Tiergarten letters of 08.06.2000 / 23.06.2000; file 251 a Ds 349/00; opening of main proceedings and hearing date.	This shows formal criminal procedure and short deadline to object to opening, raising access-to-lawyer/language issues.
Pages 12-17	LEA Duldung notes and registration certificates dated 31.01.2000, 02.05.2000, 30.06.2000; conditions restricting work, education/study and spatial movement to Berlin.	These pages are critical because the later acquittal relies on the argument that a Duldung claim existed due to lack of valid return papers. They also show a restricted-status regime rather than free integration.
Pages 18-25	Attorney Harald Lilge / Kewenig & Lilge enters the criminal case, seeks Akteneinsicht and date change; defendant/attorney summonses and interpreter information.	Shows counsel involvement before conviction and must be distinguished from later medical-access Lilge filings.
Pages 26-28	19.07.2000 Amtsgericht Tiergarten judgment, 251 a Ds 349/00: conviction under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG; 120 daily rates of 10 DM; costs to defendant; abbreviated reasoning.	This is the central judgment later annulled. The narrow reasoning must be compared with the later 2005 acquittal.
Following early bundle pages	Further powers of attorney, correspondence, enforcement/cost materials and subsequent legal steps.	These must be checked page by page in a final forensic inventory; the present report identifies them as categories rather than certifying every page.
Pages around 2003-2005 reopening cluster	Wiederaufnahme materials: Antrag of 21/22.05.2003; AG rejection 04.07.2003; LG Berlin decision 17.12.2003, 28 Qs 49/03; 03.01.2005 AG Tiergarten acquittal; post-acquittal correspondence.	This cluster shows the correction path: the Landgericht did not simply “forgive” the case; it found a reopening basis because the inability to deport/lack of return papers was a new fact under § 359 Nr. 5 StPO.
Pages around cost/fee decisions	09.02.2005 and 14.03.2005 cost decisions, including 528 Qs 12/05, increasing reimbursement for the Wiederaufnahme work.	Shows that court/legal costs were addressed, but not full restoration of health, dignity, housing, social autonomy or lost years.
Later pages	Applicant correspondence, immigration/social materials and other documents in the compiled dossier.	These must be used to test whether the 2000 erroneous conviction influenced later administrative or social decisions.

18. Attorney Roles and Court Proceedings - Expanded Analysis

The applicant specifically requested that the report not erase the work of the lawyers and the procedural path. The following expanded map should be treated as a working index for the official file requests.

Actor / institution	File period / references	Analytical relevance
Svenja Schmidt-Bandelow	1999 detention / Freiheitsentziehung matter; file references from earlier 1999 bundle include 88 T XIV 298/99 B.	Raised detention-fitness and medical concerns; requested independent examination; relevant to whether the state knew he was medically vulnerable before the 2000 criminal file.
Levent Göktekin	1999 detention visitor/support person; letters to counsel and doctors.	Documented prison medical crisis, detainee witness signatures and external hospital concerns. His letters connect the medical facts to legal action.
Harald Lilge / Kewenig & Lilge	Visible in 2000 criminal file 251 a Ds 349/00 as defence counsel; later 2002 § 123 VwGO / Krankenschein and medical-access filings.	Two roles must be separated: (1) criminal-defence entry in July 2000; (2) later urgent administrative/social-medical filings. The report must not place every Lilge warning inside Report No. 02 unless the primary 2002 filing is visible or cross-referenced as a verification target.
Christoph von Planta / vpmk	Wiederaufnahme from 21/22.05.2003 through 2005 acquittal and post-acquittal immigration correspondence; AG Tiergarten / LG Berlin.	Central to the reopening. Visible documents show von Planta as defence counsel in the 03.01.2005 decision and author of 19.01.2005 and 23.01.2005 letters.
Muharrem Aras / Bümlein law office	Applicant/family state: urgent 23.10.2003 application after 17.08.2003 heart attack / hospitalisation; reported file VG 32 A 599/03.	This must be verified with the application, hospital report and court refusal. It is crucial for the causal link between medical emergency and Reichstag crisis.
Amtsgericht Tiergarten	52 Js 7/00; 251 a/251 b Ds 349/00.	Issued the 19.07.2000 conviction; later issued 03.01.2005 acquittal and cost decisions. Its role cannot be framed only as “mistake corrected”; the question is why the key fact was not examined in 2000.
Landgericht Berlin	28 Qs 49/03; 528 Qs 12/05.	Corrected the AG’s rejection of reopening by finding the Wiederaufnahme admissible; later cost/fee appeal materials indicate the extent of defence work.

VG/OVG Berlin	Reported/visible from D4 and related materials: VG 32 A 594/00; OVG 6 SN 196/00; OVG 6 S 52/00; VG 32 A 487/01; VG 32 A 599/03; VG 32 A 77/04; OVG 6 L 67/04; VG 8 A 168/05; OVG 6 S 37/05; OVG 6 M 27/05.	These case numbers should be treated as the administrative/social-medical chain to be verified. The key question is whether courts relied on the erroneous criminal/status position and whether medical aid was denied without independent medical assessment.
European Court of Human Rights	01.09.2003 submission; later letter of 18.01.2005 states complaints submitted 02.01.2004 and 18.10.2004 and gives a handwritten file reference to Strasbourg.	Shows internationalization of the matter before the 2005 correction; Strasbourg correspondence should be requested in full.

19. The 2005 Applicant Reply Letter - Full Legal and Human Meaning

The applicant's 2005 letter must be placed at the centre of the report. It is not a courtesy note. It is a contemporaneous record of what the judicial correction meant to a person who had lived for years under the consequences of the erroneous conviction and related status/social decisions.

Theme	What the letter says	Legal meaning
Access to translation	The letter states that the decision dated 03.01.2005 was received on 20.01.2005 and that the applicant immediately searched for people who could translate it. The translators were not lawyers but could explain the most important point: that he was innocent.	This shows isolation and lack of accessible legal communication. It also shows that the applicant was not in a normal protected position after the decision.
Consistent explanation from the beginning	He wrote that at the 19.07.2000 hearing he had repeatedly explained that after 1998 he had attended several Ausländerbehörde appointments and that leaving the country was impossible because he did not possess the necessary travel documents.	This is the decisive factual issue. If this was said in 2000 and only recognized in 2005, the problem was not the applicant's silence but institutional failure to record and assess the core fact.
1999 Köpenick court hearings	The letter states that he had also explained the same incident in 1999 in Köpenick at all court hearings and before several decision-makers, including at a large December 1999 meeting.	This expands the notice chain: multiple decision-makers allegedly heard the same fact before the conviction.
Failure to enter remarks into protocols	He writes that his remarks were never taken into protocols, apparently because they were treated as unimportant.	This directly implicates right to be heard, accuracy of court records and fair-trial safeguards.
Toy metaphor / human dignity	He describes the situation as if someone had broken a worthless toy and nobody cared or was held responsible; then he states that he is not a toy but a human being.	This passage is legally relevant under human dignity, not merely emotional. It captures the difference between technical correction and restoration of a destroyed life situation.
Dependent proceedings	He states that afterwards there were about ten other court proceedings concerning his matters in which he was, in his view, absolutely unjustly convicted or harmed by misunderstandings.	This is the bridge to the social, administrative and medical-access consequences. Report No. 02 must demand the full list of dependent cases.
Irreversible loss	He writes that to get back everything he lost he would first have to be born again.	This is the strongest expression that ordinary fee reimbursement cannot restore the health, work, family-life and dignity losses claimed.

Recommended use in submissions: The letter should be attached as a primary exhibit and translated in full. The report should not paraphrase it into weak language such as "the applicant was dissatisfied." The accurate analytical characterization is: a contemporaneous objection, dignity statement and causal account written immediately after the acquittal, explaining why the correction did not undo the consequences.

20. Expanded German-Law Issues to be Analysed

German law / principle	Why engaged	Record question
Grundgesetz Art. 1(1)	Human dignity: a detained and medically vulnerable person must not be reduced to a file object; later correction without restoration may still leave dignity consequences.	Use the 2005 "not a toy but a human being" letter and the 2003 Strasbourg submission as dignity evidence.
Grundgesetz Art. 2(2)	Life, physical integrity, liberty: detention, medical neglect, winter homelessness and refusal of access to doctors implicate bodily integrity and liberty.	Requires medical files and detention fitness records.
Grundgesetz Art. 3(1) and disability-related equality	Equal treatment: foreign status, poverty, illness, lack of German and later disability must not reduce protection.	Must examine whether German nationals or documented residents would have received medical/social assistance in similar health conditions.
Grundgesetz Art. 19(4)	Effective legal remedy: repeated narrow proceedings without integrated examination may fail to provide effective protection.	Map all VG/OVG and social proceedings against the core medical-access issue.
Grundgesetz Art. 103(1)	Right to be heard: if the inability-to-leave explanation was repeatedly given but not recorded, this is central.	Compare hearing protocols with 2005 letter and reopening reasoning.
Grundgesetz Art. 104	Deprivation of liberty safeguards: detention requires strict judicial control, translation, medical fitness and proportionality.	Apply to 1998 and 1999 detention files.
Former AuslG § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1	Criminal provision used in 2000 conviction.	2005 acquittal shows that the elements were not satisfied because a Duldung claim existed.
Duldung / Abschiebungshindernis under AuslG	Lack of valid return papers created a deportation obstacle and claim to Duldung according to the 03.01.2005 reasoning.	This is the legal hinge of the entire report.
StPO § 359 Nr. 5	New fact ground for reopening.	Landgericht recognized the deportation obstacle as a new fact supporting reopening.
StPO § 371 Abs. 2 and § 371 Abs. 4	Decision after reopening and publication of annulment.	Shows court had to undo the conviction and publish

		annulment.
StrEG § 1 Abs. 1	Compensation entitlement for wrongful conviction.	The formal compensation right must be distinguished from broader damage/restoration claims.
AsylbLG §§ 4 and 6 / historical equivalents	Necessary medical treatment and other assistance to secure health/life may be required even under restricted asylum-seeker regimes.	Must verify historical versions, but the principle is central to Krankenschein/medical access.
VwGO § 123	Urgent interim relief in administrative/social-medical matters.	Relevant to Lilge 12.08.2002 filing and later urgent applications.

21. Expanded International Human-Rights Issues

Standard	Protected interest	Relevance to Report No. 02
ECHR Article 2	Right to life and positive duties	Engaged where authorities know or should know of serious medical and suicide/self-harm risk, especially after detention illness, hospital reports and Strasbourg submissions.
ECHR Article 3	Prohibition of inhuman/degrading treatment	Potentially engaged by detention despite serious illness, alleged beating, forced degradation, denial of medical access, winter homelessness, and prolonged dependency.
ECHR Article 5	Right to liberty and security	Relevant to 1998/1999 detention and whether detention was lawful, non-arbitrary and medically/procedurally justified.
ECHR Article 6	Fair trial	Relevant to the 2000 conviction, alleged failure to record explanations, language/translation barriers and delayed correction.
ECHR Article 8	Private life, bodily/psychological integrity and autonomy	Engaged by severe state-created dependency, inability to work, restrictions affecting family formation, health and personal development.
ECHR Article 13	Effective remedy	Engaged if no domestic procedure addressed the entire chain and if the 2005 correction did not repair dependent consequences.
ECHR Article 14	Non-discrimination	Relevant if foreign status, poverty, language or illness led to inferior medical/legal protection.
ECHR Article 18	Restriction for improper purpose	High evidentiary threshold; should be pleaded only as requiring investigation if documents show rights restrictions used to silence, isolate or pressure rather than lawful aims.
ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 26	Life, cruel treatment, liberty, humane detention, fair trial, equality	UN framework mirrors and reinforces the ECHR analysis, especially for detention, medical neglect and court fairness.
ICESCR Articles 9, 11, 12	Social security, adequate living standard, highest attainable health	Directly relevant to homelessness, food insecurity, inability to access doctors, and failure to provide minimal medical support.
CAT Articles 2, 11, 12, 13, 16	Prevention, review of detention practices, investigation, complaint, ill-treatment	Relevant if allegations of beating, forced stripping, medical neglect in detention and complaint obstruction are confirmed.
UDHR Articles 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 25	Life/security, no degrading treatment, equality, remedy, fair hearing, health and welfare	Not directly enforceable like a treaty in the same way, but useful as universal human-rights framing.

22. Expanded Preliminary Findings

- Finding A - The 2000 judgment was not an isolated error in a vacuum. It arose after the 1998 detention, medically vulnerable release, winter homelessness and 1999 renewed detention. Any legal analysis that begins only on 19.01.1999 misses the actual causal context.
- Finding B - The 03.01.2005 acquittal confirms that the key fact - lack of valid return papers and a resulting Duldung claim - was legally decisive. The applicant states he had explained exactly this fact from the beginning. This creates a serious fair-hearing and record-accuracy issue.
- Finding C - The 01.09.2003 Strasbourg submission proves institutional notice before the Reichstag crisis and before the 2005 correction. It contains the same core facts: detention illness, winter homelessness, medical-access denial, social assistance denial, and the risk that the situation could lead to suicide.
- Finding D - The 07.01.2004 Reichstag/Bundestag crisis must be analysed as a public-emergency consequence of accumulated legal and medical obstruction. It must not be reduced to a psychiatric event detached from legal context.
- Finding E - The 2005 reply letter is a key human-dignity document. It explains why acquittal did not restore the applicant's lost years and why fee/cost reimbursement did not address health, housing, autonomy, work, family and dignity damage.
- Finding F - The roles of Lilge and von Planta must be kept precise. Lilge appears in the 2000 criminal file and later in medical/social-access proceedings; von Planta is central to the 2003-2005 reopening and acquittal. Misplacing these roles weakens the report.
- Finding G - The full administrative/social chain must be verified. The listed VG/OVG proceedings and Krankenschein files may show whether the erroneous criminal/status position was used to block medical and social help.
- Finding H - The proper remedy analysis must distinguish between formal acquittal, StrEG/legal-cost reimbursement, and full restoration/compensation for cumulative life and health consequences.

23. Expanded Verification and Evidence Requests

Record group	Specific records to request
Criminal and reopening files	Complete AG Tiergarten file 251 a/251 b Ds 349/00; Staatsanwaltschaft 52 Js 7/00; LG Berlin 28 Qs 49/03 and 528 Qs 12/05; all protocols, interpreter records, hearing notes, service records and Bundesanzeiger publication.
Immigration files	Complete LEA/LABO file IV A 151 / related references from 1998-2005; refusal of 18.01.1999; Duldung decisions; return-paper correspondence; work permit and status-change requests; Ausweisungsverfügung 15.07.2001 and Widerspruchsbescheid 22.05.2003.
Detention files	Köpenick/Abschiebegewahrsam files 1998 and 1999; medical logs; doctor notes; hunger-strike papers; 02.11.1999 complaint; witness signatures; 480-detainee protest; director correspondence.
Medical files	DRK/Köpenick, Alt-Moabit prison hospital, Urban-Krankenhaus, DRK Klinik Westend 17.08.2003, Charité, Franziskus, Dr. Baumgarten and other doctors named in the Strasbourg submission.
Social/Krankenschein files	Sozialamt/Bezirksamt files from 2000-2004; applications of 02.05.2000 and 12.09.2000; 16.08.2001 court attempt; 24.10.2001 Frau Beyer letter; 12.08.2002 Lilge filing; AsylbLG/Krankenschein decisions.
Administrative/social court files	VG 32 A 594/00; OVG 6 SN 196/00; OVG 6 S 52/00; VG 32 A 487/01; VG 32 A 599/03; VG 32 A 77/04; OVG 6 L 67/04; VG 8 A 168/05; OVG 6 S 37/05; OVG 6 M 27/05; any Sozialgericht files relying on the conviction/status.
ECHR/Strasbourg files	01.09.2003 submission package and annexes; 02.01.2004 and 18.10.2004 complaints; application/file numbers; registry correspondence; decisions and rejection reasoning.
Reichstag / press files	Bundestag/Bundespolizei deployment records, security-camera retention records, police incident logs, Der Tagesspiegel 08.01.2004 issue 18352/2004 page 014, Hürriyet Europe archive, journalist photographs and broadcast mentions.
Compensation and damages files	StrEG implementation file, Justizkasse records, later damages proceedings, all cost decisions and any reasons for limiting restoration to legal costs.

24. Final Corrective Statement

Report No. 02 must be read as a chain report. Its subject is not only one wrong criminal judgment, but the alleged transformation of state-created vulnerability into criminal liability and then into social/medical exclusion. The 2005 acquittal is therefore not the end of the story. It is the official point at which the earlier legal basis collapsed. The key question for German and international review is what consequences followed from that collapsed basis between 1998 and 2005, and why those consequences were not restored after the correction.

This report should be used together with the original 392-page bundle, the 01.09.2003 Strasbourg submission, the 2005 court/acquittal/reply-letter bundle, and the later Reports No. 004, 005 and 06-00-07. The next stage should be a page-by-page inventory of Haz 6, Belge 51.pdf and a certified request for the complete original court, immigration, detention, social and medical files.

APPENDIX C. INTEGRATED OFFICIAL-SOURCE VERIFIED SPECIAL SECTION

Integration note: The following source-visible section is incorporated into the consolidated Report No. 02 because it strengthens the evidentiary chain by showing the sources for the 01.09.2003 Strasbourg/ECHR complaint, the 07.01.2004 Reichstag crisis, Der Tagesspiegel press reference, the Amtsgericht Tiergarten correction/acquittal of 03.01.2005, and the German/international legal standards engaged.

APPENDIX D. INTEGRATED SPECIAL INSERT SECTION

Integration note: This appendix preserves the shorter Special Insert Section. It does not contradict Appendix C. Appendix C is the source-visible and more legally indexed version; Appendix D keeps additional narrative and legal-human framing, including the closing words of the 01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint and the interpretation of the Reichstag/Bundestag crisis as an escalation of the 1998-2003 chain.

LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 02 - OFFICIAL-SOURCE VERIFIED SPECIAL SECTION

Strasbourg Complaint of 01.09.2003, Reichstag Crisis of 07.01.2004, and Judicial Correction of 03.01.2005

Applicant: Rustem Ismail / Ismail Rustam

Prepared as a source-visible legal-documentary section for integration into Report No. 02.

Date of preparation: 07 June 2026

Important method note: This version intentionally displays the sources inside the report. No source basis is hidden. Each factual section is tied to documentary evidence, and each legal assessment is tied to official legal sources.

A. Visible Source Register

This register is part of the report. It is not a separate or hidden research process. The purpose is to make clear exactly which documentary and official legal sources support the analysis.

ID	Documentary Evidence	Location	Use in this section
D1	Applicant letter to the European Court of Human Rights / Council of Europe, Berlin, 01.09.2003	01) - Strasbourg - 01.09.2003.pdf, pp. 1-9	Core contemporary complaint describing 1998 detention, 1998/99 winter homelessness, 1999 renewed detention, medical deterioration, social/medical obstruction, existential crisis, and final appeal to God.
D2	392-page criminal/administrative bundle	PDF(3).pdf, pp. 1-12 and following	Includes Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin Anklageschrift 28.03.2000, file 52 Js 7/00, Amtsgericht Tiergarten 251 a Ds 349/00, charge period 19.01.1999-12.10.1999, Duldung records, registration and later procedural documents.
D3	Amtsgericht Tiergarten correction/acquittal block	1-1(4).pdf, pp. 3-9	Includes Christoph von Planta letter of 19.01.2005, Amtsgericht Tiergarten Beschluss 03.01.2005, and applicant response/fax of 25/26.01.2005.
D4	VG Berlin / Sozialamt medical-assistance block	02) - Sozialamt Reinickendorf(3).pdf, pp. 11-17	Includes VG 32 A 487.01 letter of 04.09.2001,

			Krankenhilfe/Krankenschein discussion, pass-replacement questions, psychiatric/neurology referral and applicant reply of 14.09.2001.
D5	Der Tagesspiegel article	Der Tagesspiegel, 08.01.2004, Ausgabennummer 18352/2004, Ressort Berlin	Confirms Reichstag event: Azerbaijani man threatened self-immolation, had poured diesel over himself, had sent letters to journalists including Hueriyet, motive: alleged unfair treatment by German authorities.
D6	Harald Lilge § 123 VwGO application	Rechtsanwalt Harald Lilge, 12.08.2002, Verwaltungsgericht Berlin	Application for provisional order for medical benefits under AsylbLG; argues previous refusals and acute medical need.
ID	German legal source	Official source	Relevance
G1	Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany (Grundgesetz)	Official Gesetze-im-Internet English/German text	Art. 1 human dignity; Art. 2 life, physical integrity, liberty; Art. 3 equality; Art. 19(4) legal remedy; Art. 103(1) right to be heard; Art. 104 safeguards for deprivation of liberty. URL: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_gg/
G2	German Code of Criminal Procedure (StPO)	Official Gesetze-im-Internet text	Sections on reopening of proceedings, including §§ 359-373; § 371 acquittal without new main hearing; §§ 467, 473 costs. URL: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stpo/
G3	StrEG - Compensation for criminal prosecution measures	Official Gesetze-im-Internet text	§ 1 Entschädigung für Urteilsfolgen: compensation when a final conviction falls away or is mitigated in reopening proceedings. URL: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/streg/_1.html
G4	Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz (AsylbLG)	Official Gesetze-im-Internet text	§ 4 medical assistance for acute illness and pain; § 6 other benefits necessary in individual cases for livelihood/health. URLs: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/asylblg/_4.html and https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/asylblg/_6.html
G5	Ausländergesetz (historical context) / Aufenthaltsrecht	German immigration-law context	The conviction concerned § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG. The 2005 court correction found that because return papers were lacking, an Abschiebehindernis existed and a Duldung claim followed.
ID	International source	Official source	Relevance
E1	European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)	Official European Court of Human Rights / Council of Europe Convention text	Art. 2 right to life; Art. 3 prohibition of torture/inhuman or degrading treatment; Art. 5 liberty and security; Art. 6 fair hearing; Art. 8 private life; Art. 13 effective remedy; Art. 14 non-discrimination. URL: https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/convention_ENG
U1	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	Official OHCHR text	Art. 2 effective remedy; Art. 6 life; Art. 7 prohibition of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment; Art. 9 liberty; Art. 10 humane treatment of detainees; Art. 14 fair procedure; Art. 26 equality. URL: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-

U2	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)	Official OHCHR text	political-rights Art. 9 social security; Art. 11 adequate standard of living; Art. 12 highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. URL: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-economic-social-and-cultural-rights
U3	Convention against Torture (CAT)	Official OHCHR text	Art. 2 prevention; Art. 11 review of custody arrangements; Art. 12 prompt investigation; Art. 13 right to complain; Art. 14 redress; Art. 16 cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. URL: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-against-torture-and-other-cruel-inhuman-or-degrading
U4	Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)	OHCHR / UN reference text	Art. 3 life/security; Art. 5 prohibition of cruel treatment; Art. 7 equality; Art. 8 remedy; Art. 10 fair hearing; Art. 25 adequate standard of living and medical care.

B. Scope of this special section

This section is not intended to replace the full Report No. 02. It is a source-visible section that must be integrated into the larger report. Its specific purpose is to show the documentary and legal relationship between:

- the applicant's 01.09.2003 complaint to Strasbourg;
- the public Reichstag crisis reported on 08.01.2004;
- the later reopening, acquittal and compensation decision of 03.01.2005;
- the applicant's 25/26.01.2005 response letter explaining that his position had never changed; and
- the German and international legal standards that make this sequence legally significant.

C. Chronological evidence reconstruction

1. The Strasbourg complaint of 01.09.2003: a contemporaneous human-rights warning

Document D1 is a nine-page letter addressed to the European Court of Human Rights / Council of Europe, dated Berlin, 01.09.2003. The letter is important because it was written before the Reichstag crisis and before the 2005 judicial correction. It is therefore not a later reconstruction. It is a contemporaneous complaint describing a chain of detention, illness, homelessness, social exclusion and blocked medical assistance.

On page 1, the applicant states that in five years in Germany his life had become worse, and that he had lost his health, honour, pride and human dignity. He describes the first detention in the Koepenick prison, fear of deportation, isolation, communication difficulties and nutrition problems, followed by physical and psychological weakening. He reports that he informed the prison doctor that he felt ill and was passing blood, but that the doctor did not take care of him; he also describes hunger strike and more than 40 co-detainees signing that he was seriously ill. [D1, p. 1]

On page 2, the letter continues with the 1998/99 winter: after release from detention, he states that he repeatedly sought Duldung but unsuccessfully, that he spent the cold winter searching for food and shelter, that his cough became worse and that he often had fever. He describes being taken by Turkish citizens to a doctor, receiving medication, and then being unable to continue medical treatment because he had no one to help him reach the doctor. [D1, p. 2]

The legal significance is direct. If these statements are read together with the later 2005 court correction, the issue is not simply that the applicant was later found not guilty. The issue is that, years before the correction, he had already described the same factual core: lack of travel papers, lack of realistic departure possibility, detention-related harm, lack of medical care, and being

forced into illegality or dependency. This engages German constitutional protections of human dignity and physical integrity under G1 and international protections under E1, U1, U2 and U3.

2. The 1999 renewed detention and medical crisis as described in the Strasbourg letter

On page 2 and page 3 of D1, the applicant states that he was arrested again in October 1999 during an identity check and was brought for the second time to the Koepenick prison. He describes the illness as becoming chronic and worsening. He also describes the 02.11.1999 incident, including unanswered questions about why he had been placed on a floor for sick detainees, why emergency help was not called, why no one opened the door when he vomited and called for help, and why he was beaten after cutting his veins in an attempt to save himself. [D1, pp. 2-3]

Page 3 is legally important because it includes an early description of institutional non-response. The applicant states that he received no answer to his questions and that events were concealed to his disadvantage. This must be examined under the duties to protect detained persons under GG Art. 1, 2 and 104 [G1], ECHR Arts. 2, 3 and 5 [E1], ICCPR Arts. 6, 7, 9 and 10 [U1], and CAT Arts. 11-13 and 16 [U3].

3. The 2000 criminal conviction as the central legal turning point

Document D2 shows that the Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin filed an indictment on 28.03.2000 under file number 52 Js 7/00. The allegation concerned the period from 19.01.1999 to 12.10.1999 and accused the applicant of staying in Germany without an Aufenthaltsgenehmigung and without Duldung, punishable under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG. [D2, pp. 1-6]

The indictment later led to proceedings at Amtsgericht Tiergarten under 251 a Ds 349/00. The court correspondence of 08.06.2000 requested the applicant to respond to the indictment; the 23.06.2000 summons fixed the main hearing for 19.07.2000, and the court admitted the indictment by Beschluss. [D2, pp. 9-11]

This is the legal hinge of the chain. The later 03.01.2005 decision states that the applicant was convicted on 19.07.2000 of violating § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG and that the court had reasoned that after the 18.01.1999 rejection of residence permission he remained until 12.10.1999 without Duldung. [D3, p. 4]

4. Social assistance and medical access: the 2001 psychiatric referral must not be isolated from somatic medical evidence

Document D4 contains medical attestations and court correspondence. The medical pages show documented physical conditions, including chronic gastritis, asthma bronchiale, gastrointestinal dysfunction, hemorrhoids and melena on 18.12.2000; chronic gastritis, asthma, digestive dysfunction, hemorrhoids and depression on 06.01.2001; acute influenza-like infection, acute bronchopneumonia and acute depressive syndrome on 11.01.2001; and chronic asthmoid bronchitis, reflux-related illness, erosive gastritis and other conditions on 27.03.2001. [D4, pp. 4-7]

Against this background, the 04.09.2001 VG Berlin letter, file VG 32 A 487.01, is important. The court refers to Krankenhilfe for the third quarter and to suspicions that the applicant may still possess a passport or be withholding documents needed for departure. It asks a series of questions about the Azerbaijani Embassy and return documents. It then states that because the applicant claims to suffer from depression, the respondent had agreed, at the court's request, to issue a Krankenschein for a one-time treatment by a specialist in neurology and psychiatry, to clarify whether he needed further treatment because of a mental illness. [D4, pp. 11-13]

This must be treated carefully. The document does not merely show medical help. It also shows that access to medical help was linked to returnability, identity documents and a psychiatric/neurological clarification, while the file already contained physical medical evidence. The applicant's reply of 14.09.2001 confirms that he had collected the treatment certificate and had already seen a specialist for neurology and psychiatry, but also states that the most important matter for him was medical treatment because he was sick and could not continue living like that. [D4, pp. 14-15]

Legal assessment: Where a person has documented physical illness and lack of resources, restricting or conditioning health access may engage AsylbLG § 4 and § 6 [G4], GG Art. 1 and 2 [G1], ECHR Arts. 2 and 3 [E1], ICESCR Art. 12 [U2], and ICCPR Arts. 6, 7 and 10 where the person's situation is linked to detention or state-created dependency [U1]. The psychiatric referral should therefore not be used to reduce the entire case to mental health; it must be evaluated together with the documented physical medical file and the administrative context.

5. The Strasbourg letter explicitly links medical-social obstruction to suicide risk

The Strasbourg letter does not merely describe past events. It warns of future danger. On page 5, the applicant writes that the prohibition of work permission and social assistance made him into a "slave" and that the opposing side had unlawfully played

with his health. He states that psychologists failed to record the main reasons for what had happened and misunderstood the relationship between illness and official action. [D1, p. 5]

On page 6, the applicant states that if he were to commit suicide, he would do so before the eyes of many people so that the public would learn about his situation. This statement is a direct warning months before the Reichstag event. [D1, p. 6]

On page 9, he concludes by saying that he knows he is a human being and has the right to life wherever he is. He says that God created him, that no one has the right to make him ill, that some people believe they are God and possess such power, but that they are mistaken; he knows only one God, before whom he bows, and as a last step he will turn to Him and complain. [D1, p. 9]

This final passage must be preserved in the report because it gives the human meaning of the Strasbourg complaint. It was not only a legal filing; it was a final appeal against the feeling that state officials had placed themselves above law, remedy and human dignity. It should be interpreted together with GG Art. 1 [G1], ECHR Art. 3 and 13 [E1], ICCPR Arts. 2, 6 and 7 [U1], and CAT Arts. 13 and 14 [U3].

6. The Reichstag crisis of 07.01.2004 and Tagesspiegel confirmation of 08.01.2004

Document D5 confirms that on Wednesday afternoon, 07.01.2004, a 33-year-old Azerbaijani man living in Kreuzberg threatened to burn himself in front of the Reichstag. The article states that police intervened before he could carry out the threat and that he had already poured diesel over himself. It also states that he had sent a letter to several journalists, including employees of Hueriyet, earlier that morning, and that his motive according to a police spokesperson was that he felt unfairly treated by German authorities. [D5]

This media evidence gives independent public confirmation of the event that the Strasbourg letter had foreshadowed. The 01.09.2003 letter warned that if suicide became the last means to prove the situation, he was prepared to do it publicly. Four months later, the Reichstag event occurred and was reported in the press. This sequence must be treated as a central part of the causal chain, not as an isolated personal crisis.

Legal assessment: When state conduct, detention history, lack of medical access and lack of effective remedy are alleged to have led to a public self-immolation crisis, the relevant legal frame includes GG Art. 1 and 2 [G1], ECHR Arts. 2, 3 and 13 [E1], ICCPR Arts. 6, 7 and 2(3) [U1], and CAT Arts. 13-14 where allegations of ill-treatment and lack of investigation are made [U3].

7. The 03.01.2005 judicial correction: not a minor clerical correction, but a legal reversal

Document D3 shows that on 03.01.2005 the Amtsgericht Tiergarten ordered the reopening of the proceedings, quashed the 19.07.2000 judgment, acquitted the applicant, ordered publication of the quashing in the Bundesanzeiger, held the state treasury responsible for compensation for the conviction, and placed the costs of the earlier and reopening proceedings on the state treasury. [D3, p. 4]

The reasons are central. The court recites the earlier conviction under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG. It then records that the applicant applied on 22.05.2003 for reopening and relied on the argument that the criminal court should not merely have checked whether he possessed a Duldung, but should independently have examined whether the conditions for issuing a Duldung existed. The applicant argued that he could not be deported because he lacked valid return papers and therefore had a Duldung claim. [D3, p. 5]

The court further records that the Amtsgericht had rejected the reopening application on 04.07.2003 as inadmissible, but that the Landgericht Berlin, on immediate complaint, found the reopening admissible. According to the Amtsgericht's 03.01.2005 decision, because the applicant could not be deported at the relevant time due to lack of valid return papers, there was an Abschiebehindernis, which conveyed a Duldung claim. This was treated as a new fact under § 359 Nr. 5 StPO. [D3, p. 5]

The court concludes that, because the foreigner file showed that such an obstacle existed at the relevant time, the applicant had a claim to Duldung and therefore had not violated § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG. The public prosecutor agreed to a decision under § 371 Abs. 2 StPO; the judgment was therefore quashed and the applicant was acquitted. [D3, p. 5]

This is not merely a symbolic correction. Under StPO and StrEG, it has procedural and compensation consequences. The court itself cited § 371 Abs. 4 StPO for publication and § 1 Abs. 1 StrEG for the compensation claim; it also relied on §§ 467 and 473 StPO for costs. [D3, p. 5; G2; G3]

8. The 25/26.01.2005 response letter: the applicant's position had not changed

The applicant's response letter to Rechtsanwalt Christoph von Planta and Amtsgericht Tiergarten is dated/faxed on 26.01.2005. It is one of the most important human-rights documents in the file because it explains the meaning of the 03.01.2005 correction from the applicant's perspective. [D3, pp. 8-9]

The letter states that he thanked the court for the decision of 03.01.2005 concerning the lifting of his conviction, that the decision was delivered to his lawyer's office on 19.01.2005 and that he received it on 20.01.2005. He immediately searched for people who could translate it for him. Although they were not lawyers, they communicated the most important point: that he was innocent. [D3, p. 8]

The core legal meaning is that his position had not changed. He writes that when he was convicted on 19.07.2000, he repeated before the court several times that after 1998 he had attended the Foreigners Authority appointments. At the final appointment he was asked to leave the country, but he immediately said this was impossible because he was not in possession of the necessary travel documents. [D3, p. 8]

He further states that he described this incident in 1999 in Koepenick at all court appointments and also before several decision-makers of the Federal Republic. He says his remarks were never recorded in the protocols, apparently because they were considered unimportant. [D3, p. 8]

The strongest human-rights passage states that it seemed as if someone had broken a worthless toy and no one cared, and no one was held responsible. He then states: "Ich bin aber kein Spielzeug, sondern ein Mensch" - "I am not a toy, but a human being." He writes that about ten further court processes followed, that misunderstandings repeatedly led to his suffering, and that he had to pay for these "misunderstandings" with his health and his life. To recover everything lost, he would first have to be born again. [D3, p. 8]

This letter must be placed in the centre of Report No. 02. It explains why the judicial correction cannot be treated as a harmless technical mistake. The applicant says that the essential facts had been presented from the beginning: he lacked travel documents and could not leave. The 2005 acquittal did not arise because his story changed; it arose because the same core fact was finally legally recognized. The report should therefore state that the court corrected the conviction, but the file does not, on the material currently reviewed, provide a full explanation of why the same fact was not legally recognized at the original conviction stage or in the years of social and administrative consequences that followed.

9. The applicant's statement concerning the public/political context of 2004-2005

The applicant states that the 01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint and the 07.01.2004 Reichstag crisis were followed by public and media attention, including press and television discussion. He further states that the 2004-2005 period involved wider political and legal discussions about foreigner law and that the 01.01.2005 immigration-law change and the 03.01.2005 court correction should be examined in that wider context.

This section must be classified as "Applicant statement requiring archival verification." The currently reviewed documentary evidence supports the chronology that: (1) the Strasbourg complaint was dated 01.09.2003; (2) the Reichstag crisis occurred and was publicly reported on 08.01.2004; (3) the Landgericht admitted the reopening according to the 03.01.2005 decision; and (4) the Amtsgericht quashed the conviction and acquitted the applicant on 03.01.2005. The broader claim about television debates, diplomatic statements, presidential intervention and political motives requires additional archival verification from television archives, parliamentary archives, press archives and immigration-law legislative history.

D. Legal assessment by event

Event	Evidence position	Legal sources implicated
1998 detention and 1998/99 winter homelessness described in D1	Documented in applicant's 01.09.2003 letter; official corroboration must be drawn from detention/release records in full Report No. 01/02.	GG Art. 1, 2, 104; ECHR Arts. 2, 3, 5; ICCPR Arts. 6, 7, 9, 10; CAT Arts. 11, 16.
1999 renewed detention and 02.11.1999 medical crisis described in D1	Applicant described unanswered emergency questions, self-harm to obtain help, beating and isolation. Requires comparison with detention records and witness signatures.	GG Art. 1, 2, 104; ECHR Arts. 2, 3, 5, 13; ICCPR Arts. 6, 7, 9, 10; CAT Arts. 11-13, 16.
2000 conviction under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG	D2 and D3 show charge and conviction; D3 shows later acquittal because Duldung claim existed due to lack of return papers.	GG Art. 2, 19(4), 103(1); ECHR Arts. 5, 6, 13; ICCPR Arts. 9, 14; StPO reopening rules; StrEG § 1.
2001 Krankenhilfe/Krankenschein and	D4 shows physical medical documents plus	GG Art. 1, 2; AsylbLG § 4, § 6; ECHR Arts.

psychiatric referral	court focus on return documents and a one-time neurology/psychiatry certificate.	2, 3, 8; ICESCR Arts. 9, 11, 12; ICCPR Arts. 6, 7, 26.
01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint and suicide warning	D1 shows detailed legal/human-rights complaint and explicit warning that if suicide became last proof, it would be public.	ECHR Arts. 2, 3, 13; ICCPR Arts. 2, 6, 7; CAT Arts. 13, 14; UDHR Arts. 3, 5, 8, 25.
07.01.2004 Reichstag crisis	D5 confirms public self-immolation threat, diesel, letters to journalists, motive of unfair treatment by German authorities.	ECHR Arts. 2, 3, 13; ICCPR Arts. 6, 7, 2(3); GG Art. 1 and 2.
03.01.2005 judicial correction	D3 shows reopening, quashing, acquittal, Bundesanzeiger publication and compensation/cost consequences.	StPO §§ 359, 371, 467, 473; StrEG § 1; GG Art. 19(4), 103(1); ECHR Arts. 6 and 13; ICCPR Art. 14.

E. Core findings for insertion into Report No. 02

10. The Strasbourg letter of 01.09.2003 must be treated as a contemporaneous complaint, not as a later memory. It described detention, medical neglect, winter homelessness, denial of social/medical help, institutional non-response and suicide risk before the public Reichstag crisis occurred.
11. The letter's final passage about officials acting as if they were God, and the applicant's statement that he knew only one God and would finally complain to Him, must be preserved because it expresses the collapse of effective earthly remedies as perceived by the applicant.
12. The Tagesspiegel article of 08.01.2004 provides independent public evidence that the Reichstag event occurred and that the stated motive was unfair treatment by German authorities.
13. The 03.01.2005 Amtsgericht Tiergarten decision must be described as a substantive legal reversal: reopening ordered, 19.07.2000 judgment quashed, applicant acquitted, publication ordered and state compensation/cost consequences recognized.
14. The 25/26.01.2005 applicant response letter must be a central human-rights exhibit. It shows that the applicant's position had not changed: from the original proceedings until the correction, he had said that he could not leave because he lacked travel documents. The later correction therefore raises the question why this fact had not been legally recognized earlier.
15. The 04.09.2001 VG Berlin / Sozialamt psychiatric referral must be analyzed in context, because the file contained physical medical documents and the court/administrative process linked medical help to returnability, identity papers and psychiatric clarification.
16. The broader applicant claim that political/legal changes and television debates followed the public scandal should be included as applicant statement requiring archival verification, not as an established fact unless supported by additional archives.

F. Recommended wording for the full Report No. 02

The 1998-2005 chain cannot be described as a simple administrative mistake. The available documents show a sequence in which a person who claimed from the beginning that he lacked travel documents and could not leave Germany was nevertheless criminalized for the same situation, while his access to social and medical assistance was contested and repeatedly conditioned on returnability and document issues. The 01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint warned of life-threatening despair, and the 07.01.2004 Reichstag incident publicly confirmed that the crisis had reached the point of threatened self-immolation. The 03.01.2005 judicial correction then recognized, in legal terms, that at the relevant time there had been an obstacle to deportation and a claim to Duldung; therefore the applicant had not violated § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG. The applicant's 25/26.01.2005 response letter shows the human meaning of the correction: the same explanation had been given from the beginning, but was not recorded or treated as decisive until after years of damage.

G. Required verification and next evidence steps

- Attach the full 01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint as Annex 1.
- Attach the Der Tagesspiegel 08.01.2004 article as Annex 2.
- Attach the Amtsgericht Tiergarten 03.01.2005 Beschluss as Annex 3.
- Attach the 25/26.01.2005 applicant response letter and fax protocol as Annex 4.
- Attach the 04.09.2001 VG 32 A 487.01 letter and applicant reply of 14.09.2001 as Annex 5.
- Search television archives and press archives for the 2004-2005 debate and alleged diplomatic/political statements before including them as established facts.
- Search the full 392-page bundle for exact Landgericht Berlin reopening decision date and file number, then cite it directly in the full Report No. 02.

H. Final source list displayed for the reader

- D1: Rustem Ismail, letter to European Court of Human Rights / Council of Europe, 01.09.2003, pp. 1-9.
- D2: 392-page criminal/administrative bundle, including Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin Anklageschrift 28.03.2000, 52 Js 7/00, and Amtsgericht Tiergarten 251 a Ds 349/00 materials.
- D3: Amtsgericht Tiergarten / Christoph von Planta / applicant response bundle, January 2005, including 03.01.2005 Beschluss and 25/26.01.2005 applicant letter.
- D4: Sozialamt Reinickendorf / Verwaltungsgericht Berlin medical-assistance bundle, including VG 32 A 487.01 letter 04.09.2001 and applicant reply 14.09.2001.
- D5: Der Tagesspiegel, 08.01.2004, "Mann wollte sich selbst verbrennen".
- D6: Rechtsanwalt Harald Lilge, Antrag nach § 123 VwGO, 12.08.2002, Verwaltungsgericht Berlin, medical benefits under AsylbLG.
- G1: Grundgesetz, official Gesetze-im-Internet text: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_gg/
- G2: Strafprozessordnung (StPO), official Gesetze-im-Internet text: <https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/stpo/>
- G3: StrEG § 1, official Gesetze-im-Internet text: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/streg/__1.html
- G4: AsylbLG § 4 and § 6, official Gesetze-im-Internet text: https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/asylblg/__4.html and https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/asylblg/__6.html
- E1: European Convention on Human Rights, official ECHR/CoE text: https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/convention_ENG
- U1: ICCPR, official OHCHR text: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>
- U2: ICESCR, official OHCHR text: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-economic-social-and-cultural-rights>
- U3: CAT, official OHCHR text: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-against-torture-and-other-cruel-inhuman-or-degrading>
- U4: UDHR, OHCHR/UN reference text.

LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 02

SPECIAL INSERT SECTION

The 01.09.2003 Strasbourg/ECHR Complaint, the 07.01.2004 Reichstag Crisis, and the 03.01.2005 Judicial Correction

Applicant: Rustem Ismail / Ismail Rustam | Berlin, Germany | Prepared: 07 June 2026

Purpose of this insert: This section is intended to be inserted into Legal Analysis Report No. 02 as a central evidentiary and legal chapter. It does not replace the full 1998-2005 report; it strengthens it by analysing the 01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint, the subsequent 07.01.2004 Reichstag/Bundestag crisis confirmed by press evidence, and the later 03.01.2005 court correction/acquittal. The analysis separates documented facts, applicant statements, legal assessment, and points requiring further archival verification.

1. Evidence Register for this Special Section

Evidence	Date / Case No.	What it shows	Use in Report No. 02
Strasbourg / ECHR complaint by Rustem Ismail	01.09.2003	A nine-page complaint addressed to the European Court of Human Rights describing the 1998 detention, medical neglect, winter homelessness, 1999 renewed detention, social/medical obstruction, and the applicant's statement that his final complaint would be to God.	Central primary applicant statement showing that the full chain was formally raised before the 07.01.2004 public crisis.
Der Tagesspiegel article	08.01.2004, Ausgabe Nr. 18352/2004, Berlin section	Reports that a 33-year-old Azerbaijani in Kreuzberg threatened to burn himself before the Reichstag, had informed journalists including Hürriyet, and cited unjust treatment by German authorities.	Independent media confirmation that the matter reached public crisis level after the Strasbourg complaint.
Amtsgericht Tiergarten decision	03.01.2005, (251b/251a Ds) 52 Js 7/00 (349/00)	Orders reopening, sets aside the 19.07.2000 judgment, acquits the applicant, orders publication in Bundesanzeiger, and recognises compensation/cost consequences.	Key judicial correction showing the earlier conviction under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG was legally wrong.
Applicant reply to Amtsgericht Tiergarten	25/26.01.2005, same case number	Applicant states he had repeated the same position from the beginning, that his explanations were not recorded, and that he felt treated like a broken worthless toy although he was a living human being.	Human-rights significance: isolation, failure of hearing, cumulative harm, and absence of explanation for the error.

2. Documented Chronological Sequence

The uploaded 01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint is not merely a general political letter. It is a chronological human-rights submission written after five years of experience in Germany. The applicant states that from 1998 onward he lost health, honour, pride and human dignity; that he was taken to Köpenick detention; that he became ill, reported blood loss, received no effective medical care, and relied on signatures of fellow detainees as proof of serious illness.

The complaint then records the central transition from detention to abandonment. It states that after release in December 1998 the applicant had pain in his legs, could barely walk, sought a Duldung several times, and then spent the cold winter of 1998/1999 looking for food and a place to stay. He states that his cough worsened and he frequently had fever. This directly supports the causal chain that Report No. 02 must analyse: release from custody without effective protection, winter homelessness, medical deterioration, renewed detention, and later criminalisation.

The complaint also states that on 11.10.1999 he was stopped on the street and taken for a second time to Köpenick detention, where his chronic illness worsened and the prison doctor again did not effectively care for him. The complaint describes the 02.11.1999 medical/emergency incident and the applicant's unanswered questions concerning medical isolation, lack of emergency help, cutting his veins to be rescued, being beaten after asking to telephone, and being placed in solitary confinement.

The same complaint moves forward into the 2000 conviction and social-medical obstruction. It records the 19.07.2000 conviction for illegal stay, the applicant's lack of income, the seizure/enforcement of money, the 2000-2002 struggle for social assistance and Krankenschein, and the allegation that courts and authorities relied on the earlier judgment and on the opposing authority's assertions rather than obtaining independent medical clarification.

The sequence then reaches August-September 2003. The applicant describes a hospitalisation on 17.08.2003 with 40-degree fever, suspected myocarditis, chronic prostatitis and gastrointestinal findings, while still facing questions of how to obtain food if he was medically told to rest. The letter ends with a profound legal-human statement: even if he does not know all laws, he knows he is a human being and has a right to life.

3. The Closing Words of the 01.09.2003 Strasbourg Complaint

The closing passage must be quoted and analysed because it shows the applicant's final moral and human-rights position before the 07.01.2004 Reichstag crisis.

Original German closing passage (excerpt, page 9):

"Auch wenn ich all die Gesetze nicht kenne, so weiß ich doch eines: ich bin ein Mensch und habe das Recht auf Leben, wo immer ich auch bin. Kein Mensch kann ohne Garantien leben. Gott erschuf mich, ich bin nicht behindert oder als Kranker auf diese Welt gekommen und niemand hat das Recht mich zu einem Kranken zu machen. Manche Menschen glauben, sie seien Gott; sie besäßen eine solche Macht. Doch sie irren sich. Ich kenne nur einen Gott vor dem ich mich verneige, der diese Welt schuf und sie uns Menschen überließ. Und als letztes werde ich mich an ihn wenden und klagen."

English meaning: Even if the applicant does not know all laws, he knows that he is a human being and has the right to life wherever he is. He states that God created him, that he was not born disabled or ill, and that no one has the right to turn him into a sick person. He then says that some people believe they are God and possess such power, but they are wrong; he knows only one God before whom he bows, and as a last step he will turn to Him and complain.

Legal-human significance: This is not a theological digression. In the context of the preceding eight pages, it is the applicant's statement that ordinary legal remedies had become ineffective and that state officials appeared to exercise power over life, health, documentation, food, medical access, and social existence in a way that felt absolute. In a human-rights report, this passage should therefore be analysed as evidence of perceived total institutional abandonment and exhaustion of remedies.

4. 07.01.2004 Reichstag/Bundestag Crisis as a Consequence of Escalation

The documentary sequence is important. The Strasbourg complaint was dated 01.09.2003. Four months later, on 07.01.2004, the applicant's crisis became public at the Reichstag/Bundestag. The Tagesspiegel article of 08.01.2004 reports that a 33-year-old Azerbaijani living in Kreuzberg threatened to burn himself in front of the Reichstag, that police intervened after he had already poured diesel over himself, and that he had sent a letter to journalists including Hürriyet. According to the article, his stated motive was unjust treatment by German authorities.

This press confirmation is legally significant for Report No. 02. It shows that the applicant's 2003 written warning, moral conclusion, and despair did not remain abstract text. The matter escalated into a public, life-threatening crisis in front of the German Parliament, after journalists had been notified. The Reichstag event should therefore be treated as a visible culmination of the 1998-2003 chain, not as an isolated psychiatric event.

The report should avoid claiming motives that are not documented in a single official document. However, the chronology supports the applicant's argument that the later correction of the 2000 conviction must be understood against the background of the Strasbourg complaint, the public crisis, media attention, and the accumulated documentary pressure. The safer legal

formulation is: the judicial correction occurred only after years of suffering, legal challenge, international complaint, and public exposure; whether and how each factor influenced judicial authorities requires further archival verification.

5. 03.01.2005 Judicial Correction: Not a Minor Administrative Mistake

The Amtsgericht Tiergarten decision of 03.01.2005 is decisive. In case (251b/251a Ds) 52 Js 7/00 (349/00), the court ordered the Wiederaufnahme of the criminal case, set aside the judgment of 19.07.2000, acquitted the applicant, ordered publication of the quashing in the Bundesanzeiger, and placed costs and necessary expenses on the state treasury. The decision states that at the relevant time the applicant could not be deported because he lacked valid return papers, that this constituted an obstacle to deportation, and that he therefore had a claim to Duldung. On that basis, the offence under § 92 Abs. 1 Nr. 1 AuslG was not made out.

For Report No. 02, this must be framed as a structural correction with retrospective consequences. The applicant's position was not newly invented in 2005. The 2005 reply letter states that he had repeatedly explained from the beginning that he could not leave because he lacked the necessary travel documents. If the same core position existed in 2000 and was accepted only in 2005, the central legal question is not merely that a later court corrected the record. The central question is why the original court failed to examine or record the same explanation and why other authorities and courts were allowed to rely on the conviction and its consequences for years.

This creates a key finding: the judicial system corrected the formal criminal error, but the correction did not automatically restore the applicant's lost years, health, social position, medical access, legal status, or dignity. The 2005 decision recognised the legal error; it did not explain why the error occurred, why the applicant's earlier explanations were ignored, or how the cumulative consequences would be repaired.

6. Applicant's 25/26.01.2005 Reply to the Court

The applicant's reply to Amtsgericht Tiergarten must occupy a prominent place in Section 8 of Report No. 02. It is not a mere thank-you note. It is a human-rights document written after the court finally recognised that the 2000 conviction had to be set aside.

The letter states that the lawful decision was sent to his lawyer on 19.01.2005 and received by the applicant on 20.01.2005. It states that he immediately searched for people who could translate the decision for him, and that although they were not lawyers, they could tell him the most important point: that he was innocent. This demonstrates isolation, language barriers, and the absence of effective institutional assistance even at the moment of correction.

The applicant then explains that when he was convicted on 19.07.2000, he had repeatedly told the court that after 1998 he had repeatedly attended appointments at the Ausländerbehörde; that at the last appointment he was asked to leave the country; that he immediately said this was impossible because he did not possess the necessary travel documents; and that an official threatened him with renewed longer detention.

The letter says that he had also described this incident during 1999 Köpenick court dates, including a large December 1999 session with several decision-makers of the Federal Republic of Germany present, and that the matter had been reported in press and radio. The applicant states that, to his great regret, his remarks were never included in the protocols, apparently because they were considered unimportant.

The most powerful passage is the comparison to a broken worthless toy. The applicant writes that it seemed as if someone had broken a worthless toy and nobody was interested and nobody was held responsible. He then states that he is not a toy, but a human being. He adds that around ten further court proceedings followed, each involving his affairs, and that he was repeatedly treated unjustly; the misunderstandings always caused him to suffer, not the officials who failed to respect the laws. He writes that he had to pay for these misunderstandings with his health and life, and that to recover everything he had lost he would first have to be born again.

This letter should be analysed as evidence that the 2005 correction came too late to prevent cumulative harm. It also supports the applicant's argument that the authorities corrected the legal result without fully explaining the cause of the error and without restoring the chain of losses caused by the original conviction and its administrative consequences.

7. Legal Assessment Under German and International Law

Legal source	Relevance to this evidence block
German Basic Law, Articles 1 and 2	The applicant's allegations concern human dignity, bodily integrity, liberty, and life. A system that leaves a medically vulnerable person without effective medical access and later

	criminalises the resulting undocumented situation raises serious concerns under these constitutional principles.
German Basic Law, Articles 19(4), 103(1), and 104	The applicant alleges lack of effective remedy, lack of proper hearing/protocol recording, and unlawful or disproportionate detention. The 2005 correction strengthens the question whether the earlier proceedings offered effective judicial protection and whether the applicant's explanations were properly heard.
European Convention on Human Rights, Articles 2 and 3	The documented deterioration of health, alleged refusal of medical assistance in detention, winter homelessness, and the 07.01.2004 life-threatening crisis raise issues of positive duties to protect life and the prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment.
European Convention on Human Rights, Articles 5, 6 and 13	The detention history, criminal conviction, lack of effective correction until years later, and applicant's claim that his explanations were not recorded raise issues concerning liberty, fair hearing, and effective remedies.
ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 9, 10, 14 and 26	The same chain implicates the right to life, prohibition of cruel/inhuman treatment, liberty and security, humane treatment of detained persons, fair trial, and equality before the law.
CAT Articles 2, 12, 13, 14 and 16	If detention violence, deliberate medical neglect, or degrading treatment is substantiated, the state would have duties to prevent, investigate, provide safe complaint channels, and ensure redress.
ICESCR Articles 9, 11 and 12	The 2000-2003 denial or obstruction of social support, accommodation, and medical access should be analysed in relation to social security, adequate standard of living, and the right to the highest attainable standard of health.

8. Proposed Finding for Report No. 02

The 01.09.2003 Strasbourg complaint, read together with the 07.01.2004 Reichstag press evidence and the 03.01.2005 judicial correction, shows a documented escalation from legal complaint to public life-threatening crisis and later formal correction of a criminal judgment. The applicant had already set out the essential factual position before the crisis: he could not leave Germany because he lacked valid return papers; his health had deteriorated after detention and winter homelessness; he had been denied effective medical and social protection; and he saw ordinary remedies as exhausted.

The 03.01.2005 correction confirms that the 2000 conviction was legally wrong. It does not explain why the earlier court failed to recognise the same facts, why the applicant's statements were not properly recorded, or why the administrative and social consequences of the conviction continued for years. The applicant's 25/26.01.2005 letter must therefore be treated as a central human-rights document: it records gratitude for the correction, but also the deeper truth that the correction did not return the lost years, health, dignity, security, or life opportunities.

For legal accuracy, the report should state that the documentary record strongly supports the applicant's argument that the correction came only after prolonged suffering, international complaint, media exposure, and public crisis. Direct proof of the subjective motives of individual judges or officials requires further archival verification, including full court files, press archives, radio/television records, and correspondence with lawyers and public authorities.

9. Source References

User-provided file: 01) - Strasbourg - 01.09.2003(3).pdf, pages 1-9. Primary applicant complaint to the European Court of Human Rights.

User-provided file: Tagesspiegel extract, 08.01.2004, Ausgabe 18352/2004, Berlin, page 014. Media confirmation of the 07.01.2004 Reichstag incident.

User-provided file: 1-1(4).pdf / Haz 6, Belge 51, pages 4-8. 03.01.2005 Amtsgericht Tiergarten correction/acquittal and 25/26.01.2005 applicant response.

Official source: German Basic Law, Gesetze-im-Internet, English and German versions. Grundgesetz Articles 1, 2, 19, 103, 104.

Official source: European Convention on Human Rights, Council of Europe / ECHR. ECHR Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 13, 14.

Official source: International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, OHCHR. ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 26.

Official source: Convention against Torture, OHCHR. CAT Articles 2, 12, 13, 14, 16.

Official source: International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, OHCHR. ICESCR Articles 9, 11, 12.