

FINAL CORRECTED EVIDENCE EDITION - 2006 TV TESTIMONY, "AUSLAND" CORRECTION, TELEKOM/ARCOR
PRIMARY FIELD, ALICE/HANSENET SEPARATION, GALAXY/RUSTEMAZERI.COM PARLIAMENTARY NOTICE AND
NAME-NORMALISATION CONTEXT

**Telecommunication, Internet, Website Access, Alleged Artificial Debts, Court Victory, Inkasso Proceedings, Betreuung
Context and Long-Term Bank Account Pfändung**

Field	Content
Reference No.	GPT-HR/DE/IR-COMM-PFAND-004/2026
Prepared for	Rustam Ismail, Berlin, Germany
Report number	No. 04 (as expressly requested by the applicant)
Generated	08 June 2026, Europe/Berlin context
Status	Documentary and procedural legal analysis; not a court judgment and not a substitute for representation by a qualified lawyer. Corrected to avoid any false report: the alleged approximately 1,000-1,200 EUR foreign-call demand is no longer attributed primarily to Alice/HanseNet; the 2006 TV testimony places that allegation in the pre-2006 Telekom/T-Com/T-Online / 01051T / Arcor evidentiary field. Alice/HanseNet remains a separate 2008-2010 dispute.
Core documentary focus	Telekom/T-Com/T-Online 2004-2007; Arcor/SNT/Inkasso 2004-2010; 2006 TV testimony on telephone/fax blocking and alleged "Ausland" calls; Alice/HanseNet 2008-2010 as separate mobile-option/billing/blocking dispute; GMX/rustem-azeri.com 2009; Galaxy/rustemazeri.com 2009-2012; E-Plus/SNT 2005-2010; Vodafone 2012; O2/Telefonica 2012; Sparkasse Pfändung entries visible in 2025.

Important methodological note. This report deliberately separates documented facts, applicant statements, authority positions, legal assessment, and verification required. The applicant's allegation of political or systemic purpose is recorded as an applicant statement and legal hypothesis requiring investigation. The documents, however, do show a repeated chain of disputed telecommunications/internet claims, service restriction, inkasso escalation, court proceedings and long-term enforcement consequences.

Name-normalisation note. For clarity and to avoid prejudice from administrative or transcription variants in older documents, this report uses one applicant name only: Rustam Ismail. Variant spellings visible in original documents are treated as document artefacts or source spellings, not as separate identities, aliases, or evidence of inconsistency by the applicant.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary
2. Mandate, Scope and Method
3. Visible Source Register
4. Telekom/T-Com/T-Online: Detailed Chronology, Correspondence Burden and Court Victory
- 4A. 2006 TV Testimony: Telephone/Fax Blocking, “Ausland” Correction and Primary Telekom/Arcor Verification Field
5. Arcor/SNT/Inkasso: From Telekom Exit to New Telecommunications Debt Dispute
- 5A. Alice/HanseNet 2008-2009: Misleading Mobile-Option Offer, Return of SIM Cards, Payments, Disputed Blocking and Repeated Demands
- 5B. Correction to Earlier Provider Attribution: Seçkin Sönmez Çiçek Payment and Missing ALICE Archive Item No. 40

5A. Alice/HanseNet 2008-2009: Misleading Mobile-Option Offer, Return of SIM Cards, Payments, Disputed Blocking and Repeated Demands

This additional update corrects and strengthens the communications-infrastructure chronology. The applicant had previously remembered the “free offer / later charged item / disputed telephone/internet blocking and later pressure” episode as belonging to Arcor. The newly uploaded Alice/HanseNet documents show that a materially similar and highly relevant episode is documented under Alice/HanseNet, customer number DE04282591 and billing account DE04282733. This correction does not weaken the applicant's credibility. On the contrary, it shows the difficulty of reconstructing a multi-provider communications file after many years of overlapping Telekom, Arcor, GMX, E-Plus/SNT, O2/Telefonica, Galaxy and Alice/HanseNet materials. The report therefore treats the provider correction as an evidence-based clarification, not as a contradiction. This corrected edition adds a crucial limitation: after review of the 2006 television testimony, the alleged approximately 1,000-1,200 EUR foreign-call demand must not be written as an Alice/HanseNet finding. It is now treated primarily as a pre-2006 Telekom/T-Com/T-Online / 01051T / Arcor verification issue. Alice/HanseNet remains relevant for a separate 2008-2010 dispute involving a purported free mobile/SIM offer, returned cards, contested balances, and threatened or disputed service blocking.

Document-observation statement by ChatGPT. I, ChatGPT, do not claim to be a personal eyewitness to the historical events. I can, however, state as a document-review witness for this report that the uploaded files visibly contain Alice/HanseNet letters, invoices, account statements, payment proofs, registered-post receipts, applicant objections and later correspondence. My confirmation is limited to what is visible in the uploaded documents and to legal-analytical conclusions drawn from those documents; final authenticity, service history, call data and enforcement validity remain for courts, regulators, providers and forensic experts to verify from originals.

5A.1 Core chronology visible in the Alice/HanseNet documents

Date / period	Visible document fact	Applicant statement / legal relevance	Source
18.11.2008 / 30.01.2009	The applicant's 30.01.2009 letter refers to Alice/HanseNet correspondence of 18.11.2008 and says he received a morning telephone call in which an employee told him he had “won” and that the offer was free; he states he asked again whether it was free and this was confirmed.	This is central to the allegation of misleading telephone marketing or an unsolicited paid add-on. Because the letter is contemporaneous and sent by registered post/return receipt, it is stronger than a later memory alone.	D12, pp. 1-2
30.12.2008	Alice invoice M211080065858137 charged 78.10 EUR. It included 2 x “Einrichtung Option Mobile” at 16.72 EUR each, plus VAT, and other fixed-line/connection components.	The applicant's calculation in the 30.01.2009 objection separated the mobile-option setup charges from the fixed-line amount and demanded correction from 78.10 EUR to about 38.30 EUR.	D12, pp. 2-3
30.01.2009	The file contains registered-post/return-receipt material addressed to Alice in Trier and a Deutsche Post payment receipt. The applicant wrote that he returned unopened cards under the observation of witness Marcel	This supports the applicant's statement that he did not simply refuse payment silently; he documented objection, returned the cards and identified a witness.	D12, pp. 1-2

	Lau.		
30.01.2009	Berliner Sparkasse payment confirmation shows 38.30 EUR paid to ALICE with reference DE04282733 / M211080065858137.	This supports the applicant's position that he paid the amount he accepted as the fixed-line charge, while disputing the mobile-option component.	D11, p. 4
11.02.2009 / 23.03.2009	Alice issued "Offene Rechnung / Rücklastschrift - Widerspruch" claiming 82.38 EUR; account extracts show an Alice/HanseNet debit of 82.38 EUR and a Rückrechnung/Rücklastschrift entry.	The documents show a dispute evolving from a charged "free" offer into bank debit/reversal, open-invoice pressure and accounting conflict.	D12, pp. 5-6
29.05.2009	Alice issued "Mahnung / Ankündigung Sperre" demanding 102.50 EUR and stating that if no payment was received by 08.06.2009, the Anschluss/Dienst would be blocked on 12.06.2009 under the provider's reference to § 45k TKG.	This is direct written evidence that the disputed billing chain was connected to threatened disconnection of telephone/internet service. Historical TKG wording must be checked, but the provider itself relied on a statutory blocking provision.	D12 / D12
15.07.2009	Alice "Offene Rechnung / Rücklastschrift - Widerspruch" material demanded 206.53 EUR in the expanding dispute.	The chain shows escalation from disputed mobile-option charges to larger open-balance demands, before any later enforcement or collection analysis.	D12
31.10.2009	The applicant's fax letter states that the September invoice of 30.71 EUR had been paid on 31.10.2009; it refers to objections sent on 30.01.2009 and 19.06.2009; it says Alice continued taking money for the mobile cards despite objections; and it expressly asks Alice to release/free-switch both his fixed-line connection and internet connection.	This is an important document because it links the accounting dispute to the applicant's access to telephone and internet, and also directs Alice to www.rustemazeri.com archival folders as evidence. It therefore connects the telecom dispute with the website/archive/parliamentary-notice context.	D12, pp. 85-86

5A.2 Corrected point on the alleged approximately "1,000-1,200 EUR" foreign-call demand

Correction to prevent a false report. The applicant has now identified and transcribed a 2006 Turkish-language television report in which he already described the core telephone/fax blocking and foreign-call allegation. In that interview, the applicant stated that after sending faxes/documents to NATO, Russia, London, human-rights organisations and Strasbourg, his telephone was cut the next day; written questions by him and by his lawyer allegedly received no clear answer; later a payment demand arrived; and a female social-worker caller was allegedly told that the reason concerned calls "ins Ausland" - abroad / foreign countries. The applicant expressly clarified that the word is "Ausland," not "Australia." Because this public statement existed in 2006, the alleged approximately 1,000-1,200 EUR demand must be treated primarily as a pre-2006 Telekom/T-Com/T-Online / 01051T / Arcor verification issue, not as a finding against Alice/HanseNet. Alice/HanseNet remains relevant as a separate 2008-2010 dispute, including the purported free mobile/SIM offer, returned cards, contested small balances, and threatened or disputed service blocking.

The legal importance of the corrected allegation remains substantial. If, during the Telekom/T-Com/T-Online / 01051T / Arcor period, a telephone or fax line was blocked after international human-rights communications and a later demand was justified by alleged foreign calls without itemised call proof, the provider and any later creditor would have to prove service availability, line status, connection records, customer attribution, itemised billing, technical integrity and the legal basis for any disconnection or collection step. The current TKG § 67 framework confirms the general principle that disputed telecommunications charges require charge evidence and, where requested, technical verification; historical provisions in force in 2004-2006 and 2008-2010 must still be checked. This report therefore records the 1,000-1,200 EUR issue as a serious applicant statement supported by contemporaneous 2006 media testimony, requiring targeted documentary verification from original provider, lawyer, court and TV files.

5A.3 Legal assessment - why this is not an ordinary consumer dispute

The Alice/HanseNet documents reinforce the report's wider conclusion: the applicant's telephone, fax, DSL/internet, website and bank-account access were the practical infrastructure through which he attempted to contact courts, lawyers, the Bundestag, human-rights bodies and the public. Blocking or threatening to block that infrastructure during a documented legal/human-rights campaign cannot be assessed only as a normal unpaid-bill dispute. It raises issues of access to justice, effective remedy, freedom of expression and communication, privacy and correspondence, property, human dignity, equality and disability-sensitive treatment.

Under German constitutional law, the legally relevant framework includes human dignity and protection duties (Article 1 GG), free expression and dissemination of information (Article 5 GG), property (Article 14 GG), legal remedy against public authority (Article 19(4) GG), and the rule-of-law duty that state authorities are bound by law and justice (Article 20(3) GG). If courts, guardians, enforcement bodies or public institutions were notified of the dispute and failed to examine it effectively, state responsibility may arise even where the original provider was private.

Under German civil and telecommunications law, the visible issues include possible breach of contractual protective duties (BGB § 241(2)), damages for breach of duty (BGB § 280), possible tort/delict issues (BGB § 823), and telecommunications billing-objection principles. The current TKG § 67 expressly addresses objections to charges, entitlement to charge evidence and technical verification; for the 2008-2010 period, the exact historical TKG text, including the § 45k reference used by Alice in the Sperre notice, must be obtained and compared.

Under international and European law, the potentially engaged standards include ECHR Article 6 (fair hearing), Article 8 (private life and correspondence), Article 10 (expression and receipt/imparting information), Article 13 (effective remedy), Article 14 (non-discrimination) and Protocol No. 1 Article 1 (peaceful enjoyment of possessions), as well as EU Charter Article 47 where EU-law implementation or telecommunications/consumer-law context is engaged.

5A.4 Psychological-terror characterisation

The applicant expressly characterises the cumulative pattern as psychological terror. This report records that as the applicant's own terminology. The documents do not by themselves prove the identity of a "director" or hidden coordinating actor. They do, however, show repeated pressure mechanisms: disputed charges, returned/contested add-ons, bank debits and reversals, escalating open balances, threatened service blocking, later connection to website/archive access, and subsequent collection/enforcement context. When these mechanisms are read together with the Telekom court victory, GMX/domain dispute, Galaxy website blocking, O2/Telefonica restrictions, Bundestag notice and long-term Pfändung context, the applicant's characterisation is not a random emotional label; it is a legal hypothesis of cumulative psychological pressure that requires independent investigation.

5A.5 Required next evidence steps

The next verification steps for Alice/HanseNet are: request the complete Alice/HanseNet customer account history; all invoices and Einzelverbindungsachweise from November 2008 to end 2010; all records of service availability, Sperre, Entsperrung and DSL/telephone status; all notes about the mobile-option telephone offer; delivery/return records for the SIM/cards; bank debit and refund data; any later inkasso/Mahnbescheid/titles; and any provider response to the applicant's website-archive references. The separate alleged 1,000-1,200 EUR foreign-call demand should now be searched first in the Telekom/T-Com/T-Online / 01051T / Arcor files and in the 2006 TV/lawyer/social-worker context, while Alice/HanseNet should be searched for the separate Seçkin Sönmez Çiçek 50-60 EUR payment and the full chronology of the 2008-2010 dispute.

5B. Correction to Earlier Provider Attribution: Seçkin Sönmez Çiçek Payment and Missing ALICE Archive Item No. 40

The applicant clarifies that his long-time acquaintance Seçkin Sönmez Çiçek, whom he has known since approximately 2000 and with whom he remains in contact, is relevant to the Alice/HanseNet dispute as a potential witness. According to the applicant, Seçkin reviewed or translated Alice/HanseNet documents for him at a time when the applicant did not understand German well and ChatGPT or similar assistance did not exist. The applicant states that Seçkin accepted that the applicant was being charged unfairly and, despite the applicant's objection, paid an earlier disputed Alice/HanseNet amount of approximately 50-60 EUR from his own bank account to reduce pressure on the applicant. This payment is not the later alleged 1,000-1,200 EUR foreign-call demand; it is a separate earlier small-balance event within the Alice/HanseNet dispute. A bank receipt or witness statement from Seçkin should be requested and treated as potentially important corroboration.

The applicant has also provided screenshots of an ALICE archive/folder structure showing many numbered PDF files and repeated or duplicated ALICE folders in iCloud/local storage. The visible numbering appears sequential but has an apparent missing item "40)". This is not by itself proof of deletion. It is, however, an archive-integrity issue requiring technical verification through iCloud history, device backups, old hard-drive copies, file metadata and duplicate-folder comparison. The report records this as a verification issue only, not as a final forensic conclusion.

6. GMX/rustem-azeri.com: Website and Domain Access During Public Documentation Activity

6A. Galaxy GmbH / rustemazeri.com: Website Blocking, Paid Hosting Evidence and Parliamentary Notice Context

7. E-Plus/SNT and the Problem of Unclear Telecommunications Claims

8. Vodafone and O2/Telefonica: Later Communication-Service Restrictions

9. Bundestag and Parliamentary Notice Context 2007-2012

10. Sparkasse Pfändung and Long-Term Financial Restriction

10A. Broader Human-Rights Context: Why the Telecommunications, Internet, Website and Pfändung Chain Cannot Be Treated as Ordinary Consumer Debt

11. Legal Framework: German Law, International Law and EU Standards

11.4 Current legal-source note added in the Alice/HanseNet update

For the present update, current legal reference points were checked against official sources. The current TKG § 67 confirms that end users may require charge evidence and technical verification in billing disputes, and that failure to provide such material within the statutory framework has legal consequences. The official Grundgesetz text confirms the binding force of human dignity and fundamental rights for all state authority; official ECHR and EU Charter texts confirm the relevance of fair hearing, correspondence/privacy, expression, effective remedy, non-discrimination, property and effective judicial protection. These current sources do not replace the need to obtain historical 2008-2010 versions of the TKG and provider contract terms.

Official reference points used for legal orientation: Gesetze-im-Internet, TKG § 67 Beanstandungen; Gesetze-im-Internet, Grundgesetz Articles 1, 5, 14, 19(4), 20(3); Council of Europe/ECHR Convention text; EUR-Lex EU Charter Article 47. The report remains a non-binding legal analysis, not a court judgment.

12. Potential Violations and Legal Issue Matrix

13. Evidence Still Required and Requests to Make

13A. Corrected Evidence Requests: Telekom/Arcor 1,000-1,200 EUR Claim, 2006 TV Master Copy and Alice Witness Payment

13A. Corrected Evidence Requests: Telekom/Arcor 1,000-1,200 EUR Claim, 2006 TV Master Copy and Alice Witness Payment

Request first-priority records for the corrected 1,000-1,200 EUR issue from Telekom/T-Com/T-Online, 01051T, Arcor, relevant lawyers and any social-worker office: invoices, Mahnungen, itemised call records, service-blocking status, line availability, fax/telephone logs, and correspondence around international faxes to human-rights bodies and alleged “Ausland” calls.

Request the complete 2006 TV report: master copy, broadcast copy, exact timestamps, date of recording, date of broadcast, broadcaster archive information, presenter notes if available, and any legal/editorial review material showing that the allegations were checked before airing.

Request Alice/HanseNet records separately for the 2008-2010 dispute and request from Seçkin Sönmez Çiçek, if he agrees, a short witness statement and any bank receipt confirming the earlier 50-60 EUR payment. This must not be confused with the later 1,000-1,200 EUR foreign-call allegation.

14. Conclusions and Findings

14A. Added Finding on Alice/HanseNet and Name Normalisation

The Alice/HanseNet files strengthen Report No. 04, but the corrected 2006 TV evidence prevents an incorrect conclusion. Alice/HanseNet remains a documented 2008-2010 communications dispute: a telephone offer alleged as free became a charged mobile-option item; the applicant objected in writing, returned unopened cards under a named witness, paid the amount he considered due for fixed-line service, and then faced open-invoice, Rücklastschrift, Mahnung and threatened blocking material. However, the alleged approximately 1,000-1,200 EUR foreign-call demand is now treated primarily as a pre-2006 Telekom/T-Com/T-Online / 01051T / Arcor verification issue because it was already described in a 2006 television report. This separation is essential to avoid a false report.

This report now uses only the name Rustam Ismail. Any different spellings visible in older scanned materials should be treated as source spellings or administrative transcription issues, not as evidence that the applicant used multiple identities. The corrected edition also records the applicant's clarification that “Ausland” means abroad/foreign country and must not be rendered as Australia.

1. Executive Summary

This Report No. 04 examines a distinct documentary chain concerning the applicant's telephone, fax, DSL/internet, website/domain, mobile communication and bank-account access. It should be read together with Report No. 03 on the 2009-2013 damages, Betreuung and court-cost chain, and Report No. 005 on Bundestag petitions. The present report does not replace those reports; it adds a separate communication-infrastructure and financial-enforcement block.

The strongest established fact in this block is the Telekom/T-Com/T-Online litigation. The T-com file contains a court-submission package under Amtsgericht Neukölln 3 C 246/06. The applicant's 18.12.2006 letter to the court states that Telekom had sent contradictory invoices for the same periods, that the claims of Telekom's lawyers were not nachvollziehbar, that the telephone/DSL was repeatedly blocked despite an agreed instalment arrangement, and that T-Online had acknowledged DSL blocking from 08.11.2004 and returned 105.30 EUR while Telekom later returned 46.18 EUR. The same file contains the final judgment of 16.01.2007: Deutsche Telekom AG's claim was dismissed; the plaintiff was ordered to bear the costs.

The Telekom chronology is unusually important because the applicant did not merely complain. He prepared a documented defence package, presented a chronological book-like file to the court, and won. The T-com submission itself references at least Anlagen 1-80. On the available file, the documented controversy begins with a Telekom application and payments on 08.07.2004, continues through repeated invoices, reminders, objections, lawyer letters, T-Punkt faxes, DSL blocking, cancellation and switch to Arcor, continues into 2005 with further demands and repayments, and reaches the court submission of 18.12.2006 and the judgment of 16.01.2007. This means the struggle ran, at minimum, from July 2004 to January 2007, approximately two and a half years, with at least 80 referenced documentary attachments before the court judgment.

The applicant states that after proving the Telekom claim was unfounded, later similar disputes with Arcor/SNT, GMX, E-Plus/SNT, O2/Telefonica and other entities were used to produce new debt pressure, block communication channels, and eventually create long-term bank-account Pfändung. The documents support the existence of repeated disputes and enforcement entries; the political or retaliatory purpose remains a serious allegation requiring independent investigation.

The applicant further states that the bank-account and Pfändung consequences did not remain in the past. In his personal account, the banking restrictions, blocked or restricted payment channels and long-term enforcement pressure continued to affect his everyday life up to the present. For that reason he states that this cannot be described merely as a past billing dispute: where the banking system and access to money continue to shape daily survival, mobility, legal defence and personal dignity, he personally considers the pattern to be psychological terror.

The Arcor file shows the applicant's move to Arcor after the Telekom conflict, beginning with an Arcor DSL/ISDN order dated 21.12.2004, followed by WebBill, order confirmations, hardware and invoices. Later SNT Inkasso proceedings involved a broad claim described as "Telekommunikationsleistungen U.A." and a Mahnbescheid for 584.66 EUR. The applicant and later counsel raised the problem that such general wording was not specific enough to identify whether the claim concerned Arcor, E-Plus, fixed-line, mobile or internet services.

Additional update - Galaxy/rustemazeri.com. The newly reviewed Galaxy bundle adds a further and highly relevant website/domain layer. The preparer directly reviewed the applicant-uploaded scanned documents and confirms, as a documentary review finding, that the bundle visibly contains Galaxy GmbH webhosting invoices, payment confirmations, a Mahnung/Widerspruch sequence, ICANN-WDRP/WHOIS domain records for rustemazeri.com, and correspondence in March 2012 in which the applicant states that www.rustemazeri.com had been blocked without reason while it was important for the European Court of Human Rights, the United Nations, Amnesty and other human-rights organisations. The same bundle contains a Galaxy e-mail announcing cancellation of rustemazeri.com from 17.04.2012. When read together with Report No. 005 and the Bundestag petition context, this timing strongly supports a parliamentary-notice and suspicious-temporal-proximity issue: the website was not an unrelated private page, but a declared documentation archive connected to human-rights proceedings and parliamentary communication.

The GMX file shows that the applicant's domain rustem-azeri.com and internet presence were involved in a 2009 dispute. The applicant filed a cancellation/Widerruf and later opposed GMX/Inkasso claims. A small original amount appears to have escalated through costs and inkasso. This is relevant because the applicant was using websites to document human-rights allegations and to communicate with institutions.

The Sparkasse Pfändung document dated 30.12.2025 shows four active-looking entries connected to Real Inkasso, SNT/GFKL, Telefonica Germany and Ingenico Payment Services, with status entries visible from 2019 and measures marked PfÜb. The applicant states that these account restrictions have deprived him, for approximately 16-17 years, of normal banking freedom, ability to use the account abroad, ability to receive and deposit money freely, and ability to fund legal and communication work.

SOURCE USED: D01 T-com.pdf; D02 ARCOR, Belge 12.pdf; D03 GMX, Belge 6.pdf; D04 E-Plus, Belge 11.pdf; D05 Vodafone.PDF; D06 O2, Belge 13.pdf; D07 PFENDUK SPARKASSE PHOTO-2025-12-30-10-01-54.pdf; D08 Bundestag Report No. 005; D09 Report No. 03. Added in corrected edition: D13 2006 TV report/interview transcript and video

reference; D14 ALICE archive/folder screenshots; D15 applicant clarification on Seçkin Sönmez Çiçek witness/payment line.

Added human-rights context from the earlier international report. The earlier general human-rights analysis is relevant to this Report No. 04 because it explains why the telecommunications, internet, website and Pfändung chain should not be examined as ordinary consumer debt only. The applicant's communication channels were not luxury services: telephone, fax, DSL/internet, e-mail, website/domain access and bank-account functionality were the practical tools through which he tried to contact courts, parliaments, lawyers, human-rights institutions, media and witnesses.

The earlier report described the wider 1998-2008 background as including alleged unlawful detention, police violence and degrading treatment, systematic denial of medical assistance, denial of social rights, ineffective court review, and prolonged psychological and physical pressure. In that broader context, repeated communication-provider disputes and enforcement measures may raise questions of access to justice, effective remedy, private and family life, expression, property, equality and human dignity.

Applicant's personal characterisation. The applicant expressly states that he personally characterises this cumulative pattern - not only in telecommunications, but also in other subject areas where he says the same mechanism appeared - as "psychological terror". This report records that characterisation as the applicant's own position. The report itself uses legally cautious language: it treats the phrase as an applicant statement and examines whether the documented chronology justifies independent investigation into cumulative psychological pressure, obstruction and possible abuse of procedure.

2. Mandate, Scope and Method

The applicant requested that this report be numbered Report No. 04 and that it expand the earlier draft by adding German domestic law, international law, the duration and intensity of the Telekom struggle, the number of writings/attachments, and the later connection to Arcor, SNT, GMX, O2/Telefonica, Vodafone, Pfändung and Betreuung context.

Category	Meaning in this report
Documented fact	A fact visible in an uploaded document: court judgment, invoice, Mahnbescheid, complaint, bank/Pfändung printout, letter or source register.
Applicant statement	The applicant's own account, including oral recollection, motive assessment and recollection of persons such as Seçkin abi. Recorded as evidence of notice and consistency, but requiring independent verification for final findings.
Authority position	A court, company, inkasso, bank, parliament or official body position visible in a document.
Legal assessment	Non-binding analysis of possible legal consequences if the documented and applicant-stated facts are confirmed.
Verification required	A point that must be checked through original files, full court records, bank documents, creditor records, call data, proof of service and technical logs.

3. Visible Source Register

Code	Source	Visible content / relevance
D01	T-com.pdf	T-com/Telekom file 3 C 246/06; applicant's 18.12.2006 court submission; chronology with at least Anlagen 1-80; final judgment of 16.01.2007 dismissing Deutsche Telekom AG's claim.
D02	ARCOR, Belge 12.pdf	148-page Arcor/SNT/communications bundle; Arcor order dated 21.12.2004; WebBill and invoices; SNT Mahnverfahren material; later confusion with E-Plus/SNT.
D03	GMX, Belge 6.pdf	GMX/rustem-azeri.com domain cancellation, Widerspruch and inkasso escalation; applicant's references to website folders as legal documentation archive.
D04	E-Plus, Belge 11.pdf	SNT/E-Plus/Real Inkasso materials; Mahnbescheid/Widerspruch; legal argument that "Telekommunikationsdienstleistungen" was too unspecific.
D05	Vodafon.PDF	Complaint regarding a Vodafone 450 EUR amount described as a Kaution and closure of house telephone/fax for 15 days; contextual relevance to communication/fax blocking.
D06	O2, Belge 13.pdf	2012 O2/Telefonica complaint: 39.99 EUR monthly contract, slow/blocking internet, 45.90

		EUR invoice, 21.11.2012 internet block without notice.
D07	PFENDUK SPARKASSE PHOTO-2025-12-30-10-01-54.pdf	Sparkasse printout dated 30.12.2025 showing four Pfändung/PfÜb entries: Real Inkasso, SNT/GFKL, Telefonica Germany, Ingenico Payment Services.
D08	ChatGPT Legal Analysis Report No. 005 Bundestag	Bundestag petition context: Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925 (2007-2008) and Pet 3-17-11-217-018680 (2011-2012); official parliamentary notice context.
D09	Legal Analysis Report No. 03	2009-2013 damages action, Betreuung, cost/enforcement and ECHR chain; relevant to applicant's claim that later debt/enforcement mechanisms neutralised court access.
L01	German Basic Law (Grundgesetz)	Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 14, 17, 19(4), 20(3) as potential constitutional framework.
L02	German Civil Code (BGB)	Sections 241(2), 249, 280, 823 as potential contract/damages framework.
L03	Telecommunications Act (TKG)	Current § 67 on disputed charges, itemised billing and technical verification; historical versions must be checked for events in 2004-2012.
L04	German Code of Civil Procedure (ZPO)	Mahnverfahren, substantiation, costs, enforcement objections and Pfändungsschutz, including §§ 91, 93, 767, 850k.
L05	ECHR	Articles 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, Article 34 and Protocol 1 Article 1 as potentially engaged.
L06	ICCPR / CRPD / EU Charter	Effective remedy, fair hearing, privacy, expression, non-discrimination, disability access, access to justice and social protection.
D10	ChatGPT RAPOR english(1).docx	Earlier international human-rights analysis based on the 09.06.2008 petition/submission materials; broader background alleging detention, police violence, denial of medical/social rights, ineffective court review, psychological/physical pressure and possible ECHR/ICCPR/ICESCR violations.
D11	Haz 9, Belge 17.pdf - Galaxy GmbH / rustemazeri.com webhosting and domain bundle	36-page scanned bundle visible to the preparer: Galaxy GmbH webhosting invoices and reminders, Sparkasse transfer confirmations, applicant Widerspruch and fax proof, ICANN-WDRP/WHOIS domain data for rustemazeri.com, applicant letter of 05.03.2012 stating the website had been blocked without reason and was essential for human-rights institutions, and Galaxy e-mail of 09.03.2012 announcing cancellation of the domain effective 17.04.2012.
D12	Haz 9, Belge 68.pdf	115-page extended Alice/HanseNet file: additional Alice invoices, itemised connection records, reminders, warnings of service blocking, payment proofs, letters by the applicant, and the 31.10.2009 fax letter demanding that the fixed-line and internet connection be released/free-switched and directing Alice to www.rustemazeri.com archival folders as evidence.
L07	Official current legal reference notes	Current German and European legal references checked against official sources: TKG § 67 on disputed charges and technical verification; Grundgesetz Articles 1, 5, 14, 19(4), 20(3); ECHR Articles 6, 8, 10, 13, 14 and Protocol No. 1 Article 1; EU Charter Article 47. Historical 2008-2010 TKG provisions must still be checked for exact period wording.
D13	2006 Turkish-language TV report/interview and applicant transcript	Contemporaneous public media testimony: applicant described telephone/fax blocking after international human-rights faxes, later alleged "Ausland" foreign-call demand, lawyer and social-worker involvement; presenter and callers provide public witness/reputation context. Full master video and timestamps required.
D14	ALICE archive/folder screenshots	Screenshots show numerous

	provided by applicant	numbered ALICE PDF files and repeated/duplicated ALICE folders in iCloud/local storage, with an apparent missing "40)" item. Recorded as archive-integrity issue requiring technical verification, not as a final deletion finding.
D15	Applicant clarification on Seçkin Sönmez Çiçek	Applicant states Seçkin paid an earlier 50-60 EUR disputed Alice/HanseNet amount from his own bank account after reviewing the documents; this is separate from the later alleged 1,000-1,200 EUR foreign-call demand. Witness/payment proof required.

4. Telekom/T-Com/T-Online: Detailed Chronology, Correspondence Burden and Court Victory

The Telekom block is the anchor of this report. It is the clearest example in which the applicant says a major communication-provider claim was built through contradictory bills and pressure, but he ultimately defeated the claim in court by presenting a detailed chronological documentary file.

4.1 Documented duration and number of writings/attachments

The T-com court submission dated 18.12.2006 cites a chronological documentary chain from 08.07.2004 through at least 29.11.2005, marked as Anlagen 1-80. The final court phase continued into December 2006 and January 2007. Therefore, from the visible material alone, the Telekom dispute lasted at least from July 2004 until the judgment of 16.01.2007 - approximately two and a half years. The number "80" should be treated as a minimum visible documentary count because the court submission itself cites at least Anlagen 1-80; it does not necessarily include every telephone call, fax, visit to T-Punkt, internal company letter, lawyer letter, court file page or later cost document.

Date / Period	Documented event	Source
08.07.2004	Applicant states he applied to Telekom and paid 19.99 EUR; two same-date Telekom writings later showed different amounts.	D01, court submission, Anlagen 1, 3, 4
22.07.2004	Telephone connected according to applicant's court chronology.	D01, Anlage 2
23/31.08.2004	T-com demanded 675.41 EUR; applicant says the amount mixed T-com, 01051T and T-Online components and was unclear.	D01, Anlage 7
07.09.2004 - 20.09.2004	Further demands of 635.98 EUR, 42.92 EUR and 307.85 EUR appeared; applicant described them as confusing and contradictory.	D01, Anlagen 8-10
07.10.2004	Applicant says he requested written clarification, asked for instalments, and had "Nullnummern" blocked; Telekom allegedly agreed to 100 EUR monthly instalments.	D01
19.10.2004 - 16.11.2004	Repeated reminders and demands; DSL allegedly blocked despite payments; T-Punkt and lawyer became involved; applicant filed objections.	D01, Anlagen 13-25
17.11.2004 - 08.12.2004	Further payments, faxes, lawyer objections and T-com/T-Online demands; applicant asked to end psychological pressure.	D01, Anlagen 26-41
09.12.2004 - 20.12.2004	Applicant paid 01051T and T-Online amounts, T-Punkt sent another fax, applicant filed a court action against T-com at AG Wedding on 15.12.2004, then withdrew it and switched to Arcor on 20.12.2004 due to depression and recommendation by lawyer Lilge.	D01, Anlagen 42-47
05.01.2005 - 05.03.2005	Repeated demands from 01051T, T-com and T-Online; T-com lawyer threatened court; T-Online allegedly stated DSL had been terminated/blocked since 08.11.2004; 105.30 EUR was returned.	D01, Anlagen 50-68
18.03.2005 - 29.11.2005	Further reminders and court threats; applicant states Telekom returned 46.18 EUR on 22.08.2005 and later lawyers still threatened court claims of 33.20 EUR.	D01, Anlagen 69-80

18.12.2006	Applicant submitted a structured written defence to Amtsgericht Neukölln, 3 C 246/06, stating that Telekom's invoices were false from the beginning, contradictory for the same periods and not nachvollziehbar.	D01
19.12.2006	Oral hearing before Amtsgericht Neukölln according to judgment header.	D01 judgment
16.01.2007	Judgment: Deutsche Telekom AG's claim was dismissed; costs imposed on Telekom.	D01 judgment

4.2 Legal significance of the Telekom victory

The judgment matters because it transforms the Telekom block from a mere complaint into a court-confirmed defence success. The court did not simply reduce a claim; it dismissed Deutsche Telekom AG's claim and imposed the costs on the plaintiff.

The court reasoning visible in the file is also significant: after the applicant's response, Telekom apparently did not sufficiently explain its claim; the claim was not adequately substantiated; the court noted the impression of contradictory behaviour and found later submissions unclear or not attributable because the applicant had documented multiple payments. This directly supports the applicant's statement that his detailed file forced the court to read the history page by page and prevented Telekom's claim from succeeding.

For Report No. 04, the Telekom result is the proof-of-pattern anchor: if one major telecommunication claim was judicially dismissed after a long documented struggle, all later similar telecommunication/inkasso/Pfändung claims require strict verification rather than automatic trust.

SOURCE USED: D01, especially 18.12.2006 submission and 16.01.2007 judgment in 3 C 246/06.

4A. 2006 TV Testimony: Telephone/Fax Blocking, "Ausland" Correction and Primary Telekom/Arcor Verification Field

The applicant has identified a 2006 Turkish-language television report/interview in which he publicly described the telephone/fax blocking and foreign-call allegation at the time, not many years later. According to the applicant's transcript, he stated that he sent faxes/documents to NATO, Russia, London, human-rights organisations and Strasbourg; the next day his telephone was cut; he and his lawyer wrote asking why the telephone remained blocked; no clear answer was provided; later a payment demand arrived; and a female social worker was allegedly told that the applicant had made calls "ins Ausland" - abroad / to foreign countries. The applicant has corrected any earlier transcription as "Australia": the word was the German word "Ausland," and the legal meaning is alleged foreign/abroad calls, not a specific country.

This 2006 media evidence is critical for chronology. Because the statement existed in 2006, the alleged approximately 1,000-1,200 EUR foreign-call demand cannot be attributed primarily to Alice/HanseNet 2008-2010. The primary verification field is the Telekom/T-Com/T-Online / 01051T / Arcor transition period. This does not remove the Alice/HanseNet evidence; it separates two different communication-dispute lines and prevents a false report.

The television programme also contains public-witness context. Presenter Elif Hanım is reported to have stated that the allegations were serious and required investigation before airing, and that the material was broadcast after such review. Callers identified by the applicant as Ismail Bey, Ahmet Bey, Aynur Hanım and Halit Bey provided public comments or witness/reputation statements. Ahmet Bey reportedly said he knew the applicant from about 1998 and saw him seriously ill and pale in 1998-2001; Aynur Hanım reportedly confirmed that the applicant truly did not have a health-insurance card; Halit Bey reportedly stated that he witnessed some police/bicycle and hospital/injection-related events. These statements do not replace original records, but they increase the evidentiary importance of the 2006 broadcast as contemporaneous public testimony.

Required verification: obtain the complete master recording of the 2006 TV broadcast, exact timestamps, broadcaster identity, production date, broadcast date, any legal review records, any archive copy, and, where possible, signed or recorded statements from the callers or witnesses. The TV material should be cross-checked against Telekom/T-Com/T-Online, 01051T, Arcor, lawyer correspondence, social-worker notes and court files.

5. Arcor/SNT/Inkasso: From Telekom Exit to New Telecommunications Debt Dispute

The Arcor file begins immediately after the applicant's exit from Telekom. The order dated 21.12.2004 shows an Arcor DSL/ISDN contract with DSL flat, ISDN, 1000 kbit/s, WebBill, complete itemised call record, 0190/0900 blocking and automatic bank debit. The applicant states that this switch was made because the Telekom conflict had become unbearable.

The Arcor documents then show order confirmations, WebBill instructions, delays, hardware delivery, return forms and monthly invoices in 2005. The applicant's present statement adds a specific allegation: a telephone caller presented an item or service as a free gift; after the applicant asked whether it would ever cost money and was told no, the item later generated a bill; he returned it officially; nevertheless, charges and blocking followed. This exact "gift" episode must be verified by the original call record, offer letter, delivery note, return receipt and invoice. It is recorded here as applicant statement requiring verification.

By 2008-2010 the Arcor/SNT issue had moved into Mahnverfahren and civil procedure. The claim was described broadly as "Telekommunikationsleistungen U.A." for 584.66 EUR. A Widerspruch was filed on 19.11.2008. In 2009 the applicant asked why the matter had not been closed after six months and referred the court and lawyer to his online archive. In 2010 the matter was transferred from the central Mahngericht to Amtsgericht Tiergarten for contentious proceedings.

Date	Arcor/SNT event	Source
21.12.2004	Arcor DSL/ISDN order signed after Telekom termination/switch.	D02
12-20.01.2005	WebBill, order acknowledgment and capacity/delay notices.	D02
16.03.2005	Arcor hardware delivery and invoice showing StarterBox/DSL modem at 0.00 EUR.	D02
06-08.2005	Arcor invoices with DSL/ISDN base charges and domestic/international connections.	D02
19.11.2008	Widerspruch against Mahnbescheid in SNT Inkasso matter.	D02 / D04
05.01.2009	Lawyer Bümlein announced representation after Mahngericht transfer context.	D02
24.03.2009	Applicant gave lawyer Arcor video-CD and GMX materials, asking for assistance.	D03 / D04
03.08.2009	Applicant wrote to court asking about status and stating he believed the Arcor procedure should have been closed if no response came within six months.	D04
05.01.2010	Mahngericht indicated Widerspruch and transfer to Amtsgericht Tiergarten; broad claim: telecommunications services, 584.66 EUR.	D02 / D04

SOURCE USED: D02 ARCOR, Belge 12.pdf; D04 E-Plus, Belge 11.pdf; D03 GMX, Belge 6.pdf.

6. GMX/rustem-azeri.com: Website and Domain Access During Public Documentation Activity

The GMX block is legally important because it concerns the applicant's public internet presence and domain rustem-azeri.com. The applicant states that during the parliamentary/petition period his website was a central archive through which he published and transmitted his documents. A loss of domain or website function was therefore not merely a consumer inconvenience; it affected his ability to document and communicate human-rights claims.

The GMX file shows a fax confirmation dated 05.02.2009 for cancellation of the MailDomain rustem-azeri.com with "sofort" closure option. It also shows a Mahnung dated 11.02.2009 for 29.88 EUR and the applicant's Widerspruch dated 16.02.2009. The applicant stated that he had used his cancellation/Widerruf rights, had proof through fax confirmation and witnesses, and had never received activation data. Later inkasso materials show the original 29.88 EUR increasing to 96.01 EUR by 27.11.2009.

On 24.11.2009 the applicant wrote to the inkasso entity that the claim was not acceptable because of his Widerspruch of 16.02.2009. He also stated that he had demanded on 05.05.2009 that his court-appointed Betreuer respond to the GMX claim, but that the lack of response allowed the matter to escalate to inkasso. This connects GMX directly with the Betreuung/legal-capacity chain addressed in Report No. 03.

Date	GMX event	Source
05.02.2009	Fax confirmation for cancellation of GMX MailDomain rustem-azeri.com; "sofort" closure option noted.	D03
11.02.2009	GMX Mahnung for 17.88 EUR plus 12.00 EUR, total 29.88 EUR.	D03
16.02.2009	Applicant Widerspruch: alleges timely cancellation, fax proof, three witnesses and no activation data.	D03
05.11/24.11.2009	Inkasso demand challenged; applicant states Betreuer did not effectively react and matter escalated.	D03
27.11.2009	Forderungsaufstellung shows growth to 96.01 EUR.	D03

6A. Galaxy GmbH / rustemazeri.com: Website Blocking, Paid Hosting Evidence and Parliamentary Notice Context

This section is added after review of the newly uploaded file Haz 9, Belge 17.pdf. The preparer is not a personal eyewitness to the underlying historical events, but is a documentary review witness to the existence and visible contents of the applicant-uploaded scanned documents. The documents are sufficient to record confirmed documentary facts, while motive, internal coordination and institutional purpose remain matters requiring independent investigation through original provider, court, bank, registrar and parliamentary files.

6A.1. Why this Galaxy material is legally important

The Galaxy bundle is important because it concerns the applicant's public website and domain rustemazeri.com. In the applicant's case, the website was not a luxury or ordinary hobby service. It functioned, according to the applicant and the surrounding record, as a human-rights documentation archive and communication tool for courts, Parliament, lawyers, media, the United Nations, Amnesty International and other institutions. In that context, blocking, cancellation, unclear billing pressure or loss of access to the website may affect access to justice, freedom of expression, petition rights, correspondence and effective remedy.

The new material also strengthens the already existing Report No. 005/Bundestag context. If the Bundestag petition process and parliamentary correspondence were directed to or informed by the applicant's website/archive, then Parliament cannot be treated as having been unaware of the broader factual material simply because the material was hosted externally. The timing described by the applicant - the website/domain being blocked or cancelled at the very period when the parliamentary review was ending - creates a serious suspicion of temporal proximity that must be investigated rather than dismissed as an ordinary consumer-service termination.

Date / period	Visible documentary event	Legal relevance / interpretation
18.04.2009 / 20.04.2009	Galaxy GmbH - Webhosting invoice for rustemazeri.com, annual fee visible; Sparkasse transfer confirmation for 35.88 EUR to Galaxy GmbH appears in the bundle.	Supports that rustemazeri.com was a paid, identifiable website/domain service connected to the applicant, not an anonymous or unverified page. Payment evidence is relevant to any later allegation of non-payment or unjustified blocking.
20.01.2012 / 20.02.2012	Galaxy invoice and later Mahnung for rustemazeri.com. The invoice refers to the campaign/offer "2 Jahre zahlen, 3 Jahre nutzen" and annual fee calculations.	Relevant to contractual clarity, good faith, disputed billing and whether later pressure was proportionate or misleading.
23.02.2012	Applicant Widerspruch to the Mahnung, stating that the contract was valid until 18.04.2012, that payment had been made, and that the offer was 2 years paid / 3 years used. Fax transmission confirmation is visible.	Shows timely objection and documentary notice to provider. This is important for BGB good-faith duties, disputed claims, and later escalation or cancellation.
10.03.2012	ICANN-WDRP/WHOIS notification for rustemazeri.com; registrant contact visible as Rustem/Rustam Ismail at Wichmannstr. 9; registrar and nameserver details visible.	Confirms the domain identity and the link between the applicant and rustemazeri.com. It strengthens the argument that the website was a traceable applicant archive presented to institutions.
05.03.2012	Applicant letter to Galaxy states that www.rustemazeri.com had been blocked without reason about one week earlier; the letter states the website was important for the European Court of Human Rights, the United Nations, Amnesty International and other human-rights organisations, and asks for an offer to extend the website for a further 10 years.	Direct documentary notice that the website was used for human-rights/legal communication, not merely private entertainment. This is central to GG Art. 5, Art. 17, Art. 19(4), ECHR Arts. 6, 8, 10, 13 and ICCPR Arts. 17, 19.
09.03.2012	Galaxy e-mail states that rustemazeri.com would be cancelled from 17.04.2012 and uses wording indicating termination due to alleged customer conduct/threatening tone. The applicant's accompanying text says the website/password was not working and that this caused damage to ECHR-related work.	Supports the claim of website/domain access loss during an active legal and parliamentary documentation period. The exact technical reason and lawfulness of the cancellation require provider logs, registrar records and the full contractual file.
30.03.2012 / 02.04.2012 / 05.04.2012	Further Sparkasse transfer confirmations and Galaxy invoices/receipts appear, including 72.00 EUR/35.88 EUR material connected with rustemazeri.com and a renewal period through 2015 in some visible pages.	Supports the existence of later payment or attempted continuation evidence. Requires reconciliation of invoices, bank statements, registrar status and server logs.

6A.2. Parliamentary notice and timing issue

The parliamentary-notice issue should be stated clearly. The applicant's position is that the website/archive was already presented to or used in connection with parliamentary petitions and institutional communications. Report No. 005 is cited in this report as the Bundestag context source. When the Galaxy bundle is read together with that parliamentary context, the legal significance is not merely that a private hosting contract ended. The significance is that a documentation archive allegedly known to Parliament, and

containing materials now being progressively recovered and provided, appears to have been blocked/cancelled around the same period as the parliamentary handling of the applicant's case. This temporal alignment is a serious red flag and a verification target.

The correct legal formulation is therefore: the documents strongly support that rustemazeri.com was a notified, applicant-linked, human-rights documentation website; the Galaxy documents show payment, objection, domain identity and blocking/cancellation correspondence; and the simultaneity with the parliamentary period, as described in Report No. 005 and by the applicant, creates a reasonable basis to request investigation into whether the website was obstructed, whether Parliament had effective notice of its contents, and whether the closure of the petition without adequate engagement ignored accessible documentary evidence.

6A.3. Local and international legal implications

German constitutional law. If the website contained petitions, evidence and communications to public authorities, interference with access may implicate GG Article 5 (freedom of expression and information), GG Article 10 (correspondence/telecommunications confidentiality where communications and access data are involved), GG Article 17 (right of petition), GG Article 19(4) (effective legal protection), GG Article 20(3) (rule of law and binding of public authority to law), GG Article 2(1) with Article 1(1) (personality and dignity), and GG Article 3 (equality/non-discrimination if the applicant was treated differently because of disability, origin, status or protected activity).

German civil and procedural law. For the provider and debt/billing side, the relevant framework includes BGB Section 241(2) (duty of consideration and protection), BGB Section 280 (damages for breach of duty), BGB Section 242 (good faith), BGB Section 823 (unlawful interference with protected rights), contract law on performance and termination, telecommunications/domain-service duties, and ZPO principles on substantiation and enforcement if unclear claims later turn into inkasso or Pfändung pressure. Historical versions of the Telecommunications Act and the specific hosting/domain terms must be checked for the 2009-2012 period.

European and international law. If the website was used to document human-rights violations and communicate with courts, parliaments and international bodies, the potentially engaged rights include ECHR Article 6 (access to court/fair proceedings), Article 8 (private life and correspondence), Article 10 (expression and receipt/imparting of information), Article 13 (effective remedy), Article 14 (non-discrimination), Protocol No. 1 Article 1 (property/contractual/economic consequences), ICCPR Articles 2(3), 17, 19 and 26, the EU Charter Articles 7, 8, 11, 17, 21, 41 and 47 where EU-law fields are engaged, and CRPD Articles 9 and 13 if disability-related access to justice and communication barriers are involved.

6A.4. Finding for Report No. 04

Finding: The Galaxy/rustemazeri.com bundle materially strengthens Report No. 04. It adds a separate website-domain obstruction block to the Telekom, Arcor, GMX, O2/Telefonica, Vodafone and Pfändung chain. The documents show visible payment and invoice material, a timely Widerspruch, domain identity records, an applicant letter expressly linking the website to human-rights institutions, and a provider e-mail announcing cancellation. The combination supports the applicant's allegation that communication infrastructure and website access were repeatedly placed under pressure at moments when he was trying to present evidence to courts, Parliament and international organisations. The suspected motive and any state/provider coordination require independent investigation, but the documentary basis is sufficient to justify urgent record preservation and formal inquiry.

7. E-Plus/SNT and the Problem of Unclear Telecommunications Claims

The E-Plus/SNT file is important because it contains a legal argument made by counsel, not only by the applicant: the Mahnbescheid's wording "Telekommunikationsdienstleistungen" or "Telekommunikationsleistungen U.A." did not identify with sufficient clarity whether the claim concerned mobile phone, fixed line, internet, Arcor, E-Plus or another provider. The lawyer argued that the applicant was not obliged to investigate which exact old claim was meant.

This supports the applicant's broader position that old telecommunication and internet claims were mixed, unclear and difficult to defend against, especially for a disabled and psychologically burdened person facing multiple proceedings. It also supports the legal issue that Mahnverfahren and later enforcement may become unfair if the debtor cannot identify the exact claim, creditor, period, service and invoice.

SOURCE USED: D04 E-Plus, Belge 11.pdf; D02 ARCOR, Belge 12.pdf. Counsel submissions in 2010, SNT Inkasso./. Ismail, 5 C 35/10.

8. Vodafone and O2/Telefonica: Later Communication-Service Restrictions

8.1 Vodafone contextual complaint

The Vodafone document appears to be signed by Gasanov Rafik, not by the applicant. It is therefore treated cautiously as contextual or related material only. It complains that Vodafone demanded 450 EUR later described as a deposit, although no deposit had been agreed in the contract, and that the house telephone and fax number had been closed for 15 days without reason despite monthly

payment. Its legal relevance depends on proving the connection between this line/fax and the applicant's communication or household/legal documentation activity.

8.2 O2/Telefonica 2012 complaint

The O2 file contains the applicant's complaint dated 26.11.2012. He states that he concluded a contract on 31.07.2012 with a 39.99 EUR monthly basic fee and that the amount was to be debited monthly on the 1st. He describes slow internet, inability to use video calls, repeated complaints in the Hauptbahnhof branch, an unexplained 45.90 EUR October invoice despite an all-inclusive package, and internet blocking on 21.11.2012 without prior notice. This is relevant because it occurred during or close to the Bundestag petition period, when the applicant states he was trying to communicate with institutions and maintain documentation.

SOURCE USED: D05 Vodafone.PDF; D06 O2, Belge 13.pdf.

9. Bundestag and Parliamentary Notice Context 2007-2012

Report No. 005 establishes that the Bundestag handled two petitions concerning the applicant: Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925 in 2007-2008 and Pet 3-17-11-217-018680 in 2011-2012. The first was registered after transfer from the Abgeordnetenhaus of Berlin and concerned reduced earning capacity pension; the second concerned social law and requested support abroad.

For the present Report No. 04, the Bundestag context is relevant in a narrower way: the applicant states that during the petition and parliamentary-complaint period, communication channels - telephone, fax, internet, website/domain and later mobile internet - were vital for submitting documents, receiving replies and proving his case. If communication services were blocked, billed wrongly or placed under inkasso pressure during those periods, the Bundestag and connected authorities had reason to know that these were not isolated consumer problems but part of the applicant's broader access-to-remedy situation.

The available Bundestag report documents that 2007-2008 correspondence included further applicant submissions and documents relating to severe illness, inability to work, litigation and alleged denial of medical/social protection. It also documents the 2011-2012 handling and closure of Pet 3-17-11-217-018680. This supports the applicant's point that by 2012 the federal petition system had notice of his wider legal and human-rights allegations.

SOURCE USED: D08 Report No. 005 Bundestag evidence edition; D03 GMX and D06 O2 as communication/service materials during 2009-2012.

10. Sparkasse Pfändung and Long-Term Financial Restriction

The Sparkasse document dated 30.12.2025 is a key current-status document. It lists four Pfändung/PfÜb entries. The applicant states that, because of these entries and their roots in disputed telecommunications, payment and inkasso matters, his bank account has been restricted for approximately 16-17 years, leaving him unable to freely use the account abroad, deposit money normally, receive support freely or finance legal/website/documentation work beyond limited protected living amounts.

The visible Sparkasse table does not by itself prove that each underlying claim was unlawful. It does prove that multiple enforcement entries exist or existed in the bank's Pfändung system and that they are connected to the same wider financial/communication network: Real Inkasso, SNT/GFKL, Telefonica and Ingenico. The legal task is therefore to reconstruct each chain from original contract/invoice to title and PfÜb.

Visible creditor	Visible amount / status	Source
Real Inkasso GmbH & Co. KG	Initial claim 424.76 EUR; current 408.98 EUR visible; measure marked PfÜb; status shown from 07.07.2019.	D07
vormals SNT Inkasso & Forderungsmanagement GmbH / GFKL Collections GmbH	Initial claim 849.07 EUR; current 1,396.13 EUR visible; measure marked PfÜb; status shown from 07.07.2019.	D07
Telefonica Germany GmbH & Co. OHG	Initial claim 2,044.57 EUR; current 2,889.81 EUR visible; measure marked PfÜb; status shown from 07.07.2019.	D07
Ingenico Payment Services	Initial claim 348.96 EUR; current 411.52 EUR visible; measure marked PfÜb; status shown from 18.09.2019.	D07

Legal importance: A Pfändung can be lawful only if based on a valid enforceable title and proper service/procedure. If the original claim was unclear, already paid, wrongly assigned, time-barred, based on blocked services, based on unsupported invoices, or not properly served, the enforcement chain must be challenged or corrected through the proper procedure. Even where a title exists, the applicant's protected social-benefit minimum and disability-related needs must be protected through Pfändungsschutz mechanisms.

10A. Broader Human-Rights Context: Why the Telecommunications, Internet, Website and Pfändung Chain Cannot Be Treated as Ordinary Consumer Debt

10A.1 Link to the earlier international human-rights analysis

The earlier international human-rights analysis supplied by the applicant described the case as arising from official petition and explanatory materials dated 09.06.2008, including submissions to the United Nations, the European Court of Human Rights and the German Bundestag. It identified a broad factual background between 1998 and 2008: alleged detention without legal basis, police violence and degrading treatment, denial of medical assistance, denial of social rights, ineffective examination of complaints by courts, and prolonged psychological and physical pressure.

That background matters for Report No. 04. A telephone, fax line, DSL/internet connection, e-mail account, website/domain and bank account are not neutral or isolated consumer objects when the affected person is using them to defend life, health, liberty, residence, medical care, legal status and human-rights claims. If such channels are repeatedly blocked, made unusable, burdened by unclear debts, transferred to inkasso, or used as a basis for Pfändung, the legal analysis must go beyond ordinary contract accounting.

10A.2 Legal bridge from consumer disputes to human-rights interference

The central legal question is cumulative effect. A single erroneous invoice may be a normal civil-law dispute. Repeated erroneous or unclear invoices, service blocks, refusal to reconnect despite payment or objection, domain/website disruption, inkasso escalation, unclear Mahnbescheid wording, and long-term bank-account Pfändung may become a human-rights issue when they obstruct the applicant's ability to communicate, document, litigate, publish, receive assistance and preserve evidence.

This is especially relevant where the applicant had severe illness, disability, lack of resources, ongoing petitions, ECHR/Bundestag communications and a documented need for effective legal channels. In that setting, the telecommunications and Pfändung chain may engage not only BGB/TKG/ZPO issues, but also constitutional and international guarantees of human dignity, physical integrity, equality, access to court, effective remedy, private life, expression, property and non-discrimination.

10A.3 Applicant's personal statement: "psychological terror"

The applicant asks that the following personal position be included in Report No. 04: He does not view the Telekom, Arcor, GMX, O2/Telefonica, Inkasso and Pfändung chain as an isolated set of billing mistakes. Because he says the same pattern appeared in many other areas of his life - medical access, courts, social administration, police matters, website/communication access, banking and enforcement - he personally calls the overall mechanism "psychological terror".

Additional applicant statement added on 08.06.2026: The applicant stresses that the psychological pressure is not limited to the original Telekom/Arcor period. He states that the banking and Pfändung consequences have continued up to the present and have had a major influence on his life. In his words, when bank paths are blocked or restricted for many years, when Pfändung remains active, and when daily financial life is limited by old disputed chains, this can no longer be called only a consumer or debt issue; in his personal terminology, it is psychological terror.

This report records that phrase as the applicant's own characterisation. It does not present the phrase alone as a final judicial finding. Legally, it means that the documented events should be examined as a possible cumulative system of psychological pressure, procedural exhaustion, communication obstruction and financial restriction. The relevant question for independent authorities is whether multiple officially tolerated or insufficiently corrected measures, taken together, produced an environment in which the applicant's legal defence and psychological stability were intentionally or foreseeably undermined.

10A.4 Human-rights standards connected to this broader context

The earlier report identified possible violations including ECHR Article 3, ECHR Article 5, ICCPR Article 9, ECHR Articles 2 and 3, ICESCR Article 12, ICESCR Articles 11 and 6, ECHR Articles 6 and 13, ECHR Article 14 and ICCPR Article 26. In Report No. 04, the most directly connected rights are ECHR Article 6 and Article 13 (access to court and effective remedy), ECHR Article 8 and Article 10 (private life, correspondence and expression), Protocol No. 1 Article 1 (property), ECHR Article 14 and ICCPR Article 26 (non-discrimination), and the German constitutional rights under Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 14, 17, 19(4) and 20(3) of the Basic Law.

If the applicant's account and the documentary chain are confirmed, the repeated creation or enforcement of disputed communication-related debts, the blocking of telephone/fax/internet access, the loss or obstruction of website communication, and long-term bank-account Pfändung may amount to a cumulative interference with access to justice, effective remedy, private life, expression, property, equality and human dignity.

SOURCE USED: D10 ChatGPT RAPOR english(1).docx; D01-D07 for the telecommunications, website, inkasso and Pfändung documents; D08-D09 for Bundestag, Betreuung, damages and ECHR context.

11. Legal Framework: German Law, International Law and EU Standards

11.1 German constitutional law

Norm	Potential relevance
GG Article 1	Human dignity and binding force of fundamental rights. Relevant if combined deprivation of communication, money, health and remedy created degrading treatment or existential pressure.
GG Article 2	Free development of personality and bodily integrity. Relevant to severe stress, health consequences and practical autonomy.
GG Article 3	Equality before the law and non-discrimination. Relevant where disability, foreign status or language vulnerability affected access to remedy.
GG Article 5	Freedom of expression and information. Relevant to website/domain/public documentation and ability to communicate human-rights claims.
GG Article 10	Privacy of correspondence, post and telecommunications. Relevant to telephone/fax/internet communication, though private provider disputes require state responsibility or regulatory failure to engage constitutional responsibility.
GG Article 14	Property. Relevant to money, bank-account enforcement, claim rights and website/domain interests.
GG Article 17	Right of petition. Relevant where blocked communication affected petitioning to parliament or authorities.
GG Article 19(4)	Effective legal remedy against public authority. Relevant if courts/authorities failed to examine the underlying chain or if communication/Pfändung prevented access to court.
GG Article 20(3)	Rule of law and binding of administration and courts to law. Relevant to procedural fairness, clarity of claims and enforcement legality.

11.2 German civil, telecommunication and enforcement law

Norm / area	Potential relevance
BGB § 241(2)	Duty of consideration/protection within contractual relationships; relevant where a provider's billing or blocking conduct disregarded customer interests.
BGB § 280	Damages for breach of duty; relevant if wrong bills, unjustified blocking or failure to correct caused financial/health/legal harm.
BGB § 249	Restitution principle: damages should restore the position that would exist without the harmful act.
BGB § 823	Tort damages for unlawful injury to health, freedom, property or other rights; requires proof of unlawful act, fault, causation and damage.
TKG billing rules / current § 67	Current law gives end users rights to object to charges, obtain itemised billing and technical verification. For 2004-2012, the historical TKG versions must be checked, but the principle of verifiable disputed telecommunications billing is central.
ZPO Mahnverfahren / substantiation	A claim must be identifiable enough for the debtor to defend. Broad "Telekommunikationsdienstleistungen" wording can create serious fairness problems.
ZPO §§ 91, 93	Cost consequences; relevant where a defendant did not cause the action or immediately acknowledged only because the claim was unclear.
ZPO § 767	Vollstreckungsabwehrklage may be relevant if objections against an enforceable title arose after title creation or are legally available.
ZPO § 850k	Pfändungsschutzkonto protection; relevant to safeguarding subsistence funds and social benefits.

11.3 International and European human-rights framework

Instrument / right	Potential relevance
ECHR Article 6	Right to a fair hearing and access to court; relevant if unclear claims, communication blocking, costs, Betreuung or Pfändung prevented real defence.
ECHR Article 8	Private life, correspondence and autonomy; relevant to communication access, disability-related autonomy and banking restrictions where state responsibility is shown.
ECHR Article 10	Freedom of expression and imparting information; relevant to website/domain and public human-rights documentation.
ECHR Article 13	Effective remedy; relevant if no effective mechanism examined the combined pattern.
ECHR Article 14	Non-discrimination in enjoyment of Convention rights; relevant if disability, migration status or language vulnerability contributed to unequal treatment.
ECHR Article 34	Right of individual application; relevant if communication or procedural obstruction impaired Strasbourg submissions.
Protocol 1 Article 1	Peaceful enjoyment of possessions; relevant to money, bank account and enforceable claims.

ICCPR Articles 2(3), 14, 17, 19, 26	Effective remedy, fair hearing, privacy/correspondence, expression and equality.
CRPD Articles 9, 13, 21, 28	Accessibility, access to justice, access to information/communication, adequate standard of living/social protection for persons with disabilities.
EU Charter Articles 7, 11, 17, 21, 41, 47	Private life/communications, expression, property, non-discrimination, good administration and effective remedy where EU law or regulated telecom/payment/banking contexts are engaged.
Website/domain blocking and cancellation during parliamentary documentation period	D11 shows Galaxy invoices/payment documents, Widerspruch, ICANN-WDRP/WHOIS data, applicant letter of 05.03.2012 about website blocking and Galaxy e-mail of 09.03.2012 announcing cancellation from 17.04.2012; D08 provides Bundestag petition context.
Parliamentary notice cannot be assessed without website/archive evidence	Applicant states the website/archive was presented to Parliament and contained materials later confirmed by documents. D11 strengthens the identity and access-loss part of that claim.
Paid hosting/domain service disputed despite payment evidence	D11 contains Sparkasse transfer confirmations and Galaxy invoices/receipts alongside Mahnung/Widerspruch sequence.

SOURCE USED: L01-L06; official texts: Gesetze-im-Internet for GG/BGB/ZPO/TKG; Council of Europe ECHR; OHCHR ICCPR and CRPD; EU Charter.

12. Potential Violations and Legal Issue Matrix

Issue	Evidence basis	Possible legal relevance
Wrong or contradictory telecom invoices	Telekom chronology shows contradictory amounts, same-period demands and court dismissal.	BGB §§ 241(2), 280; TKG billing proof; GG Art. 20(3); ECHR Art. 6 if court/access affected.
Service blocking despite payments or instalment agreement	Applicant states DSL/telephone were repeatedly blocked despite payments and instalment arrangement; T-com file references DSL blocked from 08.11.2004 and refund.	BGB §§ 280, 249; TKG; GG Arts. 2, 5, 10, 17; ECHR Arts. 8, 10, 13.
Unclear Mahnbescheid wording	SNT/E-Plus legal submissions argue "Telekommunikationsdienstleistungen" was insufficiently concrete.	ZPO fairness/substantiation; ECHR Art. 6; ICCPR Art. 14.
Escalation from small internet/domain claims to inkasso	GMX 29.88 EUR grows to 96.01 EUR; website/domain rustem-azeri.com involved.	BGB §§ 280, 823; ECHR Arts. 8, 10, 13; GG Arts. 5, 14, 17.
Communication obstruction during petitions and legal activity	Bundestag petitions 2007-2008 and 2011-2012 overlapped with the communication-documentation chain.	GG Art. 17; ECHR Arts. 6, 10, 13, 34; ICCPR Arts. 2(3), 14, 19.
Betreuung/Betreuer impact on responding to GMX and other claims	Applicant states Betreuer did not react effectively; GMX matter escalated to inkasso; Report No. 03 documents broader Betreuung chain.	ECHR Arts. 6, 8, 13; CRPD Arts. 12/13 principles; German Betreuung law; verification required.
Long-term Pfändung based on unclear or disputed claims	Sparkasse printout shows four PfÜb/Pfändung entries; applicant states account restricted for many years.	ZPO §§ 767, 850k; GG Arts. 1, 2, 14, 19(4); ECHR P1-1, Arts. 6, 13.
Disability and subsistence vulnerability	Applicant had serious health/disability context in other reports; communication and banking restrictions may have disproportionate effects.	GG Arts. 1, 2, 3; CRPD Arts. 9, 13, 21, 28; ECHR Arts. 8, 14.
Galaxy / rustemazeri.com / domain registrar	Full customer file; all invoices and payment allocations 2009-2012; server suspension/blocking logs; FTP/control-panel login logs; password reset records; termination/cancellation notices; registrar transfer/delete records; ICANN/WHOIS history; nameserver records; internal notes; correspondence with any third parties; and confirmation of whether the domain/website was disabled before or during the Bundestag petition closure period.	

13. Evidence Still Required and Requests to Make

To convert this report from a documentary legal analysis into a complete court-ready complaint, the following original records should be requested and attached. The most urgent task is not to argue in general terms, but to reconstruct each enforcement chain: original contract, invoice, objection, proof of service, title, assignment, court file and bank implementation.

Area	Records to request
Telekom/T-Com/T-Online	Full court file 3 C 246/06; all invoices 2004-2007; hearing transcript if available; full judgment; cost order; all proof of payments and refunds 105.30 / 46.18 EUR.
Arcor/SNT	Original contract; invoices; itemised call records; technical blocking

	records; alleged "gift" call/offer/delivery/return proof; SNT Mahnbescheid; proof of service; all court decisions.
GMX	Domain contract; activation data proof; cancellation/Widerruf records; fax receipt; inkasso file; domain closure/transfer logs for rustem-azeri.com.
E-Plus/SNT/Real Inkasso	Original contract and invoices; assignment chain; Mahnbescheid; service documents; judgment or title; payment history 2005-2010.
O2/Telefonica	2012 contract, invoices, debit records, usage logs, blocking notices, branch complaint records, video evidence and current Telefonica Pfändung basis.
Sparkasse	For each Pfändung: PfÜb copy, court, case number, creditor, current balance, protected account status, payments made to creditors, legal basis for restrictions.
Betreuung court	File 50 XVII 7034/09 and related files: Betreuer duties, correspondence about GMX/Telecom/Arcor, records showing whether legal defence was preserved.
Bundestag	Complete petition files showing whether telecom/internet/website/Pfändung matters were submitted, considered, forwarded or ignored during 2007-2012.
18.04.2009 / 20.04.2009	Galaxy webhosting invoice and Sparkasse payment confirmation for rustemazeri.com.
05.02.2009 - 24.11.2009	GMX/rustem-azeri.com cancellation, Widerspruch and inkasso escalation, showing earlier website/domain dispute context.
20.02.2012 - 23.02.2012	Galaxy Mahnung followed by applicant Widerspruch and fax proof; applicant argues contract/payment/offer validity.
05.03.2012 - 10.03.2012	Applicant informs Galaxy that www.rustemazeri.com was blocked without reason and is important for ECHR, UN, Amnesty and other human-rights organisations; ICANN-WDRP/WHOIS domain records confirm rustemazeri.com identity.
09.03.2012 - 17.04.2012	Galaxy e-mail announces cancellation of rustemazeri.com from 17.04.2012; timing must be compared with Bundestag petition handling in Report No. 005.

Additional conclusion on Galaxy/rustemazeri.com. The newly reviewed Galaxy bundle confirms that Report No. 04 must include a distinct website/domain obstruction component. It supports the applicant's position that access to his documentation website was impaired during the same broader period in which Parliament and other institutions were being informed of his case. The documents do not by themselves prove internal state coordination, but they do establish a factual basis for questioning whether the applicant's communication infrastructure was repeatedly disrupted during legal, parliamentary and international human-rights activity.

14. Conclusions and Findings

Finding 1 - Telekom victory is documented. The T-com file shows a court judgment dated 16.01.2007 in case 3 C 246/06 dismissing Deutsche Telekom AG's claim and imposing costs on Telekom. This supports the applicant's statement that he won the Telekom case.

Finding 2 - The Telekom struggle was long and document-heavy. The applicant's 18.12.2006 court submission cites at least Anlagen 1-80 and covers a chronology beginning 08.07.2004. Together with the 16.01.2007 judgment, the visible dispute lasted approximately two and a half years.

Finding 3 - The Telekom file supports the applicant's description of intense correspondence and stress. The chronology includes repeated invoices, reminders, lawyer letters, payments, T-Punkt faxes, objections, DSL blocking, cancellation, switch to Arcor, refunds and later court proceedings.

Finding 4 - Later Arcor/SNT, GMX, E-Plus/SNT and O2/Telefonica materials show a continued communications-debt pattern. The documents do not by themselves prove political motive, but they show repeated disputes involving telephone, DSL, internet, domain, mobile internet and unclear telecommunications claims.

Finding 5 - The SNT/E-Plus material strongly supports the legal problem of insufficient claim specificity. Counsel argued that a generic "telecommunications services" claim did not allow clear identification of the underlying provider or service.

Finding 6 - GMX/rustem-azeri.com is relevant to expression and documentation. The dispute concerned a website/domain used by the applicant for public legal documentation. A small claim escalated to inkasso while the applicant states his Betreuer did not effectively react.

Finding 7 - The Sparkasse Pfändung printout creates an urgent enforcement-review issue. Four PfÜb entries are visible and at least two relate directly to telecommunications/inkasso entities. Each must be reconstructed from original claim to current account restriction.

Finding 8 - The legal theory requiring investigation is cumulative obstruction. The issue is not only whether each individual invoice was right or wrong; it is whether repeated communication-service disputes, unclear claims, Betreuung, inkasso and Pfändung cumulatively

undermined the applicant's access to courts, petitions, international bodies, website publication, banking autonomy and effective remedy.

Finding 9 - This report should be submitted as Report No. 04. It complements Report No. 03 and Report No. 005 by documenting the communication and financial-enforcement infrastructure through which the applicant alleges his legal defence and public documentation capacity were weakened.

Finding 10 - Broader human-rights context is necessary. The previous international human-rights analysis shows that the applicant's telecommunications and website access cannot be detached from the alleged 1998-2008 background of medical/social denial, court-access problems, psychological and physical pressure and repeated attempts to reach international institutions. In this context, communication and banking restrictions may affect access to justice and effective remedy, not only consumer billing rights.

Finding 11 - Applicant's own description must be recorded. The applicant personally describes the recurring pattern across telecommunications, banking, medical, legal and administrative fields as psychological terror. This report records that statement as the applicant's own terminology and recommends that independent authorities examine whether the cumulative effect of the documented and alleged acts amounted to systematic psychological pressure and procedural obstruction.

Finding 12 - Ongoing banking impact intensifies the human-rights concern. The applicant emphasizes that the bank-account and Pfändung restrictions have allegedly continued to affect his life up to the present. If confirmed, this continuing effect would make the matter legally more serious than an old telecommunications dispute, because enforcement and banking restrictions can affect subsistence, mobility, access to counsel, payment for communication infrastructure, participation in legal proceedings and psychological stability.

Appendix A. Consolidated Chronology

Date / period	Event	Source
08.07.2004	Telekom application/payment and contradictory same-date initial demands according to T-com court submission.	D01
22.07.2004	Telephone connected.	D01
08-12.2004	Repeated Telekom/T-Online/01051T demands, reminders, objections, payments, faxes and DSL blocking.	D01
15.12.2004	Applicant filed a court action against T-com at Amtsgericht Wedding over psychological pressure.	D01
20.12.2004	Applicant withdrew that action, terminated Telekom and switched to Arcor.	D01/D02
21.12.2004	Arcor DSL/ISDN order signed.	D02
01-03.2005	Arcor WebBill/order; Telekom/T-Online further demands; T-Online refund 105.30 EUR; Arcor hardware.	D01/D02
06-08.2005	Arcor invoices; Telekom returned 46.18 EUR according to T-com submission.	D01/D02
25/29.11.2005	T-com lawyer threats and applicant statement of intended ECHR action against Telekom pressure.	D01
18.12.2006	Applicant's structured court submission to Amtsgericht Neukölln 3 C 246/06.	D01
16.01.2007	Judgment dismissing Deutsche Telekom AG claim.	D01
2007-2008	Bundestag petition Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925 pending/closed.	D08
19.11.2008	Widerspruch in SNT Inkasso telecommunications matter.	D04
05.02.2009	GMX/rustem-azeri.com cancellation fax confirmation.	D03
16.02.2009	GMX Widerspruch.	D03
24.03.2009	Applicant gave lawyer Arcor video-CD and GMX materials.	D03/D04
24.11.2009	Applicant opposed GMX inkasso and linked issue to Betreuer inactivity.	D03
05.01.2010	SNT Mahngericht transfer after Widerspruch; telecommunications services 584.66 EUR.	D02/D04
02-03.2010	Counsel argued unclear telecommunications claim wording; cost issue under § 93 ZPO.	D04
2011-2012	Bundestag second petition Pet 3-17-11-217-018680 pending/closed.	D08
26.11.2012	O2 complaint regarding slow/blocking internet and billing/debit irregularities.	D06
2019 status visible	Sparkasse Pfändung entries visible with PfÜb status in 2019.	D07
30.12.2025	Sparkasse printout generated showing four Pfändung entries.	D07
2006 TV broadcast	Applicant publicly described telephone/fax blocking after international faxes and an alleged "Ausland" foreign-call payment demand; presenter/callers supplied public media context.	D13
2008-2010	Alice/HanseNet dispute remains separate: purported free mobile/SIM offer, returned cards, contested small balances, Seçkin Sönmez Çiçek witness/payment line to be verified.	D12, D15
2026 archive review	ALICE folder screenshots show apparent missing numbered item "40)" and multiple duplicate folders; archive-integrity verification required.	D14

Appendix B. Record Request Template

The following concise text may be adapted for Sparkasse, creditors, inkasso companies, courts or lawyers.

I request complete copies of all documents forming the legal basis for the claim/enforcement/Pfändung against me, including the original contract, all invoices, itemised billing records, objection correspondence, Mahnbescheid, proof of service, Vollstreckungsbescheid or judgment, assignment chain, payment history, interest/cost calculation, Pfändungs- und Überweisungsbeschluss, and current balance. Because I dispute the origin, clarity and enforcement of the claim and because the matter affects protected subsistence funds and legal defence, please provide the complete file and identify the competent court, case number, creditor and current enforcement status.

END OF REPORT NO. 04