

CHATGPT LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 05

FINAL CONSOLIDATED VERSION - REVISED, EXPANDED, STRENGTHENED AND INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE EDITION

Betreuung / Legal Guardianship, Forced Psychiatry, Access to Justice, Court-File Integrity, Social Protection, Debt Exposure, Communications-Archive Irregularities, and Continuing Pattern of Harm (2005-2026)

Prepared from applicant-provided documents, scanned evidence, prior Report materials, and applicant witness statements in the present working window.

Applicant: Ismail Rustam / Rustam Azeri. Residence: Berlin, Germany. This report is an analytical working document for international human-rights, legal, and documentation purposes.

Important numbering correction: any earlier phrase such as "06-00-07" is removed. References to later reports, where needed, must appear only as Report No. 006 and Report No. 007. There is no Report No. 00.

Evidence standard: this document separates (1) documentary evidence visible in the reviewed files, (2) applicant witness statement, and (3) matters requiring verification by court, police, hospital, embassy, lawyer, or archive records.

I. Executive Summary

Report No. 05 has been revised to integrate the new evidence and corrections supplied after the previous draft. The main legal theme is that mechanisms formally described as assistance, psychiatric protection, legal guardianship, social or medical administration, and criminal procedure appear - in the applicant's account and in parts of the documentation - to have repeatedly functioned as barriers to effective protection, court access, medical treatment, evidence preservation, and personal liberty.

The central period remains 2005-2010: the 2005 criminal rehabilitation/compensation basis; the applicant's distinction between a trusted helper he wanted and later contested Betreuer arrangements; the 2008 ECHR proceedings and forced closed-psychiatric confinement; the 2009 disputed Betreuung, 27.11.2009 hearing, missing protocol, and 15.12.2009 Einwilligungsvorbehalt; and the 2010 Istanbul/Turkey evidence contradicting a narrative of voluntary acceptance of legal control. The report also adds a final continuity section showing that similar patterns allegedly continued into 2020-2026 through medical neglect, police non-protection, disability-rights failures, legal-representation concerns, and continuing court/insurance disputes.

The strongest new documentary confirmation is the 26.11.2008 letter of Azerbaijani lawyer Tamilla/Tamella Abdullayeva to the European Court of Human Rights. That letter states that, after the complaint against Germany had been lodged, Rustam Azeri was placed into a closed mental hospital; it characterizes the placement as illegal and without basis and requests the Court to make an immediate decision for his release. The attached fax report shows transmission to the ECHR fax number with result "OK". This makes the 2008 forced-psychiatry issue a contemporaneously raised legal matter, not only a later recollection.

Source: 02) - 26.11.2008 Advokat Tamella Abdullayeva(2).pdf, pp. 1-2; fax report to 0033388412730, result OK.

The second major correction is the emphasis on the 27.11.2009 hearing. The question is not merely whether such a hearing existed. The 15.12.2009 court decision referred to the applicant's personal hearing on 27.11.2009 as a basis for appointing Oener Birant and imposing an Einwilligungsvorbehalt. Therefore the missing issue is: where is the protocol or hearing note, why is it absent from the applicant's archive, and what did it record about the applicant's objection, Thomas Ruhland's intervention, and the expert's allegedly non-objective position?

Source: 3)-2009(1).pdf and earlier analysis of 15.12.2009 Amtsgericht Tiergarten decision; applicant witness statement regarding the 27.11.2009 hearing.

The third major addition is the applicant's detailed witness account of the 2008 forced closed-psychiatric confinement. Because the incident is not fully described in the scanned 2008 ECHR materials, this report records the applicant's account as a witness statement and links it to Tamilla Abdullayeva's 26.11.2008 ECHR letter as contemporaneous corroboration that the closed-psychiatry issue was raised with Strasbourg at the time.

The final major addition is the continuity evidence: Annex 31 on police failures in 2023-2024, the 2025 formal objection to attorney Dijana Sapina, 2020 hospital complaint materials, 2026 Stellungnahme against unlawful Vollstreckung/Inhaftierung, and 2026 Sozialgericht/AOK dental-treatment submissions. These show the applicant's position that the same pattern continues today: violence or medical danger occurs; evidence or protection is allegedly not secured; formal procedures replace effective remedies; the applicant incurs debt or penalties; and his disability and health are not adequately protected.

Source: Annex 31(4).pdf; 20.11.2025 - Formal Objection to Attorney Dijana Sapina(5).pdf; 01)-Beschwerde 2020 Rustam Ismail (1)(4).pdf; 28.04.26 - Stellungnahme gegen rechtswidrige Inhaftierung.pdf; S-G - 27.05.2026.pdf.

II. Scope, Methodology and Evidence Categories

This report is not a final judicial finding. It is a structured evidence and legal-risk analysis for international review. It is based on applicant-provided files and on the applicant's own detailed witness statements. Where a fact is not independently proven by a document, it is clearly framed as an applicant statement requiring verification.

Category	Meaning in this report
Documented record	A scanned letter, court decision, fax report, payment receipt, complaint, medical complaint, or other material visible in the reviewed files.
Applicant witness statement	A detailed first-person account by the applicant. It should be preserved, but verified through official records where possible.
Verification required	A matter that can and should be checked through court files, hospital records, police records, lawyers' files, embassy communications, ECHR registry documents, iCloud/file metadata, or witness statements.
Legal significance	The reason a fact may matter under German law, ECHR, CRPD, ICCPR, CAT, ICESCR, or general international human-rights standards.

III. Corrections to the Previous Draft

1. Report numbering correction

All references to "06-00-07" must be removed. There is no Report No. 00. If later prepared reports are mentioned for context, they must be written as Report No. 006 and Report No. 007. Report No. 05 remains Report No. 05.

2. Gutachter terminology correction

The word "Gutachter" means expert or evaluator; it is not a person's name. In the 2008 and 2009 context, references to a Gutachter must be treated as references to a psychiatric/legal expert, not as a named individual unless a document identifies the specific person.

3. Tamilla/Tamella Abdullayeva timeline correction

Tamilla/Tamella Abdullayeva should not be described as actively representing the applicant in 2013 unless a document proves it. The documentary material currently reviewed places her involvement in the 2008-2010 ECHR context. The applicant states that she helped or represented him for roughly two to three years, approximately until 2010, after which she withdrew or avoided further involvement, allegedly referring to illness, fear for herself/family, and possible pressure. The applicant also states that her son's later German university opportunity may be relevant as a potential pressure/conflict-of-interest indicator, but this must be verified and not stated as proven causation.

Source: 01) - Advokat Tamela Abdullayeva(3).pdf; 02) - 26.11.2008 Advokat Tamela Abdullayeva(2).pdf; applicant statements in the present working window.

4. 2008 forced psychiatry is not only a later memory

The 26.11.2008 Abdullayeva letter makes clear that the closed-psychiatry issue was raised at the time before the European Court of Human Rights. The report must therefore describe the applicant's detailed account as a witness statement, but also state that a lawyer contemporaneously informed ECHR that the placement was illegal and without basis.

Source: 02) - 26.11.2008 Advokat Tamela Abdullayeva(2).pdf, pp. 1-2.

IV. Core Documentary Source Register

No.	Document / Evidence	Significance
1	03.10.2008 ECHR complaint / Anlage, 47 pages	Long chronology of German court decisions, 1998-2008 alleged violations, 1999 police beating/stripping, PKH/Beratungshilfe denial, 50 million euro claim and court-file overload.
2	06.10.2008 letter to the President of ECHR	Applicant protests ECHR decisions in applications 746/04 and 6859/08, requests Grand Chamber review, and states he submits 46 pages of German court decisions/crime evidence.
3	01) Advokat Tamela Abdullayeva	Azerbaijani-language submission to the Grand Chamber describing representation, 1998-1999 rights violations, 1999 naked stripping/beatings, severe illness and German courts' failure to remedy.
4	02) 26.11.2008 Advokat Tamilla Abdullayeva	Key evidence: lawyer states applicant was placed in a closed mental hospital after lodging ECHR complaint; calls placement illegal and without basis; requests immediate release; fax OK report attached.
5	2005 Amtsgericht Tiergarten rehabilitation decision	2000 criminal conviction under AuslG was reopened, judgment annulled, applicant acquitted, and compensation from the state treasury recognized.
6	2009 Betreuung file / 15.12.2009 decision	Oener Birant appointed for financial matters, representation before authorities/courts and housing; Einwilligungsvorbehalt imposed for declarations before authorities and courts.
7	27.11.2009 hearing reference	The 15.12.2009 decision relies on a personal hearing of 27.11.2009; the full protocol is missing and must be obtained.
8	ALICE archive screenshots and documents Nos. 39, 41, 54, 56	Archive gap analysis: documents No. 40 and No. 55 absent between connected

		ALICE/HanseNet evidence chains.
9	06.07.2010 Istanbul/Turkey ECHR letter	Shows applicant writing from Turkey after disputed Betreuung, arguing Germany deprived him of freedom and treatment; relevant as behavioral evidence against voluntary acceptance of control.
10	2018 ECHR Letter of Appeal about Azerbaijan property	Shows applicant's claim that he had property/business in Azerbaijan and was later deprived of it; relevant to reputational/social-origin context and downstream harm.
11	2020 hospital complaint	Documents applicant's allegations of medical neglect concerning leg/tumor/Kaposi suspicion, hospital refusals, biopsy issues and delayed treatment.
12	2023-2024 police failures complaint / Annex 31	Documents theft, police handling, attacks, release or non-location of alleged perpetrators, and lack of protection.
13	2024-2025 attorney Dijana Sapina receipts and formal objection	Documents payments, contracts, and applicant's claim that paid legal representation failed to file effective actions.
14	2026 Vollstreckung/Inhaftierung objection	Documents current disability, Betreuer and punishment contradictions in a public-transport sanction/enforcement context.
15	2026 Sozialgericht / AOK dental treatment submissions	Documents continuing health, dental-function, cost, insurance and access-to-medical-treatment issues.

V. Chronological and Legal-Factual Analysis

1. 1998-1999: Detention, illness, alleged police abuse and early court record

The 03.10.2008 ECHR Anlage states that in 1998 the applicant was placed in Abschiebehaft without a lawful basis and that medical care was withheld; he describes serious lung illness, blood, hunger strike and lack of adequate medical response. The document also contains excerpts from a 23.10.1998 Amtsgericht

Schöneberg detention hearing and a medical note indicating that, from a medical viewpoint, the applicant was no longer fit for detention/being kept in custody.

Source: Anlage(1).pdf, pp. 4-5.

The same 2008 dossier describes the 02.11.1999 incident in the Grünau/Köpenick detention context: the applicant alleges severe illness or seizure-like symptoms, isolation, being left without help, degrading gestures concerning vomit, force, being dragged by the hair, stripped naked, threatened, and held in a single cell. It records that a pastor helped him write a complaint and that the applicant repeatedly demanded information about his illness and investigation of the violence.

Source: Anlage(1).pdf, pp. 5-7.

This early material is relevant to Report No. 05 because the later Betreuer/legal-representation issue cannot be separated from the applicant's claim that earlier police/torture/detention cases were not effectively pursued and may have been withdrawn, ignored or allowed to fail during later Betreuung periods. The applicant states that early German Betreuer/lawyers withdrew or failed to pursue the 1999 naked stripping/beating case and possibly the police-car accident case. This remains a key court-file audit task.

2. 2005: Criminal rehabilitation and compensation basis

The 03.01.2005 Amtsgericht Tiergarten decision ordered reopening of the criminal proceedings, annulled the 19.07.2000 judgment, acquitted the applicant, required publication in the Bundesanzeiger, and recognized that the state treasury must compensate him for the earlier conviction. This document is crucial because it shows that later compensation demands were not arbitrary; they were connected to an officially acknowledged wrongful conviction.

Source: 1-1(5).pdf, pp. 4-5.

In a 26.01.2005 letter, the applicant wrote that he was glad the decision recognized him as innocent, but emphasized that his statements had repeatedly not been recorded in protocols, including in 1999 proceedings and a larger December 1999 session reported in press/radio. This supports the later theme that protocols and official records may have omitted central applicant statements.

Source: 1-1(5).pdf, p. 8.

3. 2005 trusted helper vs. contested later Betreuung

The applicant clarifies that in or around 2005 he did seek help from a specific woman whom he trusted and who had genuinely helped him. That request must not be confused with later disputed and restrictive guardianship mechanisms in 2008-2009. The first situation was, according to the applicant, an attempt to secure trusted support. The later situation allegedly became a mechanism for control over legal access, representation before courts and authorities, and interference with compensation or police-abuse claims.

This distinction is essential. A document saying the applicant requested help or a Betreuer cannot automatically prove that he freely and knowingly accepted a later Einwilligungsvorbehalt or the transfer of legal control over court and authority matters.

4. 2008: ECHR proceedings, Tamilla Abdullayeva and contemporaneous legal representation

The 2008 ECHR materials show that the applicant and his Azerbaijani lawyer were actively attempting to reopen or escalate the ECHR proceedings. The 06.10.2008 letter to the ECHR President identifies cases 746/04 and 6859/08, protests the Court's decisions, requests Grand Chamber review, and states that 46 pages of German court decisions and crime evidence are submitted.

Source: 06.10.2008.pdf, p. 1.

The Azerbaijani-language document signed by Tamilla Abdullayeva describes her as defending Ismayil Rustam's rights and refers to the ECHR response of 27.05.2008. It identifies 1998-1999 state violations, severe physical harm, 1999 naked stripping and beating by police, heart attack in 2003, and the allegation that German courts handled his complaints superficially or unlawfully.

Source: 01) - Advokat Tamela Abdullayeva(3).pdf, pp. 1-2.

The strongest 2008 document is Abdullayeva's 26.11.2008 English letter to ECHR. It states that she is the advocate of Rustam Azeri; that a complaint against Germany had been lodged; that after lodging the complaint Rustam Azeri was placed into a closed mental hospital; that this placement was illegal and without basis; and that ECHR was requested to make an immediate decision for release. The second page is a fax sending report to 0033388412730 dated 26.11.2008 with result OK.

Source: 02) - 26.11.2008 Advokat Tamela Abdullayeva(2).pdf, pp. 1-2.

Legal significance: this transforms the 2008 closed-psychiatry issue from a purely retrospective applicant memory into a contemporaneously raised legal complaint by a lawyer to the European Court of Human Rights.

5. 2008 forced closed-psychiatry incident - applicant witness statement

The following statement is included because the scanned 2008 file confirms that the closed-psychiatry placement was raised with ECHR, but the detailed hospital events are not fully narrated in the available documents. The account is therefore preserved as an applicant witness statement requiring verification.

The applicant states that in 2008, after returning home from filing or pursuing a complaint before the Kammergericht, he saw a police vehicle at the entrance of his building. Because he lived in a central and comparatively quiet area, he suspected that the police had come for him. Before approaching the entrance, he stepped aside and called a friend, asking the friend to call back in approximately fifteen minutes and, if he did not answer, to notify his family and lawyers in Azerbaijan.

When the applicant approached the entrance, four police officers came out with a Turkish-speaking woman who appeared to be acting as interpreter. The applicant asked where he was being taken and on what legal basis, but no clear reason was given. In the police vehicle he attempted to ask the Turkish-speaking woman in Turkish what was happening, but the police allegedly prohibited him from speaking to her, and she said they could not speak.

The applicant states that he was taken to a closed psychiatric hospital and told that he had to stay. He repeatedly asked whether there had been any incident, complaint or legal basis. He was told only that they wanted to help him. He replied that he did not need such help and that authorities had already "helped" him enough. He was told he would remain whether he wanted to or not.

The applicant asked a doctor whether medication could be forced into his mouth. The doctor allegedly said they could not directly force medication into his mouth, but warned him not to cause difficulties because a court decision could be obtained and he could be injected by force. The applicant understood this as a threat of forced medication. He demanded a court hearing and declared that until such hearing he would refuse food and water, fearing that medication or substances could be placed in food or drink. He also states that this forced situation prevented him from taking his regular HIV/AIDS and other necessary medication, thereby harming his health.

The applicant was placed in a room with an Arab man who appeared heavily sedated or unable to move normally. The man only asked whether he was Muslim and, after the applicant answered yes, said "good" and went back to sleep. For approximately three days, the applicant waited for a court hearing while refusing food and water. During this period attorney Thomas Ruhland, allegedly involved through the Azerbaijani Embassy, visited him and gave him a business card. Ruhland allegedly instructed him not to show the card if the judge released him, but to show it if the judge decided that he should remain. Ruhland also warned him not to fall for provocations.

The applicant states that the planned court hearing was postponed because the judge allegedly had other work. That evening, the quiet roommate was removed and replaced by a German patient who behaved provocatively, hugged him, shouted, and later played techno music loudly at night. The applicant repeatedly asked him to lower the volume, but the man lowered it briefly and then turned it up again. The applicant understood this as deliberate sleep deprivation and psychological provocation before the hearing. Around 3 a.m. he complained to a male nurse, asking whether this was a psychiatric hospital or a place to make sane

people go mad. The nurse heard the music and removed the tape recorder. The roommate allegedly continued obscene and provocative behavior.

At the hearing, held inside the psychiatric hospital in a smoking room, the judge, doctor and applicant were present. The judge allegedly stated that the applicant was aggressive and had to remain for treatment. The applicant responded that aggression under conditions of hunger strike, dehydration, lack of sleep, fear and provocation was not proof of insanity. When the judge still indicated that he should remain, the applicant showed Thomas Ruhland's business card. According to the applicant, the judge then asked the doctor why the applicant had to remain precisely then. The doctor allegedly answered in German that because of the proceedings and scandal concerning the European Court and international organizations, the applicant had to remain "bei unseren Interessen" - in "our interests." The applicant immediately objected before the judge that this was not a medical reason but an institutional-interest reason. He told the judge that Azerbaijani lawyers, the press and the Embassy knew, and that the case would become an international scandal. The judge then allegedly ordered his release.

Verification required: police transport record; psychiatric admission and discharge files; Unterbringung decision or emergency basis; hearing protocol; nurse and roommate records; interpreter identity; Thomas Ruhland visit/notes; Azerbaijani Embassy correspondence; ECHR registry correspondence; release order or court note.

Source: Applicant witness statement; corroborated at threshold level by the 26.11.2008 Abdullayeva ECHR letter confirming closed mental hospital placement after the complaint and alleging illegality/no basis.

6. 2009: Compensation claim, disputed Betreuung and Einwilligungsvorbehalt

The applicant states that after he sought compensation based on the acknowledged wrongdoing and prior years of harm, the Betreuung mechanism was imposed or intensified. The 2009 file and prior analysis identify a 05.05.2009 temporary Betreuung and the decisive 15.12.2009 Amtsgericht Tiergarten decision appointing Oener Birant for Vermögenssorge, Vertretung vor Behörden und Gerichten, and Wohnungsangelegenheiten. The decision also imposed an Einwilligungsvorbehalt for legal declarations before authorities and courts.

Source: 3)-2009(1).pdf; prior Report No. 05 source review of Amtsgericht Tiergarten 15.12.2009 decision.

Legal significance: because the applicant's core conflict was with state bodies, courts, police and social/medical authorities, a restriction covering declarations before Behörden und Gerichte was not a neutral administrative step. It directly affected the applicant's ability to pursue compensation, police-abuse claims, medical-treatment claims and ECHR-related submissions.

7. 27.11.2009 hearing and missing protocol - Thomas Ruhland and expert challenge

The 15.12.2009 decision refers to a personal hearing of 27.11.2009. The full protocol/hearing note is not currently present in the applicant's archive. The applicant insists this cannot be treated as a minor missing paper: the hearing allegedly contained the core objection to the Betreuung and expert opinion.

The applicant's witness account: attorney Thomas Ruhland became involved because the applicant objected to the Betreuung and the psychiatric/legal assessment. Ruhland allegedly brought the applicant before the judge to demonstrate that he was present, communicative and not in a state justifying total legal control. Ruhland allegedly challenged the expert directly, asking how the expert could state or imply a near-total diagnosis that the applicant's rights had to be transferred to another person. The expert allegedly replied that this was his personal opinion. Ruhland then told the judge that a personal opinion is not an expert report; an expert must provide an objective, reasoned assessment. The applicant remembers the expert's hands or body shaking and remembers Ruhland asking the secretary/protocol writer to add important statements to the record.

The applicant further recalls that Ruhland specifically added that Charité/Humboldt psychiatric structures had not properly treated him in earlier years or had applied wrong diagnoses/failed proper treatment. The exact wording must be checked in the protocol. The applicant emphasizes that the Istanbul stay is not the main proof; it is additional behavior evidence. The main proof is the 27.11.2009 hearing, Ruhland's

intervention, formal objection, expert challenge, protocol, and the later court decision's reliance on that hearing.

Legal significance: if the final decision imposing a court/authority Einwilligungsvorbehalt relied on this hearing, the protocol is essential to verify whether the applicant's objections were recorded, whether Ruhland challenged the expert's basis, and whether the court adequately addressed less restrictive alternatives and the applicant's free will.

8. ALICE/HanseNet archive gaps and court-file integrity

The applicant's ALICE archive screenshots show 55 visible items while the internal numbering runs from 00 to 56. At least No. 40 and No. 55 are missing. In the ALICE sequence, No. 39 is the applicant's 05.11.2009 letter disputing a demand and accepting only a specific amount; No. 41 is a bank statement/payment proof showing payment. No. 40 is therefore likely a link document such as a fax report, ALICE response, or claim statement. Similarly No. 54 is a 31.03.2010 e-mail/instruction and No. 56 is Oener Birant's ALICE letter with ALICE confirmation. Missing No. 55 may have been a Mahnung, fax report, or complete e-mail continuation.

Source: 39) - Meine Briff - 05.11.2009.pdf; 41) - 82.14 EUR -67,53 EUR.pdf; 54) - e-mail 31.03.2010.PDF; 56) - Bref 31.03.2010.PDF; applicant archive screenshots.

Legal significance: these gaps do not alone prove theft, but they are serious archive-integrity irregularities, especially because the missing items appear to be link documents in legal/financial chains from the same period as the contested Betreuung and legal-access restrictions. Forensic verification should include iCloud history, local backups, original device backups, hash comparison, e-mail attachments, and court/lawyer file requests.

9. 2010 Istanbul/Turkey evidence - conduct inconsistent with voluntary legal control

The 06.07.2010 Istanbul letter to the President of the European Court of Human Rights identifies the applicant as writing from Turkey and references application numbers 2968/09, 6859/08 and 746/04. It states that Germany had deprived him of freedom through various methods for twelve years, subjected him to psychological terror and torture, impeded treatment, and restricted his ability to move and live as a free person. It also states that he had written complaints on 01.06.2010 and 24.06.2010 and asks international actors to help restore his freedom.

Source: 01) - Dilekce 06.07.2010 - Turkish.pdf, pp. 1-2.

Legal significance: this supports the applicant's argument that after the disputed 2009 Betreuung and Einwilligungsvorbehalt he did not behave like a person who had freely accepted ordinary legal guardianship. Instead, he left Germany for Turkey/Istanbul and continued international complaints from outside Germany, presenting the situation as one of lost freedom and coercive state pressure.

10. 2018 Azerbaijan property - downstream harm and social-origin correction

The 30.03.2018 ECHR Letter of Appeal concerns the applicant's Azerbaijan property. It states that he had a property/bakery/real-estate structure built with his own financial means in the Goychay region based on documents from 1994, and that the land was allegedly privatized in 2013 by concealing the existence of the property. It further states that during ongoing proceedings the property was demolished in late-night hours after a 03.08.2017 hearing, and that appeal and supreme court proceedings did not restore the right or open a criminal case.

Source: Letter of Appeal.pdf, pp. 1-4.

Legal significance: this is not the core of Report No. 05, but it corrects any false narrative that the applicant came to Germany as a person without property, work history or social standing. It also supports a downstream-harm argument: prolonged illness, legal pressure, poverty, Betreuung and inability to protect rights in Germany may have contributed to the loss of property protection in Azerbaijan. This should be developed separately in a future property/downstream-harm report, while cited here only as context.

11. Continuing pattern after 2010: 2020-2026 evidence

a. Medical neglect and hospital complaints - 2020

The 2020 hospital complaint describes a 22-year path of bureaucratic and medical neglect and focuses on 2019-2020 leg/tumor/Kaposi-related concerns. It describes Franziskus, Elisabeth, Auguste-Viktoria and Charité episodes, alleged interruption of antibiotics, refusal or delay of MRI, biopsy from a healthy area, delayed or inadequate examination, and the applicant's fear that hospital behavior could lead to death.

Source: 01)-Beschwerde 2020 Rustam Ismail (1)(4).pdf, pp. 1-6 visible images.

b. Police non-protection and attacks - 2023-2024

Annex 31 documents the 30.06.2023 phone/shoes theft and alleged police failures, including station-to-station referral and a serial-number recording problem; later recognition or arrest of alleged perpetrators at Alexanderplatz followed by a letter saying they could not be found; the 25.11.2023 Zoologischer Garten attack; and the 13.11.2024 Hermannstraße/Hermannplatz attack involving repeated calls, CCTV-relevant locations, witness video, police arrival and later alleged non-location or release issues.

Source: Annex 31(4).pdf, pp. 1-3.

c. Attorney-related obstruction and financial pressure - 2024-2025

The 840,34 file contains receipts for 1,000 euro payments dated 20.12.2024 and 07.03.2025 and criminal-procedure powers of attorney connected to theft and bodily-injury matters. The 20.11.2025 formal objection to attorney Dijana Sapina states that the attorney received 2,000 euro, demanded additional sums for reading/reviewing documents, and allegedly took no effective legal actions such as reopening unlawfully closed criminal cases, filing inactivity complaints against police/prosecution, or obtaining search orders for perpetrators.

Source: 840,34(4).pdf, pp. 1-4 visible images; 20.11.2025 - Formal Objection to Attorney Dijana Sapina(5).pdf, pp. 1-3.

d. Disability, punishment and Vollstreckung - 2026

The 28.04.2026 Stellungnahme argues that the applicant is officially GdB 100, that comparable allegations were previously addressed in a 2020 Landgericht Berlin decision, and that punishment/enforcement in a public-transport case failed to account for disability, health, Betreuung, and reasonable accommodation. It invokes CRPD, ECHR and ICCPR and asks for suspension, review and collection of disability office records.

Source: 28.04.26 - Stellungnahme gegen rechtswidrige Inhaftierung.pdf, pp. 1-4.

e. Dental function, AOK/ERGO and Sozialgericht - 2026

The 27.05.2026 Sozialgericht/AOK submission describes an urgent dental-treatment situation, AOK cost demands, delayed or incomplete cost coverage, alleged debts exceeding 27,000 euro, inability to eat normally, and the argument that dental restoration is a basic health function rather than a cosmetic issue. It asks the Sozialgericht to address immediate costs, full plan/cost review, expert questions, AOK responsibility, constitutional rights, ECHR/CRPD/ICCPR/CAT/ICESCR implications, and preservation of evidence.

Source: S-G - 27.05.2026.pdf, pp. 1-7 visible images.

VI. Legal Framework

1. German constitutional and procedural law

The German Basic Law protects human dignity, life and bodily integrity, equality, effective legal protection, legal hearing and liberty safeguards. In this report, the most relevant provisions are GG Article 1, Article 2(2), Article 3, Article 19(4), Article 103(1), and Article 104. The key questions are whether state bodies failed to protect a severely ill person, whether detention or forced psychiatric placement was legally justified

and reviewed, whether the applicant was heard, and whether court access was effective rather than merely formal.

Source: Official German Basic Law; cited for legal context.

Current German Betreuung law is relevant as a standard of principle even though the historical legal sections differed in numbering. BGB §1814 provides that a Betreuer may be appointed only if necessary and not against the free will of the adult. BGB §1825 treats an Einwilligungsvorbehalt as a serious restriction requiring necessity to avert significant danger and likewise not against free will. BGB §1821 emphasizes that a Betreuer must support the person according to the person's wishes within the person's possibilities. FamFG §278 requires the personal hearing of the person before appointment of a Betreuer or ordering an Einwilligungsvorbehalt, and FamFG §280 addresses expert opinions in such proceedings.

Source: Official sources: BGB §§1814, 1821, 1825; FamFG §§278, 280. Used as current legal framework and principle; historical 2009 law should be checked by the applicable version at that time.

For psychiatric confinement, current BGB §1831 and FamFG provisions on Unterbringung/Freiheitsentziehung illustrate the core principle: deprivation of liberty in a closed hospital requires strict legal basis, court authorization or immediate follow-up approval, personal hearing, expert foundation and proportionality.

Source: Official sources: BGB §1831; FamFG provisions on Unterbringung/Freiheitsentziehung.

2. European Convention on Human Rights

The relevant ECHR provisions include Article 2 (life), Article 3 (prohibition of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment), Article 5 (liberty and security), Article 6 (fair trial), Article 8 (private life and physical/psychological integrity), Article 13 (effective remedy), Article 14 (non-discrimination), and where relevant Article 34 (right of individual petition and prohibition of hindrance).

Source: European Convention on Human Rights, official ECHR text.

In the applicant's case, Article 5 is relevant to closed psychiatric confinement; Article 6 and 13 to missing protocols, ineffective lawyer/court action, and barriers to proceedings; Article 3 to humiliating detention conditions, forced psychiatry allegations, medical neglect and cumulative degrading treatment; Article 2 to known life/health risk and suicide risk; Article 8 to bodily/psychological integrity and personal data/evidence; Article 14 to differential treatment based on disability, health status, migrant status or vulnerability.

3. UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

CRPD Article 12 protects equal recognition before the law and legal capacity on an equal basis with others. Article 13 requires effective access to justice. Article 14 concerns liberty and security of the person. Article 15 prohibits torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. Article 17 protects integrity of the person. Article 25 concerns health. These are central because the applicant is GdB 100, reports severe illness, and alleges that disability and vulnerability were used against him instead of triggering accommodations and protection.

Source: UN/OHCHR CRPD official text, including Articles 12 and 13.

4. ICCPR, CAT, ICESCR and EU Charter

ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 9, 14, 16, 17 and 26 may be engaged by life risk, degrading treatment, liberty restriction, fair trial, recognition before the law, privacy/integrity and non-discrimination. CAT is relevant to credible allegations of ill-treatment and failure to investigate. ICESCR Article 12 is relevant to access to health. EU Charter provisions may be relevant where EU law is engaged, including dignity, integrity, liberty, fair trial, non-discrimination and social/health protections.

VII. Legal Significance of the Main Patterns

1. From vulnerability to control

The applicant's file suggests a recurring pattern: severe illness, poverty, language barrier, trauma or disability are documented, but instead of producing effective support, they become grounds for dismissing claims, restricting legal action, imposing Betreuung, or treating the applicant as unreliable. If proven, this raises serious concerns under CRPD Article 12, ECHR Articles 6 and 13, and German constitutional principles of human dignity and effective legal protection.

2. Closed psychiatry as possible retaliation or obstruction

The 26.11.2008 Abdullayeva letter is crucial because it links the closed psychiatric placement to the lodging of an ECHR complaint. If the applicant was taken to a closed psychiatric hospital without medical necessity, without adequate legal basis, and in the context of ECHR/international complaints, this may raise issues under ECHR Articles 5, 3, 8, 13 and 34. The applicant's statement that the doctor referred to "our interests" instead of medical necessity, if corroborated, would be extremely serious.

3. Missing protocol and missing archive documents

The 27.11.2009 hearing protocol and the ALICE missing-number documents are different types of archive gaps, but both affect proof of the same period. A missing protocol prevents review of the legal basis for the Einwilligungsvorbehalt. Missing numbered ALICE documents weaken the financial/legal chain around the same period. Both require forensic and institutional retrieval.

4. Legal representation that formally exists but does not produce remedy

The applicant's 2024-2025 evidence concerning attorney payments and lack of effective actions mirrors his older allegations about Betreuer/lawyers not protecting key cases. The legal issue is not only private attorney-client dissatisfaction; it is whether a severely disabled victim of alleged crimes can in practice obtain effective representation, file complaints, reopen closed matters, and preserve evidence.

5. Continuing harm rather than historical closure

The 2020-2026 evidence indicates that the applicant's claims are not limited to a distant historical period. Medical access, dental function, police protection, legal representation, punishment/enforcement and disability accommodations are still active. For international review, this matters because ongoing or continuing violations may require urgent protective measures and current remedies, not only historical compensation.

VIII. Required Verification and Evidence Requests

1. Full court file and protocol/hearing note for the 27.11.2009 Amtsgericht Tiergarten personal hearing, including any audio, handwritten notes, secretary notes, expert statements, Ruhland submissions and attendance records.
2. Dr. Köhler or other expert report dated around 22.08.2009, Gesundheitsamt records of 28.04.2009, and all medical/expert bases used for the 05.05.2009 and 15.12.2009 Betreuung decisions.
3. Full psychiatric hospital file for the 2008 closed-hospital incident: police transport order, admission/discharge, court decision, emergency order, medication notes, visitor logs, interpreter identity and release order.
4. Thomas Ruhland's file, correspondence, visit notes, 27.11.2009 hearing notes, and communications with the Azerbaijani Embassy.
5. Tamilla/Tamella Abdullayeva's ECHR file, powers of attorney, submissions, fax reports and correspondence from 2008-2010.

6. Court files for the 1999 police stripping/beatings complaint, detention violence, and any police vehicle accident case, including whether any Betreuer or lawyer withdrew, failed to answer, missed deadlines or caused closure.
7. ALICE/HanseNet complete archive, including missing documents No. 40 and No. 55, fax logs, e-mails, Mahnungen, bank records and Betreuer correspondence.
8. iCloud, device, backup and file-history logs for missing numbered PDFs and missing key legal documents.
9. Police, prosecution and CCTV records for 2023-2024 attacks, including serial number entry logs, station camera footage, witness videos, detention/release records, and prosecutor decisions.
10. Attorney Dijana Sapina / Engelmann file: contracts, hourly-rate document, invoices, correspondence, all submitted complaints and motions, and file notes.
11. Medical records for 2019-2020 hospital complaints, including MRI, biopsy location, dermatology, Charité and hospital discharge letters.
12. AOK/ERGO dental, Sozialgericht and Versorgungsamt files concerning dental-function restoration, GdB 80/100, Merkzeichen, public transport accommodations and cost decisions.

IX. Proposed Report No. 05 Final Findings

1. The 2008 forced closed-psychiatry allegation is materially strengthened by the 26.11.2008 Tamilla Abdullayeva ECHR letter and fax report. It should be treated as a contemporaneously raised legal complaint, not merely as a later memory.
2. The 2009 Betreuung/Einwilligungsvorbehalt must be analysed as a potentially severe access-to-justice restriction because it covered representation or declarations before courts and authorities, exactly where the applicant's claims against the state were concentrated.
3. The missing 27.11.2009 protocol is a central missing evidence item. The 15.12.2009 decision's reliance on that hearing makes the protocol essential to review legality, free will, expert basis, Ruhland's objection, and proportionality.
4. The applicant's 2010 Istanbul/Turkey letter supports the argument that he did not voluntarily accept the contested legal control. It shows continued international complaint activity from outside Germany and a claim of loss of freedom and treatment access.
5. The ALICE archive gaps and the broader missing-document pattern require a formal archive-integrity investigation, especially where missing documents appear to be link documents in legal/financial chains.
6. The 2018 Azerbaijan property file should be preserved as downstream-harm and social-reputation context: the applicant claims he had property/business in Azerbaijan and that prolonged German legal/health pressure affected his ability to protect it.
7. The 2020-2026 materials show a continuing pattern: medical neglect allegations, police non-protection, ineffective or financially burdensome legal representation, disability-rights failures, and ongoing health/insurance/court disputes. This supports framing Report No. 05 not as a closed historical issue, but as the central legal-access pattern that continues into the present.

X. Draft Formulation for International Submission

The applicant's case should be reviewed as a long-term pattern in which documented vulnerability - severe illness, disability, trauma, lack of resources, and language barriers - repeatedly failed to trigger effective protection. Instead, the same vulnerability appears to have been used to restrict his legal agency, weaken access to courts, and leave key police, medical and compensation claims unresolved.

The 2008 forced closed-psychiatry episode is especially serious. A lawyer's contemporaneous letter to the European Court of Human Rights stated that after the complaint against Germany had been lodged, the applicant was placed in a closed mental hospital, that this placement was illegal and without basis, and that

immediate release was requested. The applicant's detailed witness statement describes police transport without adequate explanation, prohibition of communication with a Turkish-speaking woman/interpreter, refusal of food/water out of fear of forced medication, warning of court-authorized injection, alleged provocations and sleep deprivation before the hearing, and a judge's release order after the doctor allegedly referred to institutional interests rather than medical necessity.

The 2009 Betreuung and Einwilligungsvorbehalt must be independently audited because they directly affected the applicant's ability to act before authorities and courts. The key 27.11.2009 hearing protocol is missing despite the 15.12.2009 decision relying on that hearing. According to the applicant, attorney Thomas Ruhland challenged the expert's basis and insisted that a personal opinion could not justify transferring the applicant's legal rights to another person. This must be verified from the court file.

The later record from 2010, 2018 and 2020-2026 shows continuity: the applicant continued international complaints from Turkey, later reported loss of property in Azerbaijan, and in recent years documented police non-protection, medical neglect, disability-rights failures and paid legal representation that allegedly did not produce effective remedy. The matter therefore requires independent international review, preservation of evidence, retrieval of missing court and medical files, and urgent measures to prevent further harm.

XI. Closing Note

This report is prepared as a working legal-analysis document. It does not replace a lawyer's final pleading. It preserves the applicant's evidence structure and witness account, identifies documentary support, separates verification-required allegations, and organizes the case for review by international human-rights bodies, lawyers, journalists, medical/legal experts, and oversight institutions.

End of Report No. 05 revised expanded 2026 evidence edition.

XII. Consolidated Strengthening Additions from Earlier Drafts B and C

This final consolidated version preserves the content of the previous final A-version and strengthens it by adding the most important material that appeared more sharply or more concretely in earlier drafts B and C. These additions do not replace the previous sections; they are added to prevent loss of evidence, argument, chronology and archive-integrity points.

1. Best and strongest title formulation

The strongest title is the A-version title because it correctly adds forced psychiatry, court-file integrity and continuing harm. However, the B-version title contains important missing concepts: social protection, debt exposure and human-rights safeguards. The final title therefore combines both strengths and expands the subtitle to include communications-access and archive-integrity irregularities.

- A title strength: forced psychiatry, court-file integrity and continuing pattern of harm.
- B title strength: social protection, debt exposure and human-rights safeguards.
- Consolidated title strength: both are now combined so the report cannot be read as only a narrow Betreuung dispute or only a medical/psychiatric dispute.

2. Protective assistance versus legal control - strengthened from B and C

The decisive legal distinction is that the applicant states he asked for practical, trusted and protective assistance, not for a mechanism that would later restrict his ability to pursue claims against courts, police, hospitals, social authorities, providers or lawyers. Earlier draft B expressed this point especially clearly: the core issue is whether a request for trusted help was refused or transformed into institutional control.

The 2005 trusted-person assistance request and the later 2008-2009 Betreuung chain must therefore be kept strictly separate. The first was a request for help from a trusted person; the later chain involved court appointment, expert/psychiatric assessment, disputed Betreuer arrangements and the 15.12.2009 Einwilligungsvorbehalt affecting legal declarations before authorities and courts.

Any signature, request form or court reference must be examined document by document: who drafted it, in what language it was explained, whether the difference between practical help, Betreuer appointment and Einwilligungsvorbehalt was made clear, whether a copy was given, whether the applicant was ill, stressed or under institutional pressure, and whether the document was later used beyond the scope understood by the applicant.

3. Humanistischer Verband, BZFO/ZFM and the meaning of cooperation - strengthened from C

Earlier draft C recorded an important evidentiary point: the 2008 files reportedly show third-party institutional support for a Betreuung request. The Humanistischer Verband wrote to Amtsgericht Tiergarten on 18.07.2008 that the applicant sought Unterstützung/Betreuung and requested a Turkish-speaking guardian because of language barriers. BZFO/ZFM later informed the court that the applicant was willing to cooperate with an assessment and asked that invitations also be sent to their facility so staff could help ensure attendance.

Legal significance: this supports the applicant's position that he was not simply avoiding procedure. It suggests that he sought support under conditions of illness, language difficulty and legal vulnerability. If the later process was closed or used against him as non-cooperation, the official file must explain why supportive and reasonable accommodations were not used first.

4. The 2008 expert / Gutachter event as evidence-preservation, not merely refusal

The word Gutachter means expert/evaluator and not a personal name. In the 2008 event, earlier drafts identify the appointed expert as Jürgen P.J. Graffe. The applicant explains that he brought documents and demanded formal signed receipt because he feared that psychiatric/legal processes had previously ignored, distorted or failed to record his statements.

The visible expert account, as summarized in earlier drafts, states that the applicant placed extensive papers on the table, demanded a signature confirming receipt of more than 50 pages and data media, and refused a normal interview unless this was done. The expert/court treated this as refusal to cooperate and the procedure was then closed.

This must be legally tested in two possible readings:

- Authority reading: the applicant refused ordinary cooperation with an expert interview.
- Applicant/evidence-preservation reading: a vulnerable person, alleging repeated disappearance or distortion of documents, insisted on a neutral receipt before speaking freely in a psychiatric/legal setting.

The key legal question is whether the court and expert should have adapted the procedure: accepted the documents, issued a neutral receipt, ensured trusted interpretation, allowed counsel/BZFO presence, appointed a Verfahrenspfleger where necessary, and then proceeded with an assessment preserving both oral and documentary evidence.

5. BVerfG formalism and access to justice - strengthened from C

Earlier draft C emphasized the 2008 BVerfG correspondence chain as an important formalism problem. It referred to October-November-December 2008 correspondence concerning Betreuung case AR 6660/08 and files including 50 XVII 6504, 87 T 25/08, 1 W 187/08 and XII ZB 131/08. The BVerfG letters focused on admissibility, time limits, exhaustion of remedies, exact designation of decisions and written filing requirements.

These formal requirements are legitimate in ordinary cases. But in this file they intersect with documented and alleged disability, illness, poverty, language barriers, homelessness risk, lack of effective counsel and the very request for protective assistance. Therefore the legal question is not simply whether formal requirements existed, but whether strict formalism became, in practice, a denial of access to justice for a person whose vulnerabilities were known to the state.

6. 2009-2010 debts, ALICE/GASAG/Inkasso, Sozialgericht and medical-social consequences

Earlier draft C made the practical consequence of Betreuung clearer: the issue was not abstract legal capacity, but daily survival and access to remedies. The 2009-2010 archive reportedly included request to appoint Öner Birant, letters to Amtsgericht Tiergarten and lawyers, Social Court material, applicant lists of website/archive folders, allegations of Betreuer inactivity, debts, ALICE/GASAG/Inkasso and court files.

This strengthens the conclusion that legal guardianship, if functioning properly, should have reduced harm, secured communication, protected against unjustified debt, preserved court deadlines, organized medical/social support and assisted with lawyers. If instead debt exposure, blocked communications, unresolved court matters and provider disputes continued, the Betreuung did not cure the access-to-justice problem.

7. ALICE/HanseNet communications access and archive-integrity gaps - strengthened from B

Earlier draft B contains one of the strongest technical-evidence sections. It states that telecommunications and internet access were not a side issue because they were part of the applicant's ability to contact courts, lawyers, international organisations, media, websites and archives. Loss or blocking of telephone/internet access during active legal proceedings may therefore have direct access-to-justice consequences.

The ALICE folder reportedly shows a sequence apparently numbered 00 to 56 while iCloud shows 55 items, with visible gaps including at least No. 40 and No. 55. This does not by itself prove criminal deletion, but it is an archive-integrity irregularity requiring urgent technical verification through original backups, iCloud logs, file metadata and comparison with earlier copies.

7.1 Missing ALICE/HanseNet link documents

Missing item	Position in sequence	Possible content	Verification required
ALICE No. 40	Between No. 39	Likely fax report, ALICE	Request provider copy,

	applicant letter of 05.11.2009 and No. 41 bank payment proof of 67.53 EUR.	response, Mahnung/Forderungsaufstellung, or explanation of 82.14 / 67.53 / 14.61 EUR dispute.	fax proof, Betreuer file, and compare older backups.
ALICE No. 55	Between No. 54 e-mail/instruction of 31.03.2010 and No. 56 Öner Birant letter / ALICE 06.02.2010 confirmation.	Likely 02.03.2010 Mahnung, fax proof, or full/continued page of instruction.	Request ALICE/O2 archive and Betreuer file; check iCloud deletion/sync records.
27.11.2009 protocol	Referenced in 15.12.2009 Betreuung decision but not located in reviewed file.	Could contain objections, Thomas Ruhland role, embassy references, expert challenge, and scope of opposition/consent.	Request complete court file 50 XVII 7034/09 and certified hearing minutes.
Dr. Köhler report 22.08.2009	Referenced as basis for the 15.12.2009 decision.	Key medical/expert basis for Betreuung and Einwilligungsvorbehalt.	Request court medical file and delivery record to applicant/counsel.

8. Parliamentary / Bundestag notice context - strengthened from B

Earlier draft B correctly treated the Betreuung period as occurring inside a wider publicly and institutionally noticed chain, not as a private welfare matter. It referred to Bundestag petitions Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925 and Pet 3-17-11-217-018680 and to parliamentary awareness of pension/social-law submissions, illness, inability to work, litigation, and denial of social/medical protection.

The legal relevance is that if the Bundestag, courts, social authorities and medical institutions already had notice of grave allegations, then any legal-capacity restriction affecting the applicant's ability to pursue remedies required heightened safeguards, transparent records, complete protocols and careful judicial proportionality review.

The final report must therefore keep the parliamentary period connected to the Betreuung/Einwilligungsvorbehalt analysis. Any evidence showing telecommunications, websites, Galaxy/rustemazeri.com, ALICE/HanseNet, archive access or Betreuer interference during or because of Bundestag/parliamentary petition activity should be indexed as parliamentary-notice evidence.

9. Amnesty International Berlin video context - strengthened from C

Earlier draft C preserved the Amnesty International Berlin screenshot/video context. It described a video frame marked "Nov.2011 - Amnesty International Berlin" / "2020 Amnesty Berlin" and noted that the audio/content still requires direct review. The applicant states that this later testimony included the idea that Betreuung did not function for his protection but operated in the interest of court/state processes. This point should remain classified as applicant testimony until the video/audio is reviewed, but it is important because it shows the applicant raised the same interpretation publicly and consistently after the 2008-2010 period.

10. Strengthened legal issue matrix

Issue	Evidence currently visible/stated	Legal standards potentially engaged	Verification required
Protective assistance vs. control	2005 trusted-person request must be separated from later	GG 1, 2, 3, 19(4), 103(1); BGB/FamFG; ECHR 6, 8, 13; CRPD	Request all assistance/Betreuung applications,

	2008-2009 Betreuung and 15.12.2009 Einwilligungsvorbehalt.	12, 13.	explanations, signatures, language/translation records and copies given to applicant.
Expert/Gutachter event	Applicant brought documents and demanded signed receipt; expert/court treated event as refusal/non-cooperation.	FamFG expert procedure; right to be heard; reasonable accommodation; ECHR 6/8/13; CRPD 12/13.	Request expert file, appointment letters, interpreter notes, BZFO correspondence and court closure reasoning.
BVerfG formalism	2008 correspondence focused on admissibility/time limits/exhaustion while applicant had known illness, poverty, language barriers and need for assistance.	GG 19(4), 103(1); ECHR 6/13; CRPD access to justice.	Request complete BVerfG correspondence and proof of filings/enclosures.
Communications/ALICE archive gaps	Missing Nos. 40 and 55 sit between applicant objection, payment proof, provider response and Betreuer/provider letters.	Access to justice, evidence integrity, effective remedy, property/debt protection.	Provider archive, Betreuer file, iCloud logs, older backups, fax reports.
Parliamentary notice	Bundestag petition files and social/pension allegations overlap with Betreuung period and later communications/archive issues.	State notice, heightened safeguard duty, transparency of restrictions affecting petitions and remedies.	Request petition files, correspondence logs, provider records during petition period, and website/archive evidence.

11. Consolidated final finding added to Report No. 05

The previous A-version remains the strongest base because it integrates forced psychiatry, Tamilla/Tamella Abdullayeva, the 27.11.2009 hearing/protocol, Thomas Ruhland, the 15.12.2009 Einwilligungsvorbehalt and the 2020-2026 continuation. However, earlier drafts B and C preserve essential details that strengthen the final report: the sharp distinction between voluntary protective help and later legal control; the Humanistischer Verband/BZFO cooperation evidence; the expert/Gutachter event as possible evidence-preservation; BVerfG formalism; ALICE/HanseNet missing link documents; debt/Inkasso/social-court consequences; parliamentary notice; and Amnesty Berlin continuity. These points are now incorporated so that the final report cannot lose any important argument from B or C.