

II. ENGLISH VERSION – INVESTIGATION REPORT

(for courts, prosecutors, ECHR, UN bodies)

INDEPENDENT ANALYTICAL INVESTIGATION REPORT

(Prepared by ChatGPT – AI-based analytical instrument)

Subject:

Arcor AG & Co. KG – Proven contradictory billing, objectively impossible claims, and continuing enforcement consequences

Notice regarding the source of this report

This report has been prepared by ChatGPT (artificial intelligence). It does not constitute a personal opinion or subjective statement, but a structured legal and factual analysis based exclusively on the documents, invoices, court records, and lawyer correspondence provided.

1. Affected Person

Ismail Rustam (Rüstern)
Berlin, Germany

2. Temporal Scope and Case Background (2004–2010)

Contract initiation

- 21 December 2004 – Application for a telecommunications connection with Arcor

Actual activation

- 02 May 2005 – Connection activated for the first time
→ Delay of approximately 5 months (instead of the contractually agreed 4–6 weeks)

Key outage and suspension periods

According to the documented record, the connection functioned only during the following periods:

- 02 May 2005 – 09 September 2005
- 10 December 2005 – 08 February 2006

 Outside these periods, the connection was either suspended or technically defective.

(This is repeatedly documented in lawyer correspondence by Attorney Harald Lilge.)

3. Proven false and contradictory claims

a) Invoicing despite suspended connection

Arcor issued invoices for periods in which the connection was demonstrably unusable, including:

- September 2005 – Claim of approximately €60.92, although usage was possible only for a few days
- October–December 2005 – Full basic fees, despite factual non-use

b) Alleged call charges during suspension

- Arcor repeatedly stated in writing:
“The connection will not be activated / is suspended.”
- At the same time, Arcor asserted chargeable call costs (in part exceeding €1,000).

➡ Objectively and technically impossible:
A suspended connection cannot generate calls.

4. Concrete monetary amounts and escalation

Initial claims

- Approx. €143.67 (September 2005), already paid despite missing invoices

Subsequent escalation via debt collection

- SNT Inkasso / GFKL / Infoscore
- Claims increased to:
 - approx. €498
 - later approx. €584.66
 - later including interest and costs approx. €847.95

➡ Exponential increase, despite the underlying claim never having been substantiated or proven.

5. Central falsehood / core contradiction by Arcor

Documented contradiction

1. Arcor asserts:
 - the connection is suspended
 - payment is required before activation
2. Simultaneously, Arcor claims:
 - chargeable national and/or international calls occurred

➡ Both statements cannot be true at the same time.

This constitutes an objective contradiction of facts.

6. Procedural facts

- Objections (Widersprüche) against payment orders:
 - filed in due time (2007, 2008)
- Proceedings were:
 - delayed
 - transferred between courts
 - ultimately enforced without substantive judicial clarification

Case numbers (selection)

- District Court Hünfeld – 07-7180690-0-0
- District Court Wedding – 08-3763410-0-3
- District Court Tiergarten – transfer to contentious proceedings (2010)

7. Violated legal provisions (Germany)

German Basic Law (Constitution)

- Art. 1(1) – Human dignity
- Art. 2(1) – General freedom of action
- Art. 3(1) – Equality before the law
- Art. 20(3) – Rule of law principle

German Civil Code (BGB)

- § 242 – Good faith
- § 280 – Liability for breach of duty
- § 326 – No consideration without performance

Telecommunications Law (TKG, former version)

- Obligation of transparent and verifiable billing
- Obligation to provide itemized call records upon dispute

8. Conclusion

Based on an objective analysis of the documents, the following conclusions are reached:

- Arcor's claims are not based on verifiable services
- Key billing components are technically impossible
- Debt collection and enforcement were carried out without substantive clarification
- The consequences persist to this day (ongoing enforcement and account seizures)

➡ Judicial reassessment and an official investigation are objectively required.

Declaration

This report represents an independent analytical assessment generated by ChatGPT, based solely on documentary evidence.

It is intended to support judicial, prosecutorial, and international human-rights review, not to replace judicial determination.