

CHATGPT LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 8

BÜNDNIS 90 / DIE GRÜNEN, CLAUDIA ROTH AND THE GREEN BUNDESTAG PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

Documentary Notice, Direct Submissions, Parliamentary Knowledge, Silence, and Potential Legal-Political Responsibility

Prepared through ChatGPT - AI-assisted legal-documentary analysis

For submission to competent international and national bodies, including United Nations mechanisms

Field	Content
Report number	No. 8 (independent Greens Party report; not an amendment to Report No. 005)
Applicant / source-person	Ismail Rustem / Rustem Azeri
Primary institution analysed	Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen; Claudia Roth; Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group
Primary documentary base	PDF GRUNE.pdf, 60 pages, including letters, stamps, fax/postal records, photographs, hospital/ambulance invoices, disability/social-law material, and ECtHR submissions
External parliamentary background	Bundestag petition facts identified in Report No. 005 and used only as external background evidence; Report No. 005 remains unchanged
Date of preparation	29 June 2026
Legal nature	Legal-documentary analysis of visible records and official legal sources; not a court judgment, not a notarisation, and not a substitute for counsel

Documentary verification statement

This report treats visible dates, addressees, document numbers, file numbers, stamps, amounts, and parliamentary references as documentary facts when they appear in the reviewed records. Where a document records a statement by the applicant, this report states that the record contains that statement. This is not a doubt about the applicant; it is the legally precise distinction between (a) the existence and content of the record, and (b) the investigative determination of every underlying event by a competent authority.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Findings
 2. Scope, Source Base, and AI Document-Review Statement
 3. Chronology of Established Documentary Notice to Bündnis 90/Die Grünen
 4. What the Green Party and Its Parliamentary Group Were Documentarily Informed Of
 5. Silence, Non-Response, and Evidence-Preservation Issues
 6. Legal Analysis Under German Constitutional and Statutory Law
 7. Legal Analysis Under International Human-Rights Law
 8. Parliamentary Background and Green Party Knowledge (Using Report No. 005 Only as External Background)
 9. Accountability Questions for Bündnis 90/Die Grünen and Claudia Roth
 10. Requests for Action, Disclosure, and Preservation
 11. Final Legal-Documentary Conclusion
- Appendix A. Evidence Index
- Appendix B. Source Index
- Appendix C. Expanded English Version of the Azerbaijani Narrative
- Appendix D. Additional English Section on Bundestag Votes, Green Party Knowledge, and Legal-Political Responsibility

1. Executive Findings

This report confirms, on the basis of the reviewed documentary record, that Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, Claudia Roth, and later the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group received direct written notice of the applicant's severe medical, disability, life-risk, social-protection, judicial-protection and human-rights allegations between 2009 and 2011.

The documentary record begins with a letter to Claudia Roth dated 2 April 2009, bearing an incoming stamp of Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen. That letter records a list of sixteen severe illnesses, a demand for independent international expert review, a request for protection in another democratic country, and an explicit life-risk warning tied to 15 May 2009. It also records that two video CDs and two document CDs were attached. [D1, p. 1]

The same documentary bundle contains a letter to the Federal Ministry of the Interior dated 6 April 2009. That record describes the applicant's protest in front of the Green Party premises on 2 April 2009 and states that police and emergency services intervened, handcuffs were used, and the applicant was transported toward St. Hedwig / Charité psychiatric facilities before being released. [D1, pp. 2-3]

The incident is externally corroborated by subsequent administrative records: St. Hedwig Kliniken issued a 10 EUR practice-fee demand dated 7 April 2009 for emergency treatment on 2 April 2009, and Berliner Feuerwehr issued a 281.43 EUR fee notice dated 26 June 2009 for emergency medical transport on 2 April 2009. [D1, pp. 4-6]

The applicant objected on 6 July 2009 to the Feuerwehr fee, stating that the emergency-medical cost resulted from an unlawful police-generated situation and should not be imposed on him or his health insurer. Berliner Feuerwehr responded on 8 July 2009 that the objection had been received and the matter would be reviewed. [D1, pp. 7-8]

On 6 August 2009, Claudia Roth received a further submission concerning the Amtsgericht Tiergarten care/guardianship file 50 XVII 7034, in which the applicant stated that fundamental personal rights had been transferred to others while his real food, health, legal, financial and defence needs remained unresolved. [D1]

On 26 January 2011, the applicant sent an English-language Complaint to Claudia Roth, supported by a fax transmission record. That Complaint records the 1998-2011 chain, alleged detention/police violence, severe illness, 80% disability, HIV/AIDS, court-error history, the 91,456 EUR financial burden, bank-account blockage and a request for UN expert intervention. [D1, pp. 39-40]

On 12 December 2011, the applicant addressed a letter directly to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen Bundestagsfraktion. This record brought the matter from party leadership into the parliamentary group sphere. [D1, p. 40]

The separate Bundestag petition record analysed in Report No. 005 shows that the Green parliamentary group had formal parliamentary exposure to the applicant's petition record in 2008 and 2012: on 24 April 2008 the Greens abstained on the closure of Sammelübersicht 391 / Drucksache 16/8764, entry 71, Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925; on 27 September 2012 the closure of Sammelübersicht 466 / Drucksache 17/10674, entry 99, Pet 3-17-11-217-018680, was adopted with no opposing vote and no abstention. [D2]

No substantive response from Claudia Roth, the Green Party office, or the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group is visible in the reviewed Green Party dossier. This is not merely a political observation; it is an evidentiary and legal issue because the direct submissions concerned life, health, disability, basic subsistence, psychiatric intervention, legal defence, and international human-rights protection.

Core conclusion

The reviewed records establish documentary notice to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen and its parliamentary structures. The legally relevant question is no longer whether the Green Party could have known. The record shows that it was informed. The unresolved legal-political question is what it did with that information, whether evidence was preserved, whether the matter was forwarded or escalated, and why no substantive response or protective parliamentary action is visible in the documentary file.

2. Scope, Source Base, and AI Document-Review Statement

2.1 Scope of Report No. 8

This report is an independent legal-documentary report concerning Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen. It is not an amendment to Report No. 005. Report No. 005 concerns Bundestag petition proceedings and remains unchanged. The present report uses certain Bundestag petition facts only as external background because they show the Green parliamentary group's formal parliamentary exposure to the matter.

2.2 Primary source base

The primary source base is the 60-page file PDF GRUNE.pdf. It includes scanned letters, documentary stamps, photographs of protest at/near the Green Party premises, hospital and emergency-service fee notices, objections, disability and social-law materials, fax/postal proof, and European Court of Human Rights submissions. The file is treated as the documentary basis for what was submitted to, received by, or connected with Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen.

2.3 AI document-review statement

ChatGPT reviewed the supplied documentary material and generated this legal-documentary analysis. The report confirms the visible content of the documents reviewed in this conversation: dates, file numbers, addressees, stamps, amounts, correspondence sequence, and the legal significance of the documentary notice. This report does not claim to be an official OpenAI legal opinion, court judgment, notarisation, or forensic certification of the original paper documents. It is an AI-assisted legal analysis based on the reviewed records and official legal sources.

3. Chronology of Established Documentary Notice to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen

Date	Document / event shown in the record	Legal-documentary significance
15 Dec. 2008 onward	Applicant states in the 6 Apr. 2009 letter that he had been demonstrating before Bundestag, Bundeskanzleramt, Bundespräsidentenhaus, Amnesty International, DRK, Berlin Senate authorities and newspapers since 15 Dec. 2008.	The Green Party incident is presented in the documents as part of a continuing human-rights protest chain, not as an isolated event.
2 Apr. 2009	Letter to Claudia Roth, Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, bearing incoming stamp dated 2 Apr. 2009.	Direct receipt of a severe medical, human-rights and life-risk submission by the Green Party. The letter records sixteen severe illnesses, a request for independent expert review, a life-risk warning and attached video/document CDs.
2 Apr. 2009	Applicant protests in front of the Green Party premises; later correspondence records police/emergency intervention and attempted psychiatric transfer.	Connects the Green Party premises with a police/psychiatric intervention affecting freedom of expression, assembly, liberty and dignity.
6 Apr. 2009	Letter to Federal Ministry of the Interior / Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble describing the 2 Apr. 2009 incident.	The matter was escalated immediately to federal level and framed as unlawful suppression of protest and psychiatric misuse.
7 Apr. 2009	St. Hedwig Kliniken payment demand for 10 EUR for treatment on 2 Apr. 2009.	Administrative corroboration that the 2 Apr. 2009 incident generated an emergency medical record.
26 Jun. 2009	Berliner Feuerwehr fee notice for 281.43 EUR for emergency medical transport on 2 Apr. 2009.	Administrative corroboration that emergency transport occurred and generated a fee imposed on the applicant.
6 Jul. 2009	Applicant objects to the Feuerwehr fee.	Applicant records the position that the cost resulted from an unlawful police-generated

		situation.
8 Jul. 2009	Berliner Feuerwehr response acknowledging the objection and indicating review.	Shows at least one authority accepted the incident for administrative review.
24 Jul. 2009	Versorgungsamt / LaGeSo-related objection; GdB 80 disability context appears in the file.	Confirms that the medical/disability context was not merely narrative but linked to formal disability proceedings.
3 Aug. 2009	Third objection to Amtsgericht Tiergarten in file 50 XVII 7034.	Shows the Betreuung/care issue and alleged transfer of rights before the Claudia Roth submission of 6 Aug. 2009.
6 Aug. 2009	Azerbaijani-language submission to Claudia Roth concerning file 50 XVII 7034.	Direct notice to Claudia Roth of the applicant's complaint that the care/guardianship structure removed real self-defence without solving basic needs.
5 Feb. 2010	Schwerbehindertenausweis / GdB 80 visible in the record.	Documentary disability status supporting the seriousness of Article 3(3) GG, CRPD and non-discrimination analysis.
26 Jan. 2011	English-language Complaint to Claudia Roth; fax transmission evidence visible.	Renewed direct notice to Claudia Roth of the 1998-2011 chain, severe illness, 80% disability, HIV/AIDS, 91,456 EUR burden and request for UN expert intervention.
10 Sept. 2011	ECtHR submission, certified translation from German, included in the file.	Shows the case was framed before international human-rights bodies and referred to later in the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group submission.
12 Dec. 2011	Letter to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen Bundestagsfraktion.	Direct notice to the Green parliamentary group itself; the matter moves from party-office / Claudia Roth level into parliamentary-group level.
24 Apr. 2008 and 27 Sept. 2012	Bundestag votes identified through Report No. 005: Green abstention in 2008; no objection/abstention in 2012.	External parliamentary evidence that the Green parliamentary group had formal petition-process exposure to the applicant's case.

4. What the Green Party and Its Parliamentary Group Were Documentarily Informed Of

- **Severe illness and disability.** The 2 Apr. 2009 letter lists sixteen severe illnesses. Later records include GdB 80 disability, HIV/AIDS, lung damage, heart infarction history, tuberculosis references and additional serious diseases.
- **Concrete life-risk warning.** The 2 Apr. 2009 letter ties the applicant's emergency request to 15 May 2009. The record is therefore not an ordinary political letter; it contains an explicit life-risk warning.
- **Peaceful protest and police/psychiatric intervention.** The 6 Apr. 2009 letter records that the applicant's protest at the Green Party premises was stopped through police and emergency-medical intervention, with handcuffs and attempted psychiatric transfer.
- **Official cost consequences.** The hospital and Feuerwehr records show that the 2 Apr. 2009 incident generated official administrative fee demands.
- **Betreuung/care and self-defence.** The 6 Aug. 2009 submission to Claudia Roth records the applicant's position that the care/guardianship framework removed rights while failing to solve basic medical, legal, financial and survival problems.
- **International proceedings.** The records refer to ECtHR proceedings and requests for UN expert intervention. The Green Parliamentary Group letter of 12 Dec. 2011 expressly escalated the matter to a parliamentary actor.
- **Financial immobilisation.** The 2011 Complaint records the 91,456 EUR burden and bank-account blockage as part of the applicant's alleged inability to leave Germany or secure protection elsewhere.

- **Requested exit to a safe democratic country.** Several records show the applicant requested relocation or the ability to live outside Germany due to the documented medical-social-human-rights emergency.

The significance of this notice is cumulative. A single unanswered complaint may be administratively mishandled; repeated direct submissions over several years, including life risk, disability, severe disease, alleged official misconduct, evidence carriers and parliamentary-group notice, create a distinct question of institutional knowledge and institutional silence.

5. Silence, Non-Response, and Evidence-Preservation Issues

The reviewed Green Party dossier does not contain a substantive response from Claudia Roth, the federal Green Party office, or the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group. The absence of a response inside the reviewed file does not mechanically prove that no response ever existed; however, it is itself an evidentiary problem because the file contains proof of receipt or attempted transmission while no corresponding answer is visible.

5.1 Why silence is legally significant

- The 2 Apr. 2009 letter contained a concrete life-risk warning and therefore required at minimum preservation, registration, and referral to competent emergency, medical, legal or parliamentary channels.
- The record states that video and document CDs were attached. Evidence carriers submitted to a parliamentary party in a life-risk human-rights matter should be preserved or their disposition should be documented.
- The 2 Apr. 2009 incident occurred at/near the Green Party premises. If the Green Party office called police or supplied information leading to psychiatric intervention, that fact must be disclosed and examined.
- The 12 Dec. 2011 letter reached the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group. At that level, at least internal routing, petition follow-up, file referral or a written response should be traceable.

5.2 Evidence-preservation questions

1. Where are the two video CDs and two document CDs referenced in the 2 Apr. 2009 Claudia Roth submission?
2. Did the Green Party office log the 2 Apr. 2009 submission in an incoming-mail register?
3. Was police called by the Green Party office or by another person? If so, who called and what was said?
4. Was any internal note created after the 2 Apr. 2009 police/emergency incident?
5. Was the 6 Aug. 2009 Azerbaijani-language submission translated or forwarded?
6. Was the 26 Jan. 2011 Complaint assigned to any staff member, MP office, human-rights desk, petition liaison or legal unit?
7. Was the 12 Dec. 2011 Green Parliamentary Group submission entered into the Bundestagsfraktion correspondence system?
8. Did the Green Parliamentary Group connect those direct submissions with the pending or earlier Bundestag petition files?

6. Legal Analysis Under German Constitutional and Statutory Law

The following analysis identifies legal provisions engaged by the documented record. It is not a criminal conviction or judicial ruling; it is a legal basis for official inquiry, disclosure, preservation and independent investigation.

6.1 Article 1(1) Basic Law - Human dignity

Article 1(1) GG provides that human dignity is inviolable and that all state authority has a duty to respect and protect it. The Green Party is not itself a police or welfare authority; however, its Bundestag parliamentary group participates in constitutional political life. A life-risk submission from a severely ill and disabled person requires handling consistent with the seriousness of human dignity. Ignoring, losing, or failing to forward such material raises a constitutional accountability question.

6.2 Article 2(2) Basic Law - Life, physical integrity, freedom of the person

Article 2(2) GG protects life, physical integrity and freedom of the person. The documentary record contains life-risk warnings, severe illness, disability, emergency transport, and attempted psychiatric intervention. These facts engage the positive-protection dimension of life and bodily integrity and the legality of any deprivation or restriction of liberty.

6.3 Articles 5 and 8 Basic Law - Expression and assembly

The 2 Apr. 2009 protest at/near the Green Party premises is recorded as a political-human-rights protest. If police/psychiatric intervention was used to suppress peaceful protest, the record engages freedom of expression and assembly.

6.4 Article 3(3) Basic Law - Disability and discrimination

The applicant's GdB 80 disability context and severe illness are visible in the record. If his submissions were ignored or downgraded because of disability, psychiatric labelling, foreign origin, poverty or illness, Article 3(3) GG and equality principles are engaged.

6.5 Article 17 Basic Law - Petition right

Article 17 GG gives every person the right to address written requests or complaints to competent authorities and the legislature. The direct Green Party submissions must be assessed together with the Bundestag petition background because the Green parliamentary group was an actor in the legislature and later received a direct parliamentary-group submission.

6.6 Article 19(4) Basic Law - Effective legal protection

The applicant's materials record repeated complaints that courts, administrative bodies and petition channels did not provide effective protection. Where a parliamentary group received direct notice and no visible forwarding or intervention followed, the effectiveness of the overall protection chain requires scrutiny.

6.7 Article 20(3) Basic Law - Rule of law

Article 20(3) binds state authority to the constitutional order, law and justice. Formal closure or political silence in the face of life, health, disability and evidence-preservation material would be incompatible with the substance of rule-of-law responsibility if no serious handling occurred.

6.8 Article 21 Basic Law - Constitutional role of political parties

Article 21 GG states that political parties participate in the formation of the political will of the people. The Green Party cannot be reduced to a private bystander once its parliamentary group is involved. Its internal organisation and political conduct must be compatible with democratic accountability.

6.9 Article 38 Basic Law - Bundestag members and conscience

Article 38 GG states that Bundestag members are representatives of the whole people and responsible only to their conscience. A parliamentary group that receives direct life-risk and human-rights material should be able to demonstrate conscientious routing, referral, or examination.

6.10 Article 45c Basic Law - Petitions Committee framework

Article 45c GG establishes the Bundestag Petitions Committee to deal with requests and complaints addressed to the Bundestag. The external petition background shows parliamentary process exposure. The direct Green Parliamentary Group submission required inquiry into whether the group used, or attempted to use, petition or oversight channels.

6.11 StGB section 323c - Failure to render assistance

StGB section 323c is relevant as an issue for investigation where a concrete emergency is known, assistance is necessary, reasonable and possible, and no action is taken. This report does not make a criminal finding; it identifies why a life-risk submission with a specific date and attached evidence must be examined under the failure-to-assist framework.

6.12 StGB section 258 - Obstruction of prosecution or punishment

StGB section 258 requires intentional or knowing obstruction of prosecution or punishment. Silence alone is not enough. However, if evidence carriers were received and then concealed, destroyed, not forwarded or deliberately disconnected from competent review despite knowledge of serious official misconduct allegations, the issue requires investigation.

7. Legal Analysis Under International Human-Rights Law

The international provisions below are engaged by the documentary record because the submissions concern life, bodily integrity, liberty, degrading treatment, disability, medical access, social protection, peaceful protest, effective remedy and discrimination.

Instrument / provision	Documentary relevance
ECHR Article 2 - Right to life	The 2 Apr. 2009 submission contains a concrete life-risk warning. Later submissions repeat the life/health emergency. The state duty to protect life is engaged where authorities or parliamentary mechanisms had knowledge of real risk.
ECHR Article 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment	The records describe detention abuse, degrading police/psychiatric treatment, severe medical deprivation and social abandonment while ill.
ECHR Article 5 - Liberty and security	Handcuffing, emergency transport and attempted psychiatric detention are liberty-relevant events if not based on lawful procedure and medical necessity.
ECHR Article 6 - Fair trial	The record describes multiple court proceedings, late/technical rejections, recognised prior error and alleged lack of meaningful adjudication.
ECHR Article 8 - Private life, bodily and psychological integrity	Medical autonomy, psychiatric labelling, disability, health, survival conditions and personal integrity fall within the protected sphere.
ECHR Articles 10 and 11 - Expression and peaceful assembly	The 2 Apr. 2009 protest at/near the Green premises is a political expression/assembly event. Police/psychiatric intervention to end a protest engages these rights.
ECHR Article 13 - Effective remedy	If the applicant's grave complaints were repeatedly received but not examined, forwarded or remedied, effective-remedy concerns arise.
ECHR Article 14 - Non-discrimination	Disability, illness, foreign origin, poverty, social status and psychiatric labelling are potential discrimination factors in the handling of the case.
ICCPR Articles 2(3), 6, 7, 9, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 26	Effective remedy, life, cruel/degrading treatment, liberty, fair hearing, privacy, expression, peaceful assembly, association and equality are directly relevant to the documented submissions.
ICESCR Articles 9, 11, 12	The record concerns social security, adequate living conditions, medical treatment and the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.
CRPD Articles 5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 25, 28	The applicant's severe disability makes equality, access to justice, freedom from degrading treatment, protection from abuse, integrity, privacy, health and adequate social protection central.
CAT Articles 12, 13, 14, 16	The records require prompt and impartial examination of alleged ill-treatment, protection of complainants, redress, and prevention of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.

8. Parliamentary Background and Green Party Knowledge

This section uses Report No. 005 only as external background evidence. It does not amend, correct, replace or reopen Report No. 005. The purpose is to show that the Green Party's knowledge was both direct and parliamentary.

8.1 First Bundestag petition: Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925

The first Bundestag petition was registered as Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925. It arose from a submission dated 27 February 2007 addressed to the Abgeordnetenhaus von Berlin, received by the Bundestag on 5 April 2007 and acknowledged on 11 April 2007. The subject was "Renten wegen verminderter Erwerbsfähigkeit". The Bundestag public record identified the matter in Drucksache 16/8764, Sammelübersicht 391, dated 9 April 2008, entry no. 71. On 24 April 2008, the Bundestag adopted the closure recommendation; the Green parliamentary group abstained. [D2]

8.2 Second Bundestag petition: Pet 3-17-11-217-018680

The second Bundestag petition was registered as Pet 3-17-11-217-018680 under "Sozialrecht" on the basis of the applicant's 18 January 2011 submission, acknowledged on 2 February 2011. The Bundestag public record identified the matter in Drucksache 17/10674, Sammelübersicht 466, dated 12 September 2012, Beschlussempfehlung 10, entry no. 99. On 27 September 2012, the closure recommendation was adopted by all parliamentary groups with no opposing vote and no abstention. [D2]

8.3 Legal significance

The 2008 abstention and the 2012 non-opposition are not used here to assert that every Green MP personally examined every annex. They are used to establish formal parliamentary exposure. By 2012, that formal exposure must be read together with the direct submissions to Claudia Roth and the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group in 2009 and 2011. The cumulative record defeats any claim that the Green Party was simply unaware of the existence, seriousness or human-rights character of the matter.

9. Accountability Questions for Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen and Claudia Roth

9. Did Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen register the 2 Apr. 2009 Claudia Roth submission, and what internal reference number was assigned?
10. Where are the two video CDs and two document CDs referenced in the 2 Apr. 2009 submission?
11. Was the 2 Apr. 2009 police/emergency incident triggered by a call from the Green Party premises or any Green Party staff member?
12. Did Claudia Roth's office respond to the 2 Apr. 2009 submission? If yes, where is the response? If not, why not?
13. Was the 6 Aug. 2009 Azerbaijani-language submission translated, reviewed, forwarded or answered?
14. Did the Green Party or Claudia Roth's office connect the applicant's disability and life-risk submissions with parliamentary/petition mechanisms?
15. Was the 26 Jan. 2011 Complaint received by fax, and what routing occurred after receipt?
16. Was the 12 Dec. 2011 submission to the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group registered in the parliamentary-group correspondence system?
17. Did any Green MP, staff member or parliamentary unit request Petitions Committee follow-up, ministerial clarification, file disclosure, medical review or independent expert assessment?
18. If no action was taken, who made that decision and on what basis?

10. Requests for Action, Disclosure, and Preservation

This report supports the following requests to competent bodies and to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen:

19. Preserve all remaining records relating to the applicant, including paper files, incoming-mail logs, fax logs, email metadata, staff notes, MP-office correspondence, Green parliamentary-group records and any CD/DVD evidence carriers.
20. Disclose the full internal handling history of the 2 Apr. 2009, 6 Aug. 2009, 26 Jan. 2011 and 12 Dec. 2011 submissions.
21. Identify whether the Green Party office called police or emergency services on 2 Apr. 2009 and disclose any internal notes concerning that event.
22. State whether the two video CDs and two document CDs referenced in the 2 Apr. 2009 submission were received, stored, copied, returned, destroyed, lost or forwarded.
23. Disclose whether Claudia Roth or her office forwarded the matter to any parliamentary, governmental, medical, human-rights or emergency body.
24. Disclose whether the 12 Dec. 2011 submission to the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group was connected internally with the pending or earlier Bundestag petition record.
25. Conduct or request an independent review of the police/psychiatric intervention connected with the Green Party premises on 2 Apr. 2009.
26. Conduct or request an independent medical-social-human-rights review of the applicant's documented disability, illness, legal-protection and subsistence situation.
27. Provide a written explanation for the absence of any visible substantive response in the reviewed Green Party dossier.
28. Transmit this report and the underlying documentary file to the competent UN and German oversight bodies for preservation and examination.

10A. Detailed Legal-Documentary Findings

Finding	Confirmed documentary basis	Legal significance
Finding 1 - Direct Green Party notice	The 2 Apr. 2009 Claudia Roth letter bears an incoming stamp and records severe illness, life risk, international expert request, relocation request and attached video/document CDs.	Establishes knowledge and triggers questions of registration, preservation, response, emergency referral and political-parliamentary escalation.
Finding 2 - Green premises connection	The 6 Apr. 2009 BMI letter records that the protest occurred before the Green Party premises and was followed by police/emergency-medical intervention.	Raises freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, liberty, dignity and psychiatric-misuse questions directly connected with the Green Party location.
Finding 3 - Administrative corroboration	St. Hedwig Kliniken and Berliner Feuerwehr documents record treatment/transport fee consequences from the same date, 2 Apr. 2009.	Corroborates that the incident entered official medical/emergency systems and was not only a later narrative.
Finding 4 - Disability/legal-defence notice	The 6 Aug. 2009 Claudia Roth submission records the Amtsgericht Tiergarten 50 XVII 7034 care/guardianship issue.	Shows the Green Party received notice that the applicant regarded the Betreuung structure as impairing legal defence and survival rather than protecting him.
Finding 5 - Repeated notice	The 26 Jan. 2011 Complaint to Claudia Roth and the 12 Dec. 2011 letter to the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group continue the same chain.	Negates any argument that the matter was a single, isolated or accidental communication.
Finding 6 - Parliamentary knowledge	Report No. 005 records the 2008 Green abstention and 2012 non-opposition in Bundestag petition dispositions concerning the applicant.	Shows formal parliamentary exposure independent of the direct letters.
Finding 7 - No visible substantive response	The reviewed Green Party dossier contains no substantive answer by Claudia Roth, the Green Party office or the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group.	Creates a concrete disclosure and accountability issue: if responses exist, they must be produced; if not, the reasons for silence must be explained.

10B. Legal Responsibility Pathways Requiring Investigation

This report does not need to prove in advance which single liability route a competent authority will ultimately apply. Its purpose is to show that several responsibility pathways are legally engaged by the same documentary facts.

10B.1 Political-parliamentary responsibility

Because Article 21 GG gives political parties a constitutional role in forming the political will of the people and Article 38 GG frames Bundestag members as representatives of the whole people, a parliamentary party cannot treat direct life-risk and human-rights submissions as ordinary private correspondence without traceable handling. The responsibility here is first evidentiary and political-constitutional: registration, preservation, referral, escalation, and explanation.

10B.2 Civil responsibility under the law of associations and torts

If a party organ, board member, constitutionally appointed representative or authorised staff member caused damage while acting in the entrusted sphere of party business, BGB section 31 makes association liability legally relevant. If a person intentionally or negligently unlawfully injures life, limb, health, freedom, property or another right, BGB section 823 creates a damages framework. These provisions are not invoked as an automatic judgment against the Green Party; they identify why the internal handling of the 2 Apr. 2009 police/emergency incident and any active role by party personnel must be disclosed.

10B.3 Criminal-law responsibility by omission and failure to assist

StGB section 323c is directly relevant where a concrete emergency is known and reasonable assistance is possible. StGB section 13 is relevant where omission is equivalent to active realisation of an offence only if a legal duty to prevent the result exists. The 2 Apr. 2009 letter, with a concrete life-risk warning and attached evidence, is sufficient to require examination of whether any staff member, office holder or parliamentary actor had a reasonable duty to forward, preserve, or call competent help rather than leave the matter unanswered.

10B.4 Obstruction or concealment

StGB section 258 requires intentional or knowing obstruction of prosecution or punishment. The present record does not by itself prove that element. However, the referenced evidence carriers, the absence of visible response, and the possible non-production of internal records create a clear evidentiary issue: if material was received and then lost, concealed, destroyed, or deliberately disconnected from competent review, the obstruction question becomes legally concrete and must be investigated.

10B.5 State responsibility and parliamentary silence

The Green Party itself is not identical with the German State. Nevertheless, the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group acts inside the constitutional parliamentary structure. Where a parliamentary group receives direct notice of life-risk, disability, medical deprivation, alleged police/psychiatric misuse and absence of remedy, silence by that parliamentary actor is relevant to the larger question whether Germany's institutional protection system functioned or failed.

10C. Relevance for United Nations Submission

The report is appropriate for UN submission because the documentary record engages multiple UN human-rights protection areas at once: life and health risk; disability; alleged arbitrary psychiatric intervention; freedom of expression and peaceful assembly; access to justice; effective remedy; protection from degrading treatment; social protection; and the treatment of a human-rights complainant who repeatedly approached domestic and international institutions.

The UN relevance does not depend on whether the Green Party is itself a court, police authority or welfare office. The relevance lies in the documented notice to a parliamentary party and the absence of a visible response in a chain where the applicant had already reported systemic failure by courts, administration, medical-social systems and petition mechanisms. A parliamentary party receiving such material could have preserved evidence, asked questions, forwarded the matter, requested file review, or activated parliamentary oversight channels. The reviewed record does not show that this occurred.

For UN purposes, the strongest formulation is: the documents establish notice, repeated notice, evidence submission, parliamentary-group notice and no visible response. These facts require the competent body to request preservation, disclosure, and independent review of the Green Party's internal handling and its relation to the Bundestag petition record.

10D. ChatGPT Document-Review Observations

The following observations are made as AI-assisted document-review findings from the material analysed for this report. They are not personal memory, speculation or advocacy; they identify what the reviewed documents visibly contain.

Observation	What was visibly confirmed in the reviewed material
O1	A 2 Apr. 2009 letter to Claudia Roth / Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen with incoming-stamp evidence.
O2	The 2 Apr. 2009 letter records sixteen severe illnesses, a life-risk warning and attached two video CDs plus two document CDs.
O3	A 6 Apr. 2009 letter to the Federal Ministry of the Interior records the Green Party protest and police/emergency intervention.
O4	St. Hedwig Kliniken and Berliner Feuerwehr documents record medical/emergency cost consequences from 2 Apr. 2009.
O5	A 6 Aug. 2009 Claudia Roth submission records the Amtsgericht Tiergarten / Betreuung file 50 XVII 7034 issue.
O6	A 26 Jan. 2011 English Complaint to Claudia Roth and fax transmission material are present.
O7	A 12 Dec. 2011 letter to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen Bundestagsfraktion is present.
O8	The reviewed Green Party dossier does not show a substantive response by Claudia Roth, the Green Party office or the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group.
O9	Report No. 005, used only as external background, records the 2008 and 2012 Bundestag petition voting facts involving the Green parliamentary group.

11. Final Legal-Documentary Conclusion

The 60-page Green Party documentary file establishes a direct notice chain to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, Claudia Roth and the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group. The notice was not vague, abstract or merely political. It concerned severe illness, disability, an explicit life-risk warning, submitted evidence carriers, alleged state misconduct, alleged police/psychiatric intervention at the Green Party premises, medical and ambulance records, guardianship/care restrictions, ECtHR and UN references, financial immobilisation and the applicant's request for protection outside Germany.

The separate Bundestag petition background strengthens the conclusion that the Green Party was not outside the matter. It had formal parliamentary exposure in 2008 and 2012 and direct written notice in 2009 and 2011.

The reviewed file contains no substantive Green Party response. In a case involving life, health, disability, legal defence, psychiatric intervention and evidence carriers, such silence is not a minor administrative imperfection. It is a distinct legal-political issue requiring disclosure, preservation, and independent inquiry.

The core finding of Report No. 8 is therefore this: Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen and its parliamentary structures were documentarily informed of the applicant's severe human-rights, medical-social, disability, police/psychiatric and judicial-protection allegations. The unanswered question is not whether the Green Party could have known; the record shows that it was informed. The unanswered question is what it did, what it preserved, what it forwarded, what it failed to answer, and whether that silence contributed to the continuation of the applicant's rights-protection failure.

Appendix A. Evidence Index

Code	Evidence item	Relevance
D1	PDF GRUNE.pdf, 60 pages	Primary Green Party documentary file: Claudia Roth letters, Bundestag parliamentary-group letter, photos, fax/postal proof, official fee notices, disability and ECtHR materials.
D1/p.1	2 Apr. 2009 letter to Claudia Roth with incoming stamp	Direct receipt by Green Party; sixteen diseases; explicit life-risk warning; reference to two video CDs and two document CDs.
D1/pp.2-3	6 Apr. 2009 letter to Federal Ministry of the Interior	Records the Green Party protest and police/psychiatric intervention narrative.
D1/p.4	7 Apr. 2009 St. Hedwig Kliniken fee demand	Administrative medical record connected with 2 Apr. 2009.
D1/pp.5-6	26 Jun. 2009 Berliner Feuerwehr fee notice for 281.43 EUR	Administrative emergency-transport record connected with 2 Apr. 2009.
D1/pp.7-8	6 Jul. 2009 objection to Feuerwehr fee	Applicant contests the cost as arising from unlawful police-generated intervention.
D1	6 Aug. 2009 submission to Claudia Roth	Direct notice of Betreuung/care file 50 XVII 7034 and alleged rights-transfer issue.
D1	26 Jan. 2011 Complaint to Claudia Roth with fax proof	Renewed direct notice of the 1998-2011 chain, 80% disability, HIV/AIDS, 91,456 EUR burden and request for UN expert intervention.
D1	12 Dec. 2011 letter to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen Bundestagsfraktion	Direct notice to the Green parliamentary group.
D2	Report No. 005 Bundestag petition analysis	External background only: Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925 and Pet 3-17-11-217-018680 voting facts; Report No. 005 remains unchanged.

Appendix B. Source Index

Code	Source	Official / documentary relevance
W1	Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany, official English translation, gesetz-im-internet.de	Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 17, 19, 20, 21, 38, 45c.
W2	European Convention on Human Rights, Council of Europe / ECtHR official text	Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14.
W3	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, OHCHR official PDF	Articles 2(3), 6, 7, 9, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 26.
W4	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, OHCHR official PDF	Articles 9, 11, 12.

W5	Convention against Torture, OHCHR official PDF	Articles 12, 13, 14, 16.
W6	German Criminal Code, official English translation, gesetz-im-internet.de	Sections 13, 323c and 258 / 258a as investigative frameworks.
W7	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, UN/OHCHR official treaty text	Articles 5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 25, 28.
W8	German Civil Code (BGB), official English translation, gesetz-im-internet.de	Sections 31 and 823 as civil-liability frameworks for association/organs and injury to life, health, freedom or other rights.

End of Report No. 8

APPENDIX C — EXPANDED ENGLISH VERSION OF THE AZERBAIJANI NARRATIVE

Note: The original English report above is preserved. This appendix is the English version of the expanded Azerbaijani narrative supplied by the applicant, added so that the stronger explanatory formulation is available in English for United Nations submission.

CHATGPT LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 008

Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen — Submissions to Claudia Roth and to the Bundestag Parliamentary Group, the 2 April 2009 incident, silence, parliamentary knowledge, and possible legal violations: legal-analytical report

Purpose of preparation:

The purpose of this report is to present, in a systematic manner, the submissions raised before the Green Party — Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, in particular before Claudia Roth and, at a later stage, before the Green Party Bundestag Parliamentary Group; the documents submitted; the incident of 2 April 2009; the later correspondence; the absence of response / silence; and the possible questions of legal responsibility.

Primary documentary base analysed:

The 60-page documentary bundle titled “PDF GRUNE.pdf”. The documents consist mainly of scanned letters, photographic evidence, fax/postal traces, objections to state authorities, medical-social documents, and materials submitted to the European Court of Human Rights.

I. Executive Summary

The documentary bundle indicates that, beginning in 2009, Ismail Rustem / Rustem Azeri addressed the Green Party with extremely serious allegations concerning his life, health, legal situation, access to medical treatment, court proceedings, psychiatric issues, and Betreuung / guardianship matters.

The central starting point is the letter of 2 April 2009 addressed to Claudia Roth and Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen. In that letter the applicant stated that he was suffering from sixteen severe illnesses, that for many years in Germany he had been deprived of medical, social and legal protection, that he requested examination of his case at a higher level of the European Court of Human Rights, and that if he did not receive help by 15 May 2009 he would kill himself. The letter also stated that two video CDs and two document CDs were attached. This fact shows that the Green Party was notified not merely of a general political complaint, but of a concrete life risk, a medical catastrophe, and severe human-rights allegations.

On the same day, 2 April 2009, the applicant states that he protested in front of the Green Party building. In the later letter of 6 April 2009 he wrote that, during that protest, he was detained by the police, handcuffed, transported by ambulance toward St. Hedwig / Charité psychiatric facilities, and then immediately released there. According to his argument, this proves that he had been presented without basis as “mentally ill” and that his peaceful protest had been stopped.

The documentary bundle shows that, after the 2 April incident, St. Hedwig Kliniken demanded a 10 EUR practice fee and Berliner Feuerwehr demanded 281.43 EUR for emergency transport. On 6 July 2009 the applicant objected to those costs and wrote that the expenses should not fall on him or on his health-insurance fund, but on the police or competent authorities that had created the situation.

In August 2009 Claudia Roth was contacted again, this time by a letter written in Azerbaijani, objecting to the Amtsgericht Tiergarten Betreuung decision in file 50 XVII 7034. The letter alleges that, by the court decision of 5 May 2009, the applicant's fundamental rights had been transferred without his consent to other persons, while the real problems — food, bureaucracy, debts, daily life, treatment and defence — remained on him.

In 2011 the contact with the Green Party continued. On 26 January 2011 an extensive English-language “Complaint” was sent to Claudia Roth. That letter contains allegations concerning the applicant's situation in Germany since 1998, prison/police violence in 1999, absence of medical care, 80% disability, HIV/AIDS, severe illnesses, errors in court decisions, a 91,456 EUR court-cost / fine burden, and the blockage of his bank account. Fax transmission proof is present in the file.

On 12 December 2011 the submission was sent to the Green Party Bundestag Parliamentary Group. This document is no longer addressed only to Claudia Roth, but operates as a submission directed to a political group represented in Parliament. The letter also names European courts, the United Nations, Amnesty International, international press and humanitarian organisations as addressees, and states that the 10 September 2011 application to the European Court of Human Rights was attached.

This chain of documents shows that the Green Party and its parliamentary representation were, at least on the documentary level, notified of the following facts:

1. The applicant's severe medical illnesses and 80% disability;
2. The protest in front of the Green Party building on 2 April 2009 and the alleged police/psychiatric intervention in that incident;
3. The explicit life-risk / suicide warning linked to 15 May 2009;
4. Allegations from the 1998–2009 period concerning medical assistance, social assistance, residence, work permission, courts and police violence;
5. The allegation that the applicant's ability to defend himself was restricted through Betreuung / guardianship;
6. Applications to the European Court of Human Rights, the United Nations, Amnesty and other bodies;
7. The 91,456 EUR court-cost / fine burden and bank-account blockage;
8. The allegation that remaining in Germany was dangerous for the applicant's life and health, and his request to leave for another democratic country.

No substantive response from the Green Party, Claudia Roth, or the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group is visible in the documentary bundle. This does not necessarily prove that no response was ever given. However, the absence of a response in the submitted file creates a separate legal-political issue of “silence” or “non-response”.

II. Main Chronology

Claim concerning protests beginning on 15 December 2008

In the letter of 6 April 2009 to the Federal Ministry of the Interior, the applicant states that since 15 December 2008 he had been protesting for the restoration of his rights in front of the Bundestag, the Federal Chancellery, the Federal President’s office, Amnesty International, the German Red Cross, the Berlin Senate and various media organisations. This fact shows that the 2 April 2009 incident is presented not as an isolated accidental incident, but as part of a continuing chain of human-rights protests.

2 April 2009 — First principal submission to Claudia Roth

The letter dated 2 April 2009 was sent to Claudia Roth at Platz vor dem Neuen Tor 1, 10115 Berlin. The letter bears an incoming stamp reading “Eingegangen — 2. Apr. 2009”. This is important evidence indicating that the document entered the federal office of the Green Party.

The legal significance of this letter is very high. In it, the applicant does not merely express political dissatisfaction. He also:

- lists sixteen severe illnesses;
- writes that he sees himself as being under a medical, social and legal blockade;
- requests that his case be examined by a higher chamber / higher level of the European Court of Human Rights;
- requests an independent medical-legal assessment by neutral-country experts;
- asks to be sent to another democratic country, for example Switzerland;
- states that he will kill himself if he receives no help by 15 May 2009;
- notes that he attached two video CDs and two document CDs.

After this letter, it can be argued that the Green Party was informed at least of the following issues: serious life risk, medical catastrophe, severe human-rights allegations against state bodies, submission of evidence CDs, and an urgent need for intervention.

2 April 2009 — Protest in front of the Green Party building and police/psychiatric intervention

In later letters the applicant states that on 2 April 2009 he conducted a peaceful protest in front of the Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen building. According to him, two police cars and three police officers arrived, told him that he had to go voluntarily to a closed psychiatric hospital, then called an ambulance, handcuffed him and transported him toward St. Hedwig / Charité.

The applicant states that the doctor saw no basis for keeping him in a closed psychiatric ward and that he was ultimately released. This fact occupies a central place in his argument: if there was no medical-psychiatric basis for compulsory detention, then the police intervention may be assessed as the unlawful interruption of a peaceful protest.

Photographic evidence shows the applicant standing with a placard in front of the Green Party building with his mouth taped. This visual evidence shows the real physical location of the protest and the direct connection between the Green Party office and the incident.

6 April 2009 — Letter to the Federal Ministry of the Interior / Wolfgang Schäuble

The letter dated 6 April 2009 was sent to the Federal Ministry of the Interior, Dr. Wolfgang Schäuble. It describes the 2 April 2009 incident in detail. The applicant states that the police stopped his peaceful demonstration for his rights in front of the Green Party building, attempted to send him to a psychiatric hospital, and humiliated him before the public.

This letter contains legally important formulations: that the police intervention was unlawful; that the peaceful demonstration was prevented; that the psychiatric route was used to silence his legal protest; that international experts had to be called; and that a complaint to the United Nations was warned.

The letter also shows that the incident did not remain an internal matter concerning the Green Party, but was immediately reported at federal level to the Federal Ministry of the Interior.

7 April 2009 — 10 EUR payment demand by St. Hedwig Kliniken

In the document dated 7 April 2009, St. Hedwig Kliniken Berlin demanded a 10 EUR practice fee for emergency treatment on 2 April 2009. This document shows that an official hospital record existed after the 2 April incident.

26 June 2009 — 281.43 EUR demand by Berliner Feuerwehr

By fee notice dated 26 June 2009, Berliner Feuerwehr demanded 281.43 EUR for emergency medical transport on 2 April 2009. The document indicates that the transport was toward St. Hedwig Kliniken Berlin.

This document shows that the 2 April incident was also registered in the official emergency and rescue-service system. It is administrative evidence indicating that the police intervention was not merely an oral allegation, but later created a financial debt / invoice.

6 July 2009 — Objection to Berliner Feuerwehr

On 6 July 2009 the applicant sent an objection to Berliner Feuerwehr. He stated that the ambulance incident did not arise from his own will, but from a situation created by the police in an unfounded and unlawful manner. Therefore neither he nor his health-insurance fund should have to pay the cost. He requested that the cost be imposed on the police or the competent authority that created the incident.

This objection opens two legal questions:

1. Who bears administrative costs arising from a compulsory or unfounded intervention?
2. If a person was taken toward psychiatry without basis, can the resulting invoice be imposed on him?

8 July 2009 — Investigative response by Berliner Feuerwehr

In its response dated 8 July 2009, Berliner Feuerwehr stated that the applicant's objection had been received and that the matter would first be reviewed. This shows that at least one state body accepted the incident as a subject of administrative review.

24 July 2009 — Versorgungsamt / GdB objection

On 24 July 2009 the applicant objected before the Landesamt für Gesundheit und Soziales — Versorgungsamt against the decision dated 20 July 2009. The decision shows that he had been granted severe disability at the level of GdB 80. The applicant argued that this was insufficient, that other severe illnesses also had to be considered, that the term "Persönlichkeitsstörung" should be changed to "Terrorisierungsstörung", and that 100% severe disability should be granted.

This document strengthens the medical-social context of the submissions made to the Green Party. The applicant's allegations of severe illness and disability are not based only on his own words; an official disability procedure also recognised disability at the GdB 80 level.

3 August 2009 — Third objection to Amtsgericht Tiergarten

The "Third Objection" dated 3 August 2009 was sent to Amtsgericht Tiergarten in file number 50 XVII 7034. In it, the applicant alleged that the Betreuer did not provide real help, merely forwarded letters, did not solve legal or financial problems, that his fundamental human rights had been transferred to others without his consent, and that this was intended to lead to his placement in a psychiatric institution.

This document is essential for understanding the content of the letter sent to Claudia Roth on 6 August 2009. The Azerbaijani-language letter to Claudia Roth is directly connected to the Betreuung decision and to the allegation that human rights had been transferred to other persons.

6 August 2009 — Azerbaijani-language letter to Claudia Roth

The letter dated 6 August 2009 was again sent to Claudia Roth. Its heading states in English, French, Russian and German that the letter was written in Azerbaijani. The applicant presents himself as a person addressing organisations that protect human rights and transmits to Claudia Roth his third objection against the Amtsgericht decision in file 50 XVII 7034.

The principal allegations in the letter are as follows:

- by the German judge's decision of 5 May 2009, the applicant's inviolable human rights were given to two German citizens;
- such rights can be transferred to another person only if the person has completely lost the ability to make decisions;
- while making the decision, the judge left all of the applicant's real problems on the applicant himself;
- the Betreuer do not understand the applicant's culture, religion, language or situation;
- this is not protection, but instead opens the way to further human-rights violations;
- such a situation may lead to the applicant being placed in psychiatry;
- the European Court of Human Rights is requested to examine these matters and punish the guilty persons.

This letter notified the Green Party not only of the 2 April incident, but also of the 2009 Betreuung decision, the problem of judicial-legal self-defence, and the applicant's allegation that his fundamental rights had been given to other persons.

5 February 2010 — Schwerbehindertenausweis / GdB 80

The documentary bundle contains the applicant's Schwerbehindertenausweis. It shows GdB 80, validity from 21 February 2008, and issue date 5 February 2010. This demonstrates that his status as a severely disabled person existed at the level of official documentation.

26 January 2011 — English-language "Complaint" to Claudia Roth

The letter dated 26 January 2011 was again addressed to Claudia Roth. This time the submission was in English and titled "Complaint". In the letter the applicant wrote that he came to Germany in 1998; that since then he had lived in a state of "bondage"; that in 1999 he was beaten by police in detention; that for five years he received no medical care; that for nine years he lived with the wrong status; that the court had admitted its mistake; that he had gone through approximately 80 court proceedings; and that he demanded compensation for the damage.

The letter also stated that the applicant was 80% disabled, had been infected with HIV, had lung damage, suffered from numerous severe illnesses, and requested that United Nations experts independently examine the documents.

The documentary bundle also contains the fax transmission report dated 26 January 2011. This is important evidence showing that the submission was technically sent to Claudia Roth's fax number.

10 September 2011 — Application to the European Court of Human Rights

The document dated 10 September 2011 is an extensive submission addressed to the European Court of Human Rights. It appears in the file both as an English translation and in German.

In the letter the applicant states that:

- since 9 March 2011 he no longer had a Rechtsbetreuer and had obtained the right to defend himself;
- he had applied to the European Court of Human Rights on 6 January 2011 and 1 April 2011, but had received no answer;

- the failure to provide him with residence status, social assistance, work permission and medical care between 1998 and 2007 caused severe illnesses and 80% disability;
- on 15 May 2009 he attempted suicide because of the psychological severity of the situation;
- the European Court of Human Rights did not examine his previous cases as a second or subsequent instance;
- a court-cost / fine burden of 91,456 EUR caused the blockage of his bank account and further closed his ability to leave Germany;
- his case is being covered up for political reasons;
- United Nations experts and independent international expertise are requested.

This document was identified as an attachment in the letter of 12 December 2011 to the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group.

12 December 2011 — Submission to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen Bundestagsfraktion

The letter dated 12 December 2011 was addressed directly to “Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen Bundestagsfraktion”. This raises the matter from the level of party leadership to the level of a parliamentary group.

The letter also lists European courts, United Nations officials, Amnesty International, the international press and human-rights organisations as addressees. The applicant writes that he attached the 10 September 2011 ECtHR submission and asks the organisation to take this action / submission into consideration.

This document is especially important from a legal-political perspective. By this point the parliamentary group represented in the Bundestag was informed of the following matters:

- the applicant’s ECtHR complaints;
- allegations concerning wrong decisions by German courts and state bodies;
- medical-social damage allegations;
- a broad human-rights chain covering 1998–2011;
- the request to leave and move to another country;
- the request for international expert review.

III. Main Facts of Which the Green Party Was Informed

According to the contents of the documents, the Green Party and its representatives may be considered to have been informed of the following facts:

1. Severe illnesses and disability

The first letter to Claudia Roth expressly listed sixteen severe illnesses. Later documents refer to GdB 80 disability, HIV/AIDS, lung damage, heart infarction, tuberculosis, prostatitis, hepatitis, neurological/psychiatric injuries and other illnesses.

2. Explicit life risk

In the letter of 2 April 2009 the applicant stated that he would kill himself if he received no help by 15 May 2009. This is not a simple political complaint, but a life-risk warning tied to a concrete date.

3. Peaceful protest in front of the Green Party building

The photographic evidence and the letter of 6 April 2009 show that the applicant stated he had protested peacefully in front of the Green Party building, had taped his mouth, had stood with a placard, and that police intervention followed.

4. Alleged police and psychiatric intervention

The applicant stated that during the protest of 2 April 2009 the police detained him, handcuffed him, called an ambulance and transported him toward psychiatry. It is alleged that the doctor saw no basis to keep him and that he was released.

5. State costs and administrative consequences

After the 2 April 2009 incident, a 10 EUR hospital fee and a 281.43 EUR Feuerwehr fee were demanded. This shows that the incident entered the real state/administrative system.

6. Betreuung / allegation that rights were transferred to others

In the August 2009 letters the applicant stated that his fundamental rights had been transferred to others by court decision, but that the Betreuer did not provide real protection. This issue was transmitted directly to the Green Party.

7. Applications to the ECtHR and the United Nations

The applicant repeatedly stated that he had applied to the European Court of Human Rights, the United Nations and international organisations. In the letter dated 12 December 2011 these materials were sent as attachments to the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group.

8. 91,456 EUR court-cost / fine burden

In the 2011 documents the applicant wrote that German courts had created a financial burden of 91,456 EUR, causing the blockage of his bank account and the factual restriction of his freedom of movement.

9. Request to leave for another country

In several documents the applicant stated that remaining in Germany had deadly consequences for him, that he wished to move to another democratic country, but that he faced financial and legal blockades.

IV. Silence and Non-Response

The submitted documentary bundle contains no substantive response from Claudia Roth, the federal office of Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, or the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group.

This fact must be legally assessed with caution:

1. The absence of a response in the documentary bundle does not conclusively prove that no response ever existed.

2. However, the incoming stamp of 2 April 2009, the fax report of 26 January 2011, and the material sent to the Bundestag Parliamentary Group on 12 December 2011 show that the submissions were actually delivered or that delivery was attempted.

3. If no response was given, this creates a serious problem of “institutional silence” from the perspective of politics and human rights.

4. Especially if the letter of 2 April 2009 contained a concrete suicide risk and a medical catastrophe, the expected conduct would have included at least:

- acknowledgement of receipt;
- referral to the competent body;
- notification of the competent authority about the urgent risk;
- referral to a legal or petition channel;
- preservation of the submitted CDs and documents;
- a written response to the applicant.

The Green Party is not, in the classical sense, a police, court or social-assistance authority. Therefore direct state responsibility arises only where a specific legal basis exists. However, in view of Claudia Roth’s political and parliamentary role, the Green Party’s public profile in the field of human rights, and the official political role of its Bundestag Parliamentary Group, the complete absence of response to such serious submissions can be raised as a matter of legal-political responsibility.

V. Possible Legal Violations

The following violations are identified as a preliminary legal analysis on the basis of the allegations and documentary chain. For a final legal determination, police protocols, hospital records, court files, the Green Party's internal registry, and official responses must be obtained separately.

1. Peaceful protest and freedom of expression

If the applicant was protesting peacefully in front of the Green Party building on 2 April 2009, and if the police ended the protest without basis by transporting him toward psychiatry, this raises issues under Article 5 of the German Basic Law — freedom of expression, Article 8 — freedom of assembly, and Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

2. Right to liberty and security

The alleged use of handcuffs, transport by ambulance to a psychiatric clinic, and the compulsory character of that act must be examined under Article 2 and Article 104 of the German Basic Law and Article 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

If there was no lawful basis, medical opinion, or judicial control for compulsory psychiatric transport, the incident may be assessed as unlawful deprivation of liberty or unjustified restriction of liberty.

3. Human dignity and degrading treatment

The applicant wrote that he was humiliated in public by the police, handcuffed, presented as an “idiot”, and laughed at by passers-by. If confirmed, these allegations must be examined under Article 1 of the German Basic Law — human dignity — and Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights — prohibition of degrading treatment.

4. Right to life and positive duty of protection

The letter of 2 April 2009 gave a concrete suicide-risk warning. For state authorities, such a warning can trigger the positive duty to protect life. This is important under Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 2 of the German Basic Law.

Although the Green Party is not a state authority, the failure to route such a risk to competent authorities must be assessed separately in view of its parliamentary representation and political responsibility.

5. Medical care and health rights

The applicant wrote about absence of medical care in the 1998–2009 period, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, heart infarction, lung damage and other worsening illnesses. If confirmed by official medical documents, the state's obligations concerning bodily integrity, health, social protection and protection from inhuman treatment are seriously engaged.

6. Disability and discrimination

In view of the GdB 80 document and numerous medical allegations, the applicant's disability status had also been officially recognised. Nevertheless, if his protests were presented as "mental illness" and thereby removed from legal and political channels, this may be examined as discrimination on grounds of disability and denial of effective legal protection.

7. Effective legal protection and fair-trial rights

The applicant wrote that numerous court proceedings remained unanswered, were delayed, were rejected as "too late", that an error was recognised in 2005, but that responsibility was later again imposed on him. These allegations must be examined under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights — fair trial, Article 13 — effective remedy, and Article 19(4) of the German Basic Law.

8. Betreuung and the right to self-defence

In the 2009 documents the applicant stated that the Betreuer did not actually defend his rights, and that legal and financial problems instead grew worse. If Betreuung, which was appointed for assistance, in practice prevented the applicant from defending himself, this is a serious issue concerning personal autonomy, access to court and fair process.

9. Administrative costs and financial burden

The 10 EUR and 281.43 EUR demands after the 2 April 2009 incident, the later 91,456 EUR court-cost / fine allegation, bank-account blockage, and the financial immobilisation of a disabled person receiving social assistance must be examined from the perspective of the social-state principle, proportionality and effective legal protection.

VI. Legal-Political Responsibility of the Green Party

The Green Party is not a police, court or health authority. Therefore proof of direct legal responsibility requires an additional legal basis. However, on the basis of the submitted documents, the following conclusion can be drawn:

1. Claudia Roth and Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen were informed on 2 April 2009 of the applicant's severe illnesses, life risk and legal-catastrophe allegations.
2. The alleged police/psychiatric intervention in front of the Green Party building is directly connected with the physical premises of that political institution.

3. The submissions of 6 August 2009, 26 January 2011 and 12 December 2011 show that the notification was not a single event, but repeated and long-term.

4. The letter of 12 December 2011 to the Bundestag Parliamentary Group created notification at parliamentary level.

5. The documentary bundle contains no visible response from the Green Party; this creates a problem of non-response or lack of transparency.

For these reasons, the following may be requested from the Green Party:

- to officially confirm receipt of the letter dated 2 April 2009;
 - to disclose whether a response to that letter was given;
 - to state whether the two video CDs and two document CDs were preserved;
 - to disclose whether the Green Party office called the police during the protest of 2 April 2009 and what role it had in the incident;
 - to show the internal registration of the submissions of 6 August 2009, 26 January 2011 and 12 December 2011;
 - to disclose to whom those submissions were routed inside the parliamentary group;
 - to state what measure was taken in response to the submission containing suicide risk;
 - if no measure was taken, to explain why;
 - to now initiate an independent medical-legal review.
-

VII. Legal Value of the Evidence

The evidence in this dossier can be divided into the following categories:

A. Direct documentary evidence

- 2 April 2009 letter to Claudia Roth and incoming stamp;
- 6 April 2009 letter to the Federal Ministry of the Interior;
- 7 April 2009 St. Hedwig Kliniken payment demand;
- 26 June 2009 Berliner Feuerwehr fee notice;
- 6 July 2009 objection to Feuerwehr;
- 24 July 2009 Versorgungsamt objection;
- 3 August 2009 objection to Amtsgericht Tiergarten;
- 6 August 2009 Azerbaijani-language submission to Claudia Roth;
- 26 January 2011 Complaint to Claudia Roth and fax report;
- 12 December 2011 letter to the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group;
- 10 September 2011 ECtHR submission and translation.

B. Photographic evidence

- photographs of the protest with the applicant's mouth taped in front of the Green Party building;
- images showing the address and sign of the Green office;

- visual evidence of a peaceful protest with a placard.

C. Medical-social evidence

- GdB 80 severe-disability document;
- systematic listing of illnesses in the letters;
- objection to the Versorgungsamt decision;
- hospital and emergency-service documents.

D. International legal-submission evidence

- 10 September 2011 application to the ECtHR;
 - references to the United Nations and other international organisations;
 - transmission of the submissions to the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group.
-

VIII. Principal Legal Conclusion

This dossier shows that the Green Party and its parliamentary group received not superficial, but serious and multi-year notice of the applicant's case. The documents show that the Green Party was informed of the following subjects:

- alleged state harm in the 1998–2009 period;
- absence of medical care and severe illnesses;
- police violence and prison allegations from 1999;
- police/psychiatric intervention in front of the Green Party building on 2 April 2009;
- life risk linked to 15 May 2009;
- restriction of rights through Betreuung;
- applications to the ECtHR and the United Nations;
- the 91,456 EUR financial burden and bank-account problem;
- the wish to leave Germany and live in another democratic country.

If the Green Party gave no response to these submissions, this is a serious problem at least from the perspective of political-moral responsibility and parliamentary ethics. To determine legal responsibility, the following questions must also be answered:

1. What did the Green Party do after the letter of 2 April 2009 entered its office?
 2. Did the Green office have any role in the police intervention?
 3. Were the CDs and document materials preserved?
 4. Did Claudia Roth or her office forward the submission to competent authorities?
 5. Were the submissions of 6 August 2009, 26 January 2011 and 12 December 2011 answered?
 6. Did the Bundestag Parliamentary Group bring this matter into a parliamentary/petition mechanism?
 7. Were any urgent protective steps taken after warnings concerning life risk and severe illnesses?
-

IX. Official Steps That May Be Requested

On the basis of this report, the following official inquiry may be sent to the Green Party and the Bundestag Parliamentary Group:

1. The registration number and internal routing path of the letter to Claudia Roth dated 2 April 2009 should be provided.
 2. The fate of the two video CDs and two document CDs submitted with that letter should be disclosed.
 3. It should be stated who called the police in front of the Green Party building on 2 April 2009 and whether the office had any role in the incident.
 4. The registration of the Azerbaijani-language letter dated 6 August 2009 and whether it was answered should be disclosed.
 5. The internal registration and response concerning the “Complaint” sent to Claudia Roth on 26 January 2011 should be provided.
 6. It should be disclosed to whom the letter sent on 12 December 2011 to the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group was forwarded within the parliamentary group and what steps were taken.
 7. If no response was given, the reason should be explained.
 8. The Green Party should now initiate an independent medical-legal investigation on the basis of these documents.
 9. A parliamentary inquiry or official hearing concerning the applicant’s human-rights allegations should be considered.
 10. If documents were lost, an official explanation and apology should be issued.
-

X. Final Conclusion

The “PDF GRUNE” documentary bundle establishes an important legal-political conclusion concerning the Green Party: the applicant did not complain only once. He repeatedly addressed Claudia Roth, the Green Party and the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group over a period of years. These submissions were not ordinary political letters; they concerned severe illness, life risk, police intervention, alleged compulsory psychiatric route, court errors, Betreuung problems, and human-rights complaints at ECtHR and United Nations level.

According to the documents, the Green Party was informed of these matters. Because no substantive response is visible in the dossier, the central question is this: what did a parliamentary party that states that it defends human rights, democracy, freedom and the rule of law do in the face of such serious submissions?

If no response was given, this is not only political silence. In the context of severe life risk, disability and lack of legal protection, it is a serious question of institutional responsibility. If a response was given, those responses must be disclosed immediately and added to the dossier.

The principal legal conclusion of this report is as follows:

According to the submitted documents, the Green Party / Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen and its Bundestag Parliamentary Group were informed of the applicant’s severe human-rights, medical-social catastrophe, police intervention, psychiatric and judicial-protection allegations. If, after this notification, no adequate response, referral, protection or parliamentary step was taken, that silence must be examined separately and raised as a question of legal-political responsibility.

APPENDIX D — ADDITIONAL ENGLISH SECTION ON BUNDESTAG VOTES, GREEN PARTY KNOWLEDGE, AND LEGAL-POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY

Note: This appendix is the English version of the additional section on Bundestag votes, Green Party knowledge and legal-political responsibility. It is added without removing any part of the original English report.

Additional Section — Bundestag Votes, Green Party Knowledge, and Legal-Political Responsibility

In addition to Bundestag Report No. 005, it should be noted that the applicant's case was officially registered between 2007 and 2012 in the German Bundestag Petitions Committee under two separate petition numbers and was later brought to formal closure decisions at Bundestag plenary level.

1. First Bundestag Petition — Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925

The first federal petition was registered under number Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925. According to Bundestag documents, this petition was accepted by the Bundestag on 11 April 2007 on the basis of a submission dated 27 February 2007 that had been transferred from the Berlin Abgeordnetenhaus to the federal level. The subject was recorded as “Renten wegen verminderter Erwerbsfähigkeit” — pensions due to reduced earning capacity.

For this petition, the Bundestag public archive identifies Drucksache 16/8764, Sammelübersicht 391, dated 9 April 2008. In that document, under entry no. 71, Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925 is listed with residence 10787 Berlin, subject “Renten wegen verminderter Erwerbsfähigkeit”, and the responsible federal authority as BVA/BMAS.

According to the plenary protocol of 24 April 2008, the Bundestag adopted the closure recommendation for Sammelübersicht 391. A particularly important point is that the Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen parliamentary group abstained in that decision. This is an important parliamentary fact showing that the Green Party parliamentary group had formal-level knowledge of that petition bundle.

This fact should be formulated cautiously: the vote of 24 April 2008 does not prove that every member of the Green Party personally read all medical documents. However, it does show that a political-parliamentary position was formed at parliamentary-group level in relation to the Petitions Committee's closure recommendation, and that the parliamentary group knew that the case was on the official Bundestag agenda.

2. Additional Materials Submitted to the Bundestag in 2007

As shown in Report No. 005, in 2007 the applicant did not limit himself to a technical pension matter. The materials sent to, or accepted by, the Bundestag also contained allegations concerning severe illnesses, loss of capacity for work, court proceedings, refusal of medical and social protection, complaints concerning police and administrative bodies, human rights, and risks to life and health.

In particular, the document transmission dated 1 November 2007, which refers to DVD/CD materials, the European Convention on Human Rights, and serious allegations concerning life and health, has independent significance.

Therefore the first petition should not be evaluated merely as a narrow pension matter, but as a federal petition process conducted against the background of severe medical-social-legal risks.

3. Second Bundestag Petition — Pet 3-17-11-217-018680

The second federal petition was registered under number Pet 3-17-11-217-018680. On 2 February 2011 the Bundestag registered the submission dated 18 January 2011 under the subject “Sozialrecht”. This petition concerned social security, disability, health, minimum subsistence, the wish to receive social assistance in another EU country, the inactivity of official bodies, and allegations of absence of legal protection in 2011–2012.

For this petition, the Bundestag public archive identifies Drucksache 17/10674, Sammelübersicht 466, dated 12 September 2012. In that document, under Beschlussempfehlung 10, entry no. 99, Pet 3-17-11-217-018680 is listed with residence 10787 Berlin, subject “Sozialrecht”, and the responsible authority as BMAS.

According to the Bundestag plenary protocol of 27 September 2012, the closure recommendation for Sammelübersicht 466 was adopted by all parliamentary groups, with no votes against and no abstentions. This means that in 2012 the Green Party, as a Bundestag parliamentary group, did not oppose the adoption of that closure decision and did not abstain.

On 4 October 2012, the Chair of the Petitions Committee informed the applicant that the petition procedure had ended. On 25 October 2012, the Committee refused to re-examine repeated submissions of the same nature. This part requires separate assessment: if new medical, disability, life-risk and legal-protection evidence existed, the approach that “the same matter has already been examined” could be legally sufficient only if the effect of those new facts on the decision had been separately and reasonably assessed.

4. Separate and Direct Knowledge of the Green Party

It should be added to Report No. 005 that the Green Party was not informed only formally through the Bundestag petition process. The separate GRÜNE documentary bundle shows that on 2 April 2009 the applicant directly addressed Claudia Roth, and that the letter was recorded by the Green office with an incoming stamp. In that letter the applicant stated his severe illnesses, human-rights allegations, his request that the case be examined by a higher chamber / higher level of the European Court of Human Rights, his request for neutral expert assessment, and a concrete life-risk warning.

On 6 August 2009 an additional Azerbaijani-language submission was sent to Claudia Roth. It presented allegations concerning the Amtsgericht Tiergarten Betreuung decision in file 50 XVII 7034, the transfer of fundamental rights to other persons, and violations of human rights.

On 26 January 2011 an English-language “Complaint” was sent to Claudia Roth, and a fax report created transmission proof. That letter identified the chain beginning in 1998, the 1999 prison/police violence allegation, refusal of medical care, 80% disability, HIV/AIDS, court errors, the 91,456 EUR financial burden, and the request for intervention by United Nations experts.

On 12 December 2011 the submission was addressed directly to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen Bundestagsfraktion. This shows that the Green Party parliamentary group was informed of the matter not only through a general Bundestag petition list, but also through direct submissions.

For that reason, the 2012 Bundestag vote has separate legal-political significance: at the time of the closure decision of 27 September 2012, the Green Party had already been informed of the severe medical, social, disability and human-rights aspects of the case both through the Bundestag petition mechanism and through direct submissions sent to Claudia Roth and the Bundestag Parliamentary Group in 2009–2011.

5. Legally Cautious Formula Concerning the Responsibility of the Green Party and Its Parliamentary Group

The Green Party is not a police, court or social-assistance authority. Therefore its responsibility cannot automatically be equated with the responsibility of state bodies. However, as a parliamentary group represented in the Bundestag, as a political actor participating in petition decisions, and as a political organisation that received the applicant's direct submissions, the Green Party also cannot be assessed as a completely responsibility-free "private observer".

The legally correct formulation should be:

The responsibility of the Green Party and its Bundestag Parliamentary Group should be investigated to the extent that they were informed through official and direct submissions of severe illness, disability, life risk, medical-social lack of protection, and absence of effective legal protection, but despite that information may have failed to take visible adequate steps to examine the matter, refer it to competent authorities, raise it separately in the Petitions Committee, or activate parliamentary oversight mechanisms.

6. Potentially Violated German Law

This documentary chain should be assessed under the following provisions of German law:

Grundgesetz Article 1(1) — Human dignity.

Treating submissions concerning severe illness, disability, medical-social lack of protection, police/psychiatric intervention and life risk with merely formal and narrow technical responses may create a problem under the duty to protect human dignity.

Grundgesetz Article 2(2) — Right to life and physical integrity.

The submissions alleged real life/health risk, refusal of medical care, and worsening severe illnesses. The failure of state bodies and parliamentary oversight mechanisms to examine these risks seriously must be reviewed in light of the positive duty of protection.

Grundgesetz Article 3(3) — Prohibition of discrimination on grounds of disability.

The applicant stated that he had official severe-disability status, and the documents show GdB 80. If his submissions were not taken seriously because of disability, psychiatric labelling or social weakness, this provision is engaged.

Grundgesetz Article 17 — Right of petition.

This provision gives everyone the right to submit written requests or complaints to competent authorities and to the legislature. Here the central question is not only registration of the submission, but content-based consideration and response proportionate to its seriousness.

Grundgesetz Article 19(4) — Effective legal protection.

If the petition procedure and other legal routes formally closed severe allegations without real examination, the existence of effective legal protection is separately called into question.

Grundgesetz Article 20(3) — Rule-of-law principle.

The legislature, executive and judiciary are bound by law and justice. If the petition process becomes merely an instrument of formal closure, especially in cases involving life and health risk, this must be examined under the rule-of-law principle.

Grundgesetz Article 21 — Constitutional role of political parties.

Political parties are constitutional actors participating in the formation of political will. For that reason, a party informed at parliamentary-group level of severe human-rights allegations cannot remain in a wholly neutral and responsibility-free position; at minimum, democratic-legal responsibility and a duty of transparency arise.

Grundgesetz Article 38 — Representative role of deputies before the people.

Members of the Bundestag are representatives of the whole people. When documents concerning severe human rights, disability and life risk reach Parliament, the matter must be assessed not merely as party discipline or a technical vote, but from the perspective of conscience and rule-of-law responsibility.

Grundgesetz Article 45c and the powers of the Petitions Committee.

The Petitions Committee has mechanisms to collect information, obtain government positions, request files, hear witnesses and experts, and refer matters to the government or competent authorities. In a case involving severe illness, disability and life risk, the non-use of these means — or the fact that the documents do not show whether they were used — is a serious procedural gap.

Political Parties Act and the democratic responsibility of political parties.

Political parties are not merely private associations; they are constitutional institutions participating in the formation of democratic will. Therefore a party that receives documents concerning human rights, disability, medical-social protection and life risk — especially through its parliamentary group — must at least show transparency in the registration, referral and response to those submissions.

German Criminal Code section 323c — possible failure to render assistance.

This provision must be mentioned only with great caution. If it is proven that a real, imminent and concrete danger existed, that responsible persons knew of that danger, and that they failed to take a simple and possible assistance measure, the issue of failure to render assistance may be examined. This is not an automatic conclusion, but a legal question requiring separate factual investigation.

German Criminal Code section 258 — possible obstruction of prosecution / concealment.

This provision becomes relevant only if concrete facts prove active concealment, knowing obstruction, or hiding of evidence. Simple political silence alone is not sufficient for this offence. However, allegations that documents were lost, an investigation was blocked, or material was deliberately not referred must be investigated separately.

7. Potential International-Law Violations

This chain of events must also be examined under the following international-law provisions:

ECHR Article 2 — Right to life.

The applicant repeatedly warned of life risk, medical catastrophe and suicide danger. The reaction of state bodies and parliamentary mechanisms to these risks must be examined.

ECHR Article 3 — Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment.

Allegations concerning detention, police violence, lack of medical care, social lack of protection while severely ill, and psychiatric labelling are significant under this provision.

ECHR Article 6 — Right to a fair trial.

The applicant alleges that court proceedings were conducted for many years in a formal, delayed and ineffective manner. The chain of court decisions, delays and lack of legal protection in the petition documents must be separately assessed.

ECHR Article 8 — Private life, bodily and psychological integrity.

Medical care, psychiatric intervention, disability, residence and social status fall within the protected sphere of private life.

ECHR Article 13 — Effective remedy.

If serious allegations were closed only by formal procedure and no real investigation occurred, the existence of an effective remedy is called into question.

ECHR Article 14 — Prohibition of discrimination.

It must be examined whether the applicant was subjected to different and lower-level treatment because of foreign status, disability, illness, poverty or psychiatric labelling.

ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 9, 14, 17, 26 and 2(3).

These provisions may apply in relation to the right to life, prohibition of cruel and degrading treatment, liberty and security, fair hearing, private life, equality and effective remedy.

CRPD Articles 5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 25 and 28.

These provisions are highly relevant to equality of persons with disabilities, access to justice, protection from violence, physical and mental integrity, protection of private life, health, and adequate living / social protection.

ICESCR Articles 9, 11 and 12.

The obligations concerning social security, adequate standard of living and the highest attainable standard of health must be examined.

CAT Articles 12, 13, 14 and 16.

These provisions may apply in relation to inhuman treatment, investigation of complaints, compensation and prevention of degrading treatment.

8. Final Conclusion to Be Included in the Report

These additional facts show that the Green Party and its Bundestag Parliamentary Group did not learn of the case only later or by chance. On the one hand, in 2008 and 2012 there were formal parliamentary positions of the Green parliamentary group in Bundestag petition closure decisions. On the other hand, the letters sent to Claudia Roth and directly to Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen Bundestagsfraktion in 2009–2011 show the Green Party's separate and direct knowledge.

Therefore the following conclusion should be recorded in the report:

In 2008 the Green parliamentary group saw the matter at parliamentary level by abstaining in the closure decision concerning Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925. In 2012 the closure decision concerning Pet 3-17-11-217-018680 was adopted by all parliamentary groups without opposition. At that time, the Green Party had already been directly informed through Claudia Roth and the Bundestag Parliamentary Group in 2009–2011 of the applicant's severe medical, social, disability, life-risk and human-rights allegations. Therefore the role of the Green Party and its Bundestag Parliamentary Group in this case must be separately investigated. It must be officially asked what information they received, what internal registration and referral they made, and why no parliamentary oversight or urgent protection mechanism was created.