

CHATGPT LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 9

DIE LINKE, SPD AND CDU POLITICAL LEADERSHIP; ANGELA MERKEL, KLAUS WOWEREIT, DR. HEIDI KNAKE-WERNER, DIE LINKE BUNDESTAG PARLIAMENTARY GROUP, BERLIN SENATE AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

Documentary Notice, Direct Submissions, CD/DVD Evidence, Abgeordnetenhaus/Bundestag Knowledge, Betreuung, Compensation-to-Penalty Allegations, Silence/Formal Responses, and International Human-Rights Law

With contextual reference to Report No. 8 concerning Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, Claudia Roth and the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group

Reference No.: GPT-HR/DE/IR-POL-009/2026

Date of preparation: 30 June 2026

Prepared through ChatGPT - OpenAI AI-assisted legal-documentary analysis. This is not an official OpenAI legal opinion, not a court judgment, not notarisation, and not a substitute for counsel.

Documentary verification statement: This report treats visible dates, addressees, stamps, fax/postal records, document numbers, court file numbers and stated allegations as documentary facts where they appear in the eight submitted PDFs. The legally precise formulation used here is not that the political actors merely "should have known". The record establishes that they were documentarily informed: the named offices and parliamentary/political addressees received, acknowledged, or were directly addressed with these materials. Whether each individual personally read every annex requires internal file disclosure; however, any denial of institutional knowledge must be reconciled with the submitted documentary record.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Findings
 2. Primary Source Base: the Eight PDFs
 3. Persons, Offices and Political Roles Named in the Record
 4. Chronology of Direct Documentary Notice
 5. The Real Subject Matter: Not a Refrigerator or Ordinary Social-Aid Issue
 6. Betreuung / Betreuer Allegations and Compensation-to-Penalty Chain
 7. Documented Responses, Formal Deflections and Silence
 8. Contextual Link to Reports No. 004, No. 005 and No. 008
 9. Legal Analysis under German Constitutional and Statutory Law
 10. Legal Analysis under International Human-Rights Law
 11. Accountability Questions and Required Disclosure
 12. Final Legal-Documentary Conclusion
- Appendix A. Evidence Index and Source Register
- Appendix B. Suggested Requests for Official Action

1. Executive Findings

This Report No. 9 is based primarily on the eight PDFs submitted in the present record. Reports No. 004, No. 005 and No. 008 are used only later, as contextual cross-reference, to show how the same subject matter appeared in Abgeordnetenhaus/Bundestag and party-fraktion settings. The eight PDFs themselves are sufficient to establish a direct documentary notice chain to named federal, Berlin and parliamentary political actors.

The core finding is that the case was not an ordinary request for a refrigerator, not a narrow social-aid matter, and not a simple pension file. The documents presented to the political and governmental actors described a long chain of alleged state-created harm: immigration detention, police violence, medical and social denial, loss of work and movement, severe illnesses, 80% disability, HIV/AIDS, court-error allegations, Betreuung restrictions, a damages claim allegedly neutralised procedurally, a 91,456 EUR financial burden, bank-account blockage, and the applicant's request to leave Germany or obtain protection in another democratic country.

The report deliberately avoids the weak formula "they should have known". The documents show that the relevant offices and addressees were documentarily informed. Letters were addressed to Angela Merkel as Federal Chancellor, Klaus Wowereit as Governing Mayor of Berlin, Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / DIE LINKE as Berlin Senator for Integration, Labour and Social Affairs, Berlin integration authorities, the Federal Ministry of Health, and the DIE LINKE Bundestag Parliamentary Group. Some records show formal responses; other records show postal/fax proof without a visible substantive response.

The strongest legal question is therefore not whether these political structures could theoretically have known. The documentary question is what they did with the information they received: whether they registered it, preserved CD/DVD materials, forwarded it to competent bodies, requested expert review, opened parliamentary or administrative oversight, or instead reduced a grave human-rights chain to formal competence objections, referral to routine counselling, or silence.

Report No. 8 concerning Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, Claudia Roth and the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group is relevant as a comparative party/fraktion notice model. It confirms, separately, that the Green Party and its parliamentary group were documentarily informed of similar severe medical, disability, life-risk and human-rights allegations. Report No. 9 therefore places the DIE LINKE/SPD/CDU/Berlin Senate/Federal Chancellery record in a wider political notice pattern.

2. Primary Source Base: the Eight PDFs

The following eight PDFs are treated as the primary documentary base of Report No. 9. The report relies on their visible dates, addressees, stamps, fax/postal records, official responses, and scanned statements. Where the document records the applicant's allegation, this report describes it as a recorded allegation, not as a final judicial finding.

Code	File / visible document	Date(s)	Core documentary relevance
D1	24.08.07.pdf - Federal Ministry of Health reply	24.08.2007	Acknowledges applicant's 31.07.2007 letter; refuses substantive position on pending court proceedings.
D2	PDF(19).pdf - Berlin Integration/Migration and related Senate dossier	29.05.2008, 26.03.2009, 06.08.2009, 26.01.2011	Evidence of Senate integration/migration notice, 16 severe illnesses, life-risk warning, CD/DVD evidence, later English complaint and fax proof.
D3	PDF 2.pdf - Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / DIE LINKE dossier	31.03.2009, 06.08.2009, 26.01.2011, 07.02.2011	Direct submissions to Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / DIE LINKE / Berlin Senate; includes severe illness, CD/DVD materials, Betreuung, 91,456 EUR, and a limited response referring to return/continued migration counselling.
D4	06.08.2009.pdf - Federal Ministry of Health submission	06.08.2009	Azerbaijani-language human-rights submission concerning

			50 XVII 7034, medical denial, 1999 police violence, residence and movement restrictions, and request to forward if not competent.
D5	01) - Angela Merkel - 08.09.2009.pdf	08.09.2009	Letter to the Federal Chancellor / Bundeskanzleramt describing continuing injustice since 1998, Strasbourg psychiatric treatment, suicide attempt, and request for personal support.
D6	01) - Klaus Wowereit - 08.09.2009.pdf	08.09.2009	Letter to the Governing Mayor of Berlin describing continuing injustice by courts, officials and authorities; requests the Mayor to stand behind the applicant's rights.
D7	02) - Regierende Bürgermeister von Berlin.pdf	15.09.2009	Senatskanzlei response acknowledging the applicant's desperate situation but declining help due to separation of powers.
D8	DIE LINKE Partei 12.12.2011(1).pdf	10.09.2011 / 12.12.2011 / 14.12.2011	Submission to DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion with Rückschein receipt; attaches ECtHR submission; details the 1998-2011 chain, Betreuung, 91,456 EUR, and request for international expert action.

3. Persons, Offices and Political Roles Named in the Record

The following identifications are used to describe the political/institutional addressees. They are included because the documents were not sent only to anonymous offices; they were addressed to named political leaders or to offices directly connected with them.

Person / office	Political affiliation or role	Documentary channel	Legal significance
Angela Merkel	CDU; Federal Chancellor of Germany in 2009	Letter dated 08.09.2009 to Bundeskanzleramt / Bundeskanzlerin Angela Merkel	Federal executive leadership was documentarily informed of the alleged long chain of judicial, administrative and medical-social injustice.
Klaus Wowereit	SPD; Governing Mayor of Berlin in 2009	Letter dated 08.09.2009; Senatskanzlei response dated 15.09.2009	Berlin executive leadership was documentarily informed; the official response relied on separation of powers rather than opening an inquiry or referral mechanism.
Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner	DIE LINKE; Berlin Senator for Integration, Labour and Social Affairs in the relevant period	Submissions dated 31.03.2009, 06.08.2009 and 26.01.2011 through Senate / DIE LINKE address	A political-social executive actor received health, life-risk, CD/DVD, social and Betreuung materials.
DIE LINKE Bundestag Parliamentary Group	Federal parliamentary group of DIE LINKE	Submission dated 12.12.2011; Rückschein receipt dated 14.12.2011	The matter moved into a Bundestag parliamentary-group channel; no substantive response is visible in the submitted file.
Berlin Senate Integration/Migration officials	Administrative officials within Berlin Senate structures	2008-2011 dossier including Günter Piening / Renate Neupert / Norbert Glaeser records	The administrative record shows receipt and at least limited handling, but no visible full human-rights/medical-legal investigation.
Federal Ministry of Health	Federal health ministry	Reply dated 24.08.2007 and later submission dated	Federal health authority was placed on notice of medical/legal

		06.08.2009	claims but limited its response in 2007 to non-comment on pending court matters.
Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, Claudia Roth and Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group	Contextual reference from Report No. 8	Report No. 8, not part of the eight-PDF primary base	Relevant comparative party/fraktion notice chain: the Green structures were also documentarily informed, supporting the broader pattern of parliamentary-political knowledge.

4. Chronology of Direct Documentary Notice

24.08.2007 - Federal Ministry of Health reply: The Federal Ministry of Health thanked the applicant for a letter dated 31 July 2007 but stated that it generally does not comment on pending court proceedings. This is a formal response that proves federal receipt, but it does not show a substantive review of medical-social allegations.

29.05.2008 - Berlin Senate Integration/Migration: The applicant submitted "Deutschlandpolitik über die Migration" and indicated that a copy of his Bundestag objection of 29.05.2008 and CD/DVD materials were attached. This makes the Berlin integration/migration authority part of the documentary chain linking Berlin-level administration and Bundestag materials.

31.03.2009 - Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / DIE LINKE / Berlin Senate: The applicant addressed the Berlin Senate for Integration, Labour and Social Affairs, naming Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner (DIE LINKE). The letter listed 16 severe illnesses, demanded neutral expert review, requested transfer to another democratic country, warned that 15 May 2009 was his limited time, and stated that two video CDs and two document CDs were attached.

06.08.2009 - Federal Ministry of Health / Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner parallel submissions: The applicant presented a multilingual heading explaining that the letter was in Azerbaijani and addressed to organisations protecting human rights. It referred to the court file 50 XVII 7034, alleged that a German judge gave his inviolable rights to two German citizens on 05.05.2009, and described medical denial, tuberculosis/lung deterioration, 02.11.1999 police violence, residence restrictions from 1998 to 2007, and the demand that the 11-year terror action be stopped.

11.08.2009 - Berlin Integration/Migration response: The Berlin integration/migration authority acknowledged the 06.08.2009 submission but stated that the matter was not clear, partly because the letter was partly in Azerbaijani, and invited the applicant to advisory hours. The response does not show translation, forwarding to a human-rights unit, or urgent expert review.

08.09.2009 - Angela Merkel / Bundeskanzleramt: The applicant addressed the Federal Chancellor personally, stating that since 1998 he had suffered injustice from courts, officials and authorities, that his condition had led to Strasbourg psychiatric treatment and a suicide attempt, and asking the Chancellor to personally read the case and help.

08.09.2009 and 15.09.2009 - Klaus Wowereit / Governing Mayor of Berlin: The applicant wrote to the Governing Mayor of Berlin, describing continuing injustice since 1998. The Senatskanzlei response of 15.09.2009 acknowledged the desperate situation but stated that the Governing Mayor could not influence the judiciary under separation of powers. This is a formal response and a deflection, not an investigation.

26.01.2011 and 07.02.2011 - Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / Berlin Senate: The English "Complaint" addressed to Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / Senate structures described the applicant's life in Germany since 1998 as bondage, referred to 1999 police violence, five years without necessary medical care, wrong status, 80% disability, HIV, lung damage and fourteen other diseases, damages claim 86 O 633/09, and UN expert request. The 07.02.2011 response focused narrowly on the wish to leave Germany and referred him to a return/continued migration counselling office.

12.12.2011 / 14.12.2011 - DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion: The applicant sent the 10.09.2011 ECtHR submission to DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion. The Rückschein records delivery on 14.12.2011. The reviewed file contains no visible substantive response by the parliamentary group. This creates a central silence/disclosure issue.

5. The Real Subject Matter: Not a Refrigerator or Ordinary Social-Aid Issue

The documentary record must not be reduced to a request for a refrigerator, a narrow welfare matter, or a technical pension contribution dispute. The eight PDFs show that the political addressees were informed of a multi-layered human-rights and state-responsibility allegation. The record includes medical catastrophe, disability, alleged state-created loss of work and movement, alleged criminalisation after wrongful decisions, and a compensation chain that allegedly became a financial penalty.

The repeated request to leave Germany or obtain support to live in another democratic country is not presented in the documents as a travel preference. It is presented as a survival and freedom request. The applicant stated that he could not obtain effective protection inside Germany and that his health, dignity and freedom remained tied to German administrative and court control.

The CD/DVD issue is legally important. The 2009 Senate submissions state that two video CDs and two document CDs were attached. Report No. 005 later confirms that DVD/CD material and serious life/health allegations were also referenced in the Bundestag petition context. Evidence carriers in a life-risk, medical and alleged state-crime matter create preservation duties, or at least a duty to document receipt, routing, loss, return or non-review.

The record is therefore best described as a documentary notice chain about alleged state-created disability and dependency: a formerly healthy or less severely damaged person allegedly became severely ill, disabled, medically and socially dependent, financially blocked, and bound to state benefits, while compensation and independent review were allegedly neutralised through procedure, Betreuung and costs.

6. Betreuung / Betreuer Allegations and Compensation-to-Penalty Chain

The Betreuung issue appears as a central factual and legal bridge. The file number repeatedly stated is 50 XVII 7034 / 09. The applicant stated that rights concerning his bank account and court processes were transferred to Betreuer, while the real practical problems - food, health, legal defence, translations, debts, incoming letters and survival needs - remained unresolved.

In the 03.08.2009 "Third Objection" materials, the applicant stated that his Betreuer merely forwarded letters rather than translating, explaining, responding or obtaining counsel. He alleged that the Betreuer did not lift his bureaucratic burden and that this pushed him toward psychiatric institutionalisation. He demanded that his rights not be transferred under pressure and stated that the court had given a Betreuer power to place him in a psychiatric institution without his consent.

The same materials record concrete dates of alleged inadequate Betreuer contact: 15.06.2009 home visit; 03.07.2009 court appointment; 14.07.2009 Ausländerbehörde/AOK assistance; 23.07.2009 meeting with counsel. The applicant stated that only two out of many problems were actually helped in approximately 90 days, while daily official letters continued to create new pressure.

The 10.09.2011 material sent to DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion names a first Betreuer line involving Kaufmann. It states that Kaufmann took back the action concerning the police brawl from August 2009 without the applicant's knowledge and agreement, and that the Betreuer instead revoked the action from the Federal Court under Az. 2 Ars 346/09. These are recorded allegations and require the full internal court and Betreuer file for verification.

The same 2011 material then describes a new Rechtsbetreuer, Mr. Birant Öner, appointed on 15.12.2009 in connection with 50 XVII 7034 / 09, after the applicant filed a damages action on 24.11.2009 concerning the wrong decision Az. 528 Os 49/03 (251 b / 251 a Ds) 52 Js 7/00 (349/00). The applicant stated that the damages action related to the 2005 court recognition of error.

The applicant alleged that Mr. Birant Öner left the court processes to drop and especially did not answer the damages action. The result described in the record is that the applicant learned in December 2010 of a penalty/cost burden of 91,456 EUR. The applicant's theory is that a compensation path arising from the 2005 judicial correction was procedurally converted into a financial penalty, enforcement pressure and bank-account blockage.

File numbers and references appearing in this chain include: 50 XVII 7034 / 09 (Betreuung); 528 Os 49/03 (251 b / 251 a Ds) 52 Js 7/00 (349/00) (wrong decision / 2005 correction context); 2 Ars 346/09 (Federal Court line allegedly revoked by Betreuer); 86 O 633/09 (damages action); 31 M 4683/10 (blocked account / enforcement context stated by applicant); 87 T 91/11 (regional court line); XII ZB 347/11 and XII ZB 484/11 (Federal Court / BGH lines appearing in the 2011 material).

7. Documented Responses, Formal Deflections and Silence

The eight PDFs show three types of institutional reaction: formal acknowledgement with non-intervention; limited administrative referral; and visible silence despite proof of transmission or receipt.

Federal Ministry of Health: the 24.08.2007 reply proves receipt but states that the Ministry generally does not comment on pending court proceedings. This does not show any substantive health-rights review.

Berlin Governing Mayor / Senatskanzlei: the 15.09.2009 response acknowledges the applicant's despair but states that the Governing Mayor cannot influence the judiciary due to separation of powers. Separation of powers may explain why the Mayor could not order a court decision, but it does not automatically answer whether the office could preserve evidence, forward to competent social/health/human-rights bodies, or initiate administrative review.

Berlin Integration/Migration: the 11.08.2009 response states that the matter was unclear partly because the letter was in Azerbaijani and refers the applicant to advisory hours. In a file containing life-risk, severe illness, disability and alleged judicial removal of rights, a mere language/clarity response is legally insufficient unless the record shows translation, emergency review or referral. No such review is visible in the submitted documents.

Berlin Senate / Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner channel: the 07.02.2011 response by Norbert Glaeser focuses mainly on the applicant's wish to leave Germany and refers to the return/continued migration counselling office. It does not visibly address the 1998-2011 chain, 1999 violence, court-error allegations, HIV/AIDS, 80% disability, 91,456 EUR, bank blockage or UN expert request.

DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion: the 12.12.2011 submission and 14.12.2011 receipt establish parliamentary-group notice. No substantive response is visible in the reviewed file. In a matter involving alleged serious state crimes, CD/DVD evidence, health, disability, compensation and ECtHR/UN references, this silence is an evidentiary and legal-political problem.

8. Contextual Link to Reports No. 004, No. 005 and No. 008

This section is not the primary basis of Report No. 9. It is added only after the eight-PDF analysis to connect the present record with earlier documented parliamentary and party/fraktion analyses.

Report No. 004 (Abgeordnetenhaus Berlin) shows that Berlin-level petition handling existed before the 2009 political letters. It records the 05.09.2006 complaint, file 9824/15, later file 1222/16, and subjects including alleged official arbitrariness, detention, medical denial, police treatment, social and housing harm, residence issues, and later refrigerator/benefit/court non-intervention topics. The significance for Report No. 9 is that the Berlin political-administrative level already had a documented history before Merkel, Wowereit, Knake-Werner and other offices were approached.

Report No. 005 (Bundestag petitions) records Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925 and Pet 3-17-11-217-018680. It confirms that the first petition was registered after transfer from the Abgeordnetenhaus and that the second petition concerned social law/support abroad. It also records DVD/CD material and serious life/health/human-rights allegations. The public parliamentary record alone may show only pension or social-law labels, but the documentary bundle shows that the underlying matter was broader and more serious.

Report No. 008 (Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, Claudia Roth and Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group) confirms a separate party/fraktion notice chain. It records that Claudia Roth and the Green Party received direct submissions and that the Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group was later informed. For Report No. 9 the important formulation is: the Green Party and its parliamentary group were also documentarily informed of severe medical, disability, life-risk, police/psychiatric, ECtHR/UN and human-rights allegations. This sentence is included here because the user requested that the Report No. 8 Green Party / Claudia Roth finding be expressly connected with Report No. 9.

Together, the eight PDFs and contextual Reports No. 004, 005 and 008 show that the state and political leadership were not dealing with a refrigerator case. They were documentarily informed of a compensation, disability, alleged criminal-state-harm and human-rights chain. The correct phrase is: according to the documents, they knew through the submissions and parliamentary/administrative channels; the unresolved question is how they handled that knowledge.

9. Legal Analysis under German Constitutional and Statutory Law

Basic Law Article 1(1) - Human dignity: The alleged reduction of a severely ill, disabled person to a bureaucratic object, the alleged conversion of compensation into penalty, psychiatric labelling without adequate review, and failure to treat grave submissions seriously engage the constitutional duty to respect and protect human dignity.

Basic Law Article 2(2) - Life, physical integrity and liberty: The life-risk warnings, severe illness, alleged medical denial, police/psychiatric interventions, detention history and physical deterioration engage life, bodily integrity and liberty. Where offices received such warnings, the issue is whether reasonable protective routing or review occurred.

Basic Law Article 3(3) - Disability discrimination: The documents repeatedly refer to 80% disability and serious illnesses. If the applicant's submissions were downgraded due to disability, psychiatric labelling, poverty, language or foreign origin, equality and disability non-discrimination concerns arise.

Basic Law Article 17 - Right of petition: The record must be assessed not only as registration of petitions, but as content-sensitive handling of grave complaints. A formal petition label cannot lawfully erase severe medical, compensation and human-rights allegations.

Basic Law Article 19(4) - Effective legal protection: If the applicant's legal avenues were repeatedly closed by competence objections, cost barriers, Betreuer action/inaction, compulsory-lawyer issues or formal refusals without substantive examination, effective legal protection is called into question.

Basic Law Article 20(3) - Rule of law: State bodies and parliamentary mechanisms are bound by law and justice. The alleged use of technical closure to avoid addressing grave state-harm allegations requires rule-of-law scrutiny.

Basic Law Article 21 - Constitutional role of political parties: Political parties and parliamentary groups are not ordinary private bystanders when they receive grave human-rights submissions and act inside constitutional political life. At minimum, transparency, preservation and referral duties arise as legal-political responsibilities.

Basic Law Article 38 and Article 45c - Bundestag members and Petitions Committee: Parliamentary representatives and petition mechanisms must not ignore grave evidence. Where a parliamentary group or petition process received such material, internal registration, review and use of oversight tools should be disclosed.

Then-applicable Betreuung law under BGB §§ 1896 ff. (historical framework): Betreuung was meant as assistance and protection, not as removal of legal defence or conversion of a person into silence. The record raises questions of necessity, proportionality, least restrictive support, language/cultural capacity, right to be heard and conflict of interest.

BGB §839 with Article 34 GG / state liability and StrEG compensation logic: Where state decisions are later corrected or an acquittal/compensation basis exists, the compensation path must not be neutralised through costs, procedural barriers or ineffective representation. The alleged 91,456 EUR burden should be examined against state-liability and compensation principles.

StGB §323c - failure to render assistance; StGB §13 - omission; StGB §258 - obstruction: This report makes no criminal finding. However, where concrete life-risk and severe illness were known, simple possible assistance or forwarding was ignored, or evidence carriers/cases were not preserved, these provisions become investigative frameworks. Section 258 requires proof of intentional obstruction and cannot be inferred from silence alone.

10. Legal Analysis under International Human-Rights Law

ECHR Article 2 - Right to life: Life-risk warnings, alleged medical deprivation and the claim that authorities left the applicant in a life-threatening condition engage the state's positive obligation to protect life and to investigate real risks known to authorities.

ECHR Article 3 - Prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment: The allegations of detention abuse, police beating, humiliating treatment, medical/social abandonment while severely ill, psychiatric labelling and coercive dependency require review under Article 3.

ECHR Article 5 - Liberty and security: Immigration detention, alleged arbitrary psychiatric route, handcuffing/transport and restrictions on movement engage liberty and security concerns.

ECHR Article 6 - Fair trial: Repeated technical closures, late rejections, Betreuung-related inability to respond, and the alleged non-examination of compensation claims engage fair-trial guarantees.

ECHR Article 8 - Private life, physical and psychological integrity: Health, disability, psychiatric labelling, personal autonomy, correspondence, bank-account control and the right to shape one's life fall within the protected sphere.

ECHR Articles 10 and 11 - Expression and peaceful assembly: Where the applicant's protests, signs, CD/DVD evidence or public complaint activity were interrupted or pathologised, freedom of expression and assembly are engaged.

ECHR Article 13 - Effective remedy: If repeated serious complaints were received but only formally closed, redirected or unanswered, the effective-remedy issue becomes central.

ECHR Article 14 - Non-discrimination: Disability, illness, foreign origin, language, poverty and psychiatric labelling are relevant discrimination factors.

ICCPR Articles 2(3), 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 26: These cover effective remedy, life, cruel/degrading treatment, liberty, freedom of movement, fair hearing, privacy, expression, assembly and equality.

ICESCR Articles 9, 11 and 12: The record concerns social security, adequate standard of living, medical treatment and the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.

CRPD Articles 5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 25 and 28: The disability dimension is central: equality, access to justice, freedom from degrading treatment, protection from exploitation/abuse, integrity, privacy, health and adequate social protection.

CAT Articles 12, 13, 14 and 16: Allegations of ill-treatment require prompt and impartial examination, the right to complain, redress and prevention of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.

11. Accountability Questions and Required Disclosure

1. What incoming-mail or fax registration numbers were assigned to the 31.03.2009, 06.08.2009, 26.01.2011 and 12.12.2011 submissions?
2. Where are the two video CDs and two document CDs referenced in the 2009 submissions? Were they reviewed, copied, returned, lost, destroyed, or forwarded?
3. Did Angela Merkel's Federal Chancellery create any internal routing note after receiving the 08.09.2009 submission?
4. Did Klaus Wowereit's Senate Chancellery forward the 08.09.2009 matter to health, social, integration, human-rights, petition or police oversight units, beyond the separation-of-powers response?
5. Did Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner's office or the Berlin Senate translate the Azerbaijani-language 06.08.2009 submission, or did they treat it as unclear without translation despite life-risk and human-rights content?
6. Why did the 07.02.2011 response address only the wish to leave Germany and not the full 1998-2011 chain, HIV/AIDS, disability, 91,456 EUR, bank blockage, damages action, or UN expert request?
7. Was the 12.12.2011 DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion submission registered in the parliamentary group correspondence system? If yes, what was the file number and who reviewed it?
8. Were any parliamentary oversight tools used to request files on 50 XVII 7034/09, 86 O 633/09, 2 Ars 346/09, 31 M 4683/10 or the 91,456 EUR enforcement burden?
9. What evidence exists regarding Betreuer Kaufmann's alleged withdrawal of the police-violence action and Mr. Birant Öner's alleged non-response to the damages action?
10. Were the Abgeordnetenhaus and Bundestag petition records connected internally with the direct letters to political leaders and parties, including the Green Party / Claudia Roth chain described in Report No. 8?

12. Final Legal-Documentary Conclusion

The eight submitted PDFs establish documented knowledge, not merely theoretical knowledge. Angela Merkel / CDU as Federal Chancellor, Klaus Wowereit / SPD as Governing Mayor of Berlin, Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / DIE LINKE as Berlin Senator, Berlin Senate structures, the Federal Ministry of Health and the DIE

LINKE Bundestag Parliamentary Group were addressed or responded to in documents containing severe medical, legal, social, human-rights and compensation-related allegations.

The record shows that the issue was not a refrigerator or ordinary welfare matter. It concerned alleged state-created destruction of health, severe disability, 1999 police violence, long denial of medical/social/legal protection, the 2005 correction of an earlier decision, damages claim 86 O 633/09, Betreuung file 50 XVII 7034/09, alleged Betreuer actions/inactions, the 91,456 EUR burden, bank-account blockage, CD/DVD evidence and requests for UN/international expert examination.

Formal replies were given by some offices, but the visible responses do not show a full medical-social-human-rights investigation. The DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion submission was received, but no substantive response is visible. The principal legal request is therefore preservation, disclosure and independent review of the internal handling by each named political and governmental structure.

Report No. 9 should be submitted together with the eight PDFs and, as contextual materials, Reports No. 004, No. 005 and No. 008. The contextual reports show that the same matter existed in Berlin Abgeordnetenhaus, Bundestag and Green Party / Claudia Roth parliamentary-party channels. The cumulative record supports the conclusion that political and institutional actors were documentarily informed of a serious alleged human-rights chain and that their handling must now be disclosed and independently examined.

Appendix A. Evidence Index and Source Register

A.1 Primary eight-PDF source register

D1 - 24.08.07.pdf - Federal Ministry of Health reply (24.08.2007). Acknowledges applicant's 31.07.2007 letter; refuses substantive position on pending court proceedings.

D2 - PDF(19).pdf - Berlin Integration/Migration and related Senate dossier (29.05.2008, 26.03.2009, 06.08.2009, 26.01.2011). Evidence of Senate integration/migration notice, 16 severe illnesses, life-risk warning, CD/DVD evidence, later English complaint and fax proof.

D3 - PDF 2.pdf - Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / DIE LINKE dossier (31.03.2009, 06.08.2009, 26.01.2011, 07.02.2011). Direct submissions to Dr. Heidi Knake-Werner / DIE LINKE / Berlin Senate; includes severe illness, CD/DVD materials, Betreuung, 91,456 EUR, and a limited response referring to return/continued migration counselling.

D4 - 06.08.2009.pdf - Federal Ministry of Health submission (06.08.2009). Azerbaijani-language human-rights submission concerning 50 XVII 7034, medical denial, 1999 police violence, residence and movement restrictions, and request to forward if not competent.

D5 - 01) - Angela Merkel - 08.09.2009.pdf (08.09.2009). Letter to the Federal Chancellor / Bundeskanzleramt describing continuing injustice since 1998, Strasbourg psychiatric treatment, suicide attempt, and request for personal support.

D6 - 01) - Klaus Wowereit - 08.09.2009.pdf (08.09.2009). Letter to the Governing Mayor of Berlin describing continuing injustice by courts, officials and authorities; requests the Mayor to stand behind the applicant's rights.

D7 - 02) - Regierende Bürgermeister von Berlin.pdf (15.09.2009). Senatskanzlei response acknowledging the applicant's desperate situation but declining help due to separation of powers.

D8 - DIE Linke Parti 12.12.2011(1).pdf (10.09.2011 / 12.12.2011 / 14.12.2011). Submission to DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion with Rückschein receipt; attaches ECtHR submission; details the 1998-2011 chain, Betreuung, 91,456 EUR, and request for international expert action.

A.2 Contextual report sources

R004 - ChatGPT Legal Analysis Report No. 004 - Abgeordnetenhaus Berlin. Used only for contextual cross-reference to Berlin petition files 9824/15 and 1222/16 and the earlier Berlin-level knowledge chain.

R005 - ChatGPT Legal Analysis Report No. 005 - Deutscher Bundestag Petition Proceedings. Used only for contextual cross-reference to Pet 3-16-41-8254-022925, Pet 3-17-11-217-018680, Bundestag public archive/voting facts, and CD/DVD evidence references.

R008 - ChatGPT Legal Analysis Report No. 8 - Bündnis 90 / Die Grünen, Claudia Roth and Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group. Used only for contextual comparison showing a parallel party/fraktion notice chain; it confirms that the Green Party/Claudia Roth/Green Bundestag Parliamentary Group were documentarily informed.

A.3 Official legal source register

German Basic Law (Grundgesetz): Articles 1, 2, 3, 17, 19(4), 20(3), 21, 38 and 45c.

Then-applicable German Betreuung law: BGB §§ 1896 ff. historical framework; current law has been reformed, but the report analyses the 2009-2011 materials under the then-used Betreuung terminology.

German Criminal Code (StGB): Sections 13, 258 and 323c as investigative frameworks, not final criminal findings.

German Civil Code / state liability: BGB §839 and Article 34 GG; StrEG compensation logic where official wrongful criminal prosecution/detention correction is relevant.

European Convention on Human Rights: Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: Articles 2(3), 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21 and 26.

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: Articles 9, 11 and 12.

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Articles 5, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 25 and 28.

Appendix B. Suggested Requests for Official Action

11. Preserve all incoming-mail records, fax logs, postal receipt records, internal staff notes, email metadata, paper files, CD/DVD carriers and correspondence relating to the applicant.
12. Disclose the full internal routing history for the submissions to Merkel/Bundeskanzleramt, Wowereit/Senatskanzlei, Knake-Werner/DIE LINKE/Senate, Berlin integration offices, Federal Ministry of Health and DIE LINKE Bundestagfraktion.
13. Disclose whether the CD/DVD evidence submitted in 2008/2009 was reviewed, copied, returned, destroyed, lost or forwarded.
14. Request complete files for 50 XVII 7034/09, 86 O 633/09, 2 Ars 346/09, 31 M 4683/10, 87 T 91/11, XII ZB 347/11 and XII ZB 484/11, including Betreuer actions and court correspondence.
15. Request an independent medical-social-human-rights review of the applicant's disability, health deterioration, social-dependency and compensation-to-penalty chain.
16. Request parliamentary review of whether the direct party/fraktion submissions were connected with the Abgeordnetenhaus and Bundestag petition records.
17. Transmit the report and documentary bundle to competent UN mechanisms and German oversight bodies for preservation and examination.