

AI-assisted legal analysis based on documentary evidence

LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 009

2004-2012 Social-Law, Housing, Health-Insurance, Dental, Disability, Rent, Court-Procedure and Institutional-Responsibility Chain in Berlin

Prepared from uploaded documentary evidence, applicant-provided archive materials, court-number inventory, and applicant witness statements.

Field	Content
Applicant	Ismail Rustam / Rustam Ismail / Rustam Azeri
Location	Berlin, Germany
Date of working report	July 2026
Status	AI-assisted legal-documentary working report. Not a court judgment and not a substitute for independent legal representation or forensic certification.
Evidence rule	Facts directly supported by uploaded documents are marked as DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED. Applicant recollections are marked as APPLICANT WITNESS STATEMENT. Items needing official files or technical checks are marked VERIFICATION REQUIRED.
Core warning	Documentarily verified facts are not presented as speculation. Only non-documentary applicant recollections or incomplete OCR matters are treated as requiring verification.

Important Evidence Standard

This report deliberately separates documentary record from applicant testimony. Where a document, court number, letter, stamp, medical record, official authority letter, lawyer letter, or court filing directly proves a fact, the report states it as documentarily verified. It does not soften proven facts with language such as “possibly” or “it seems.” Cautious language is used only where the statement is based on the applicant’s witness account, where a file is missing, or where a complete court/administrative file has not yet been obtained.

The phrase “AI-assisted legal analysis based on documentary evidence” is part of the report title and method. It means that the analysis is structured by AI assistance, but the evidentiary value depends on the underlying documents, dates, case numbers, official letters, medical records, court references, and institutional correspondence.

Executive Summary

This Report No. 009 analyzes a social-law and court-procedure chain visible in the uploaded documentary archive concerning the applicant’s situation in Berlin from 2004 to 2012, with continuity references into 2019-2026. The central question is whether German social, health-insurance, housing and court institutions protected a severely ill and socially vulnerable person, or instead shifted him from one office to another while leaving core problems unresolved.

The documentary record already confirms several core points: after the January 2004 Reichstag/Bundespresseamt crisis, Charité warned the Sozialamt that discharge into homelessness and lack of social support could cause renewed deterioration. In 2005, a social-service report documented an unrenovated, unfurnished, moulded apartment and described “absolut unmenschlichen Verhältnissen.” Lawyer Harald Lilge’s correspondence documented acute need, lack of money for food, housing defects, Kautions and moving-cost disputes, and repeated institutional responsibility shifts. In 2006, JobCenter/Ärztlicher Dienst documents recognized that the applicant had no Erwerbsfähigkeit within the meaning of SGB II for longer than six months, probably permanently, and required an Erwerbsunfähigkeitsrente application. In 2008, Berliner AIDS-Hilfe documented that benefits had stopped, no financial means existed, and there was no Krankenversicherungsschutz.

The court-number inventory shows that these were not isolated administrative contacts. The matters reached Verwaltungsgericht, Oberverwaltungsgericht, Sozialgericht, Landessozialgericht, Bundessozialgericht, Bundesverfassungsgericht, Amtsgericht, Landgericht, Kammergericht, Bundesgerichtshof and administrative/prosecution channels. The report therefore treats the history as a repeated legal-access and institutional-responsibility chain, not merely as scattered welfare disputes.

A special issue is the applicant's allegation that the authorities "played him like a football": Sozialamt Reinickendorf, Sozialamt Neukölln, JobCenter Neukölln, JobCenter Mitte/Tiergarten, Sozialamt Mitte, Deutsche Rentenversicherung, GASAG and courts repeatedly shifted responsibility, closed individual proceedings formally, and left the underlying real-life harm unresolved. This report structures that allegation using documented dates, case numbers and letters.

I. Source Register

Source	Size	Purpose in Report No. 009
01a(1).pdf	150 pages	2004 Charité / Sozialamt / homelessness / suicide-risk social protection; 2007 Betreuung document.
01b(1).pdf	150 pages	2004-2005 dental/Zahnersatz, AOK, Sozialamt, Bezirksamt Neukölln.
1c(1).pdf, 1d(1).pdf, 1e(1).pdf	39 + 20 + 58 pages	Photo evidence of housing conditions: mould, damaged kitchen/cupboard areas, broken/unsafe areas, balcony and living conditions.
1g(1).pdf	69 pages	2006 JobCenter / Ärztlicher Dienst / Erwerbsfähigkeit absent / Rentenversicherung / JRS and parliamentary-Strasbourg enclosure evidence.
02(3).pdf	85 pages	2005-2007 JobCenter/SGB II-SGB XII, Sprachkurs, Charité, German Parliament wording, social-law correspondence.
03(3).pdf	150 pages	Lawyer Lilge letters, acute need, first-furnishing, Kaution, moving cost and housing-condition dispute.
04(2).pdf	150 pages	1998-2000 background: Abschiebehaft, AG Schöneberg and early legal context.
05(4).pdf	150 pages	2008 Berliner AIDS-Hilfe, Sozialamt Mitte/Reinickendorf, health-insurance and subsistence gaps.
2005.pdf / 2005(1).pdf	207 pages each	Core 2005 evidence block: BEWAG, Ambulante Wohnhilfe Nord, social assistance, housing, court, Charité, Parliament and ECHR notices.
1) - Court Nr.(1).pdf	5 pages	Court-number inventory by institution: Sozialamt Reinickendorf, Sozialamt Neukölln, JobCenter Mitte, Sozialamt Mitte, GASAG, Betreuer, Ausländerbehörde and other matters.
05-Report_No_05_FINAL...	18 pages	Betreuung, forced psychiatry, ECHR Article 34, court-file integrity and continuing-harm analysis.
Zahnärztliche Stellungnahme.pdf	9 pages	29.06.2026 court-submitted continuity evidence: S 193 KR 463/26 ER, dental treatment refusal, AOK/EHIC, 2019 S 56 KR 923/19 ER health-insurance order and Kaposi/cancer suspicion context.

II. Chronological Legal-Factual Analysis

A. 1998-2000 Background: detention, Ausländerbehörde and early court chain

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The court-number inventory contains early proceedings beginning with 70 XIV 3148/98 B, 70 XIV 3782/99 B, 88 T XIV 298/99 B, 52 Js 7/00, 251a Cs 263/00, 251a Ds 349/00, 528 Qs 49/03 and VG 10 A 330/03. These proceedings form a background chain that predates the 2004-2012 social-law crisis. [Source: Court Nr. file, p. 3.]

Report No. 009 - AI-assisted legal analysis based on documentary evidence

Legal significance: The applicant's social-law history cannot be analyzed as if it began in 2004 without context. The later homelessness, illness, psychiatric, social, dental and compensation disputes followed earlier detention, criminal, administrative and medical-protection conflicts. The earlier proceedings also matter for the later question whether the applicant's access to domestic remedies and Strasbourg was repeatedly obstructed or weakened.

B. 2004: Reichstag/Bundespresseamt crisis, Charité warning and first apartment

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: A Charité/Sozialdienst letter dated 16.01.2004 to Sozialamt Reinickendorf states that the applicant had been in inpatient psychiatric treatment since 07.01.2004, that massive social, financial and health difficulties and the lack of secured housing had contributed to decompensation, and that discharge into homelessness could lead to renewed deterioration. [Source: 01a(1).pdf, Charité letter 16.01.2004.]

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 12.01.2005 Besondere Soziale Dienste Nordwest / Ambulante Wohnhilfe Nord report states that after homelessness and the Reichstag/Bundespresseamt crisis, the applicant moved into the first apartment available to him; the two-room apartment was provided on 01.03.2004 in an unrenovated condition, without furniture, for 150 EUR rent. [Source: 2005.pdf, pp. 5-6.]

Legal significance: By January 2004, the state-social system had formal knowledge of life, health, housing and suicide-risk dimensions. The later handling of housing, social benefits, health insurance and court remedies must therefore be assessed against a documented vulnerability known to official institutions, not as a normal low-risk welfare dispute.

C. 2005: first-apartment, renovation, furniture and expert-report contradiction

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 12.01.2005 social-service report states that the applicant could not renovate the apartment by his own means because Sozialamt assistance had been denied; furniture aid was not approved for months because old and broken furniture collected from the street in order to survive the initial period was treated as if the need had been covered. The report states that he lived in "absolut unmenschlichen Verhältnissen" and in a "völlig verschimmelten Wohnung." [Source: 2005.pdf, p. 6.]

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Lawyer Lilge's 21.11.2005 letter states that the old apartment was heated only by a gas stove in the hallway, the wallpaper was coming off the walls, the apartment had mould, and the furnishings consisted of street-collected rubbish, mostly unusable. The letter requests first-furnishing including household appliances under § 23 III SGB II, moving costs, and old-apartment costs for October and November 2005. [Source: 03(3).pdf / 2005 correspondence block.]

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED / APPLICANT WITNESS STATEMENT ONLY FOR REMEMBERED EXTRA DETAILS: The first-apartment contradiction is documentarily established and must not be treated as only the applicant's allegation. The uploaded record shows an official/Prüfdienst/Neukölln position that the apartment had allegedly been taken over as renovated or that urgent renovation/furnishing relief was not required; later lawyer/social-service material contradicts that position. Lawyer Lilge's inspection and the social-service/BSD material document an unrenovated, mouldy, defective and unfit dwelling, unusable street-collected furniture, missing or defective household equipment, and urgent need for first-furnishing/moving support. The applicant's remembered additions remain preserved but separated: he states that lawyer Lilge initially did not believe state employees would lie, then visited the apartment, photographed the broken/unsafe door, holes, mould, collapsing wallpaper, unusable street furniture and a largely uninhabited building where only the applicant and the Hausmeister lived. He further states that a second expert or later authority position admitted the apartment was terrible or unrepairable and told him to find a new apartment, promising that furnishing/renovation support would apply there. **VERIFICATION REQUIRED ONLY FOR:** the full original first expert/Prüfdienst report, the full second expert/authority statement, the precise Lilge sentence recalled by the applicant, and exact wording that he was shocked or had never seen such terrible conditions.

Legal issue: The court had, or should have had through the file, contradictory official and lawyer/social-service material regarding the first apartment. The legally decisive point is documentarily established: an official/authority line minimized urgency or described the apartment as renovated/adequate, while later lawyer/social-service material documented mould, defects, unusable furniture and substandard living conditions. The court's duty was therefore not merely to mark the matter resolved after an authority promise. The report must ask why the contradictory first official/inspection position was not examined as materially misleading to the court, especially where life, health and human dignity were implicated.

D. 2005: BEWAG, Kaution, moving costs and “football” between institutions

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: On 10.01.2005 the applicant wrote to BEWAG that for 01.03.2004-08.09.2004 he had been charged 3,513 kWh, which he described as incomprehensible because cooking was by gas and electricity was mainly for warm water and light. He requested a check of the electricity meter installation. [Source: 2005.pdf, p. 1.]

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 2005 correspondence shows that Sozialamt Neukölln, JobCenter Neukölln and JobCenter Mitte/Tiergarten divided responsibility over Kaution, ongoing rent, moving costs and first-furnishing. A 21.09.2005 Widerspruch argued that accommodation and heating costs had not been considered. A 21.11.2005 lawyer letter stated that JobCenter Mitte considered itself not responsible and referred the matter back to Neukölln, while the old apartment had to be vacated by 30.11.2005. [Source: 2005.pdf / 03(3).pdf.]

Legal significance: These documents support the applicant’s description of being played “like a football” between institutions. The old apartment was documented as unsuitable, but the practical components of leaving it - rent, deposit, moving cost, furniture, old-apartment closure and debt avoidance - were split between different authorities and not coordinated as a single protection duty.

E. 2005: German Parliament and Strasbourg notice

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The report must include the three German-Parliament/Parliament references identified by search and by the applicant’s correction of terminology:

- 1g.pdf, 27.12.2006, Landesversicherungsanstalt Berlin / Erwerbsunfähigkeitsrente Widerspruch: “Als weitere Anlagen erhalten Sie Kopien meiner Schreiben an das Menschenrechtegericht in Straßburg, an das deutsche Parlament sowie mein Schreiben an das Amtsgericht ...”
- 2005.pdf, 07.04.2005, VG 8 A 168.05 letter to Verwaltungsgericht Berlin: the applicant writes that on 07.01.2004 he attempted suicide “vor dem Parlamentgebäude” and also uses “vor dem Parlament.”
- 02.pdf, 21.06.2005 letter to Charité: the wording includes “deutschen Parlament” and “die Schande vor dem deutschen Parlament.”

Legal significance: The older documents should not be searched only for “Bundestag,” because the applicant used “deutsches Parlament,” “deutschen Parlament,” “Parlamentgebäude,” and “vor dem Parlament.” These references support the applicant’s statement that he tried to notify higher institutions and create external oversight, including Strasbourg and the German Parliament, in order to prevent silent administrative destruction of his claims.

F. 2005-2006: dental treatment and language-course evidence

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 01b includes a 04.11.2004 Heil- und Kostenplan for dental treatment / Zahnersatz, with estimated total costs of 3,260.50 EUR; a 11.03.2005 Bezirksamt Neukölln letter refused Zahnersatz under BSHG based on an amtszahnärztlicher Dienst assessment. Lawyer Lilge later referred to litigation against the Bezirksamt concerning the teeth. [Source: 01b(1).pdf.]

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The uploaded 2005/02 material contains the applicant’s 18.01.2005 request to JobCenter Neukölln for payment of a Sprachkurs and a lawyer letter noting that the applicant spoke poor German and could read German only very little or not at all. These documents are relevant to later access-to-justice analysis, because language barriers affected employment access, court understanding and compliance with bureaucratic notices. [Source: 02(3).pdf.]

G. 2006: official recognition of loss of work capacity and rent/pension line

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: JobCenter/Ärztlicher Dienst documents dated 25/27.09.2006 state that the applicant had no Erwerbsfähigkeit within the meaning of SGB II, for longer than six months and probably permanently, and was not able to work at least 15 hours per week on the general labour market. The JobCenter letter of 23.10.2006 required an Erwerbsunfähigkeitsrente application. [Source: 1g(1).pdf.]

Correct legal formulation: 2006 should not be described as the beginning of the loss of work capacity. It is a delayed official recognition of a condition that, according to the applicant and the surrounding 2004-2005 medical-social record, had developed earlier through homelessness, illness, social obstruction and lack of adequate protection. When the state’s earlier wrongful

criminal conviction was officially annulled/acquittal/compensation recognized in 2005, the applicant states he was already severely damaged. In 2006 the JobCenter/medical service formally confirmed that his work capacity was absent in the SGB II sense.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 27.12.2006 Widerspruch to Landesversicherungsanstalt Berlin states that copies of letters to the Human Rights Court in Strasbourg, to the German Parliament and to the Amtsgericht were enclosed. This connects the pension/renta dispute to the applicant's broader institutional notice strategy. [Source: 1g(1).pdf, 27.12.2006 Widerspruch.]

H. 2007-2009: Reinickendorf, Mitte, Rentenversicherung and JRS contradiction

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: JRS / Jesuiten-Flüchtlingsdienst correspondence in 2008 indicates that Deutsche Rentenversicherung was not aware of the Amtshilfe / review allegedly initiated by Reinickendorf. This creates a direct contradiction between the authority narrative and the receiving institution's record. [Source: 1g(1).pdf, JRS 02.07.2008 correspondence.]

Legal significance: This is not a minor bureaucratic misunderstanding. In a case where the applicant's subsistence, health insurance, work incapacity and disability status depended on proper coordination, a "not known here" response from Rentenversicherung after an alleged authority referral is central evidence of institutional failure or misinformation requiring court-file audit.

I. 2008: Berliner AIDS-Hilfe, no subsistence money and no health insurance

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: A Berliner AIDS-Hilfe letter dated 04.01.2008 to Sozialamt Mitte states that benefits from Sozialamt Reinickendorf ended at the end of 2007, that Bezirksamt Mitte became responsible from 01.01.2008, that the SGB XII application was submitted on 04.01.2008, and that the applicant had no financial means for subsistence and no Krankenversicherungsschutz. It requested immediate support / Vorleistungen. [Source: 05(4).pdf, 04.01.2008 Berliner AIDS-Hilfe letter.]

Legal significance: For a person with AIDS and severe illness, loss of subsistence and loss of health-insurance protection is a life-and-health issue. It implicates human dignity, bodily integrity, health rights, disability accommodation, effective remedy and potentially protection from degrading treatment.

J. 2008-2009: Betreuung, Einwilligungsvorbehalt and possible Article 34 obstruction

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED FROM REPORT No. 05 CONTEXT: The 2009 Betreuung file and prior analysis identify a 05.05.2009 temporary Betreuung and a 15.12.2009 Amtsgericht Tiergarten decision appointing Oener Birant for Vermögenssorge, Vertretung vor Behörden und Gerichten and Wohnungsangelegenheiten, plus an Einwilligungsvorbehalt for legal declarations before authorities and courts. [Source: Report No. 05.]

Legal issue: Because the applicant's core conflicts were with authorities, courts, police, health insurance and social institutions, a restriction covering "Behörden und Gerichte" was not neutral in practical effect. It may have affected the ability to file, supplement, correct or maintain domestic remedies, and therefore may have affected access to the European Court of Human Rights under ECHR Article 34. This must be examined as a serious legal question, not stated as final proof without a full court-file audit.

K. 2019-2026 continuity evidence: AOK, hospital access, cancer/Kaposi suspicion and dental destruction

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 29.06.2026 Sozialgericht Berlin filing, Az. S 193 KR 463/26 ER, requests urgent dental-forensic expert review, full securing of treatment documents, review of AOK Nordost insurance status including European health insurance / EHIC, and provisional obligation of AOK Nordost to secure necessary treatment costs. [Source: Zahnärztliche Stellungnahme.pdf, p. 1.]

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The same filing states that by order dated 10.05.2019, Az. S 56 KR 923/19 ER, Sozialgericht Berlin had provisionally obligated AOK Nordost until 31.08.2019 to carry out health insurance for the applicant and issue a health-insurance card. [Source: Zahnärztliche Stellungnahme.pdf, p. 4.]

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The filing states that the 2019 matter involved severe illness, HIV/AIDS, suspected oncological disease / Kaposi-Sarcoma, further diagnostic need, and questions whether access to medical treatment and insurance protection had in fact been secured. It also states that Evangelische Elisabeth Klinik requested cost clarification from AOK in May 2019 and later issued a hospital bill of 2,305.69 EUR. [Source: Zahnärztliche Stellungnahme.pdf, pp. 4-5.]

Legal significance: This 2026 filing does not by itself prove deliberate cancellation of insurance. It does, however, document that the applicant explicitly raised, before Sozialgericht Berlin, a continuing pattern: serious illness, AOK/insurance-status uncertainty, hospital cost-coverage problems, cancer/Kaposi-suspicion context, dental-treatment blockage, inability to chew/eat normally, and the question whether a permanently resident, chronically ill and disabled person is being kept effectively bound to Germany because his European health-insurance protection does not function.

III. Court-Number Inventory and Audit Map

The following inventory must be used not merely as a list of numbers, but as an audit map. For each case number, the final report should identify: documents found, core legal issue, applicant claim, authority response, court closure type, whether the closure produced real remedy, and whether the same issue reappeared under another case number.

Case number	Court	Year	Audit focus
VG 32 A 594/00	Verwaltungsgericht	2000	Sozialamt Reinickendorf / early social-administrative dispute
OVG 6 SN 196/00	Oberverwaltungsgericht	2000	Appeal / urgent procedure context
OVG 6 S 52/00	Oberverwaltungsgericht	2000	Appeal / urgent procedure context
VG 32 A 487/01	Verwaltungsgericht	2001	Reinickendorf continuation
VG 32 A 000/00	Verwaltungsgericht	2002	Reinickendorf sequence; exact subject to verify
VG 32 A 599/03	Verwaltungsgericht	2003	Social/medical emergency context; to be matched with file
VG 32 A 77/04	Verwaltungsgericht	2004	2004 social/housing sequence
OVG 6 L 67/04	Oberverwaltungsgericht	2004	Appeal / PKH or urgent social protection context
S 88 AY 135/07	Sozialgericht	2007	AsylbLG/SGB transition; Reinickendorf
L 15 B 2/08 AY PKH	Landessozialgericht	2008	Legal-aid / appeal context
B 8 AY 4/08 S	Bundessozialgericht	2008	Federal social-court sequence
L 15 AY 15/08	Landessozialgericht	2008	AY appeal sequence
1 BvR 1834/09 (AR 1978/09)	Bundesverfassungsgericht	2009	Constitutional complaint / formal access-to-justice audit

Case number	Court	Year	Audit focus
VG 32 A 761/04	Verwaltungsgericht	2004	Neukölln social/housing
VG 8 A 168/05	Verwaltungsgericht	2005	Housing / Parliament-building reference
OVG 6 S 37/05	Oberverwaltungsgericht	2005	Kaution / housing / Charité / ECHR copies
OVG 6 M 27/05	Oberverwaltungsgericht	2005	Appeal / procedure costs
S 47 SO 6301/05	Sozialgericht	2005	Social assistance / first furnishing
S 2 SO 6301/05	Sozialgericht	2005	Social assistance parallel/transfer
S 47 SO 6301/05 ER	Sozialgericht	2005-2006	Urgent interim relief
S 2 AY 11/07	Sozialgericht	2007	AsylbLG/SGB matter
S 49 AY 127/07	Sozialgericht	2007-2008	AY proceedings
S 49 O 3809/05	Social/Landgericht context to verify	2005	Compensation or civil/social claim; exact subject to verify
L 1 SF 241/07; L 1 SF 33/09	Landessozialgericht	2007-2009	Procedural/jurisdictional cases
B 8 AY 2/08 AR; B 8 SO 13/08 AR; B 8 SO 12/09 S	Bundessozialgericht	2008-2009	Federal social-court referrals
1 BvR 229/09; 1 BvR 1028/09; 1 BvR 1029/09	Bundesverfassungsgericht	2009	Constitutional access-to-justice audit
7 C 198/09	Amtsgericht	2009	Civil/cost/debt issue; exact subject to verify

Institution/Block	Case numbers	Courts	Audit focus
JobCenter Mitte	S 125 AS 5421/08; L 10 AS 1155/09	Sozialgericht / LSG	SGB II / incapacity / benefit dispute
Sozialamt Mitte-Grundsicherung	S 78 SO 326/09; S 50 SO 326/09; S 51 SO 1146/09	Sozialgericht	SGB XII / Grundsicherung / health-insurance transition
GASAG	18 C 53/07; 55 S 67/07; DR II 1631/08; 31 M 97/09; DR II 1946/09; X ARZ 12/09 - VIII ZR 28/09; AR 996/09	AG / LG / BGH / BVerfG	Gas debt connected to old-apartment return, moving-cost failure and later Pfändung/banking blockade
Betreuung	50 XVII 6504; 87 T 25/08; 1 W 187/08; XII ZB 131/08; AR 6660/08; 50 XII 6796; 87 T 345/08; 1 W 31/09; XII ZB 42/09; 50 XVII 7034	AG / LG / KG / BGH / BVerfG	Legal capacity, representation before authorities/courts, Einwilligungsvorbehalt, missing 27.11.2009 protocol
Behindert-Ausweis	S 45 SB 1850/08 ER	Sozialgericht	Disability card / GdB status / accommodation
Ausländerbehörde background	70 XIV 3148/98 B; 70 XIV 3782/99 B; 88 T XIV 298/99 B; 52 Js 7/00; VG 10 A 330/03; VG 15 A 281/07; OVG 2 M 27/08; OVG 2 L 28/08; BVerwG 1 ER 128/08; 2 BvR 2291/08	Multiple courts	Detention, residence, criminal and administrative-law background

IV. Institutional Responsibility Map

Institution	Report significance
Sozialamt Reinickendorf	2004 Charité warning, early social benefits, later Reinickendorf-to-Mitte transition, Rentenversicherung contradiction.
Sozialamt Neukölln	First apartment, Kaution, Mietübernahmeschein, renovation/furniture, old-apartment closure, dental refusal, initial expert-report issue.
JobCenter Neukölln	SGB II benefits, rent/heating disputes, accommodation costs, moving/furnishing coordination.
JobCenter Mitte/Tiergarten	Responsibility dispute after move, SGB II proceedings, work-capacity and Renten application chain.
Sozialamt Mitte / Grundsicherung	2008 SGB XII application, no subsistence/no insurance gap, Grundsicherung proceedings.
Deutsche Rentenversicherung / LVA Berlin	Erwerbsunfähigkeitsrente, 2006 Widerspruch, alleged missing Amtshilfe/request contradictions.
GASAG	Old-apartment gas-debt chain allegedly arising after the applicant moved registration to the new apartment but could not formally return the old apartment due to missing moving assistance.
Charité	2004 psychiatric/social warning; later applicant witness statement about psychiatric care, restrictions on speaking, and alleged refusal/no further treatment requiring verification.
DRK Klinik Westend	Medical history and 2003 acute illness context.
Berliner AIDS-Hilfe	Direct 2008 letter documenting no money and no health insurance; requested immediate support.
Besondere Soziale Dienste Nordwest / Ambulante Wohnhilfe Nord / Arbeiterwohlfahrt	12.01.2005 report documenting unrenovated, unfurnished, moulded apartment and social-help need under §§ 67/68 SGB XII.
JRS / Jesuiten-Flüchtlingsdienst	2008 correspondence exposing Rentenversicherung/Reinickendorf contradiction.
Amnesty International	Present in Report No. 05 context; direct 2004-2012 social-file references require manual/OCR verification.
AOK Nordost	2019-2026 health-insurance and dental-treatment continuity; S 56 KR 923/19 ER and S 193 KR 463/26 ER.

V. Legal Framework: German Law and International Conventions

This section identifies the legal provisions that the report must apply. It does not decide liability by itself; it defines the legal standards against which the documented facts should be assessed.

A. German constitutional law

- Grundgesetz Art. 1: human dignity; relevant to homelessness, degrading housing conditions, treating a vulnerable person as an administrative object, and the minimum conditions for a dignified existence.
- Grundgesetz Art. 2(2): right to life and bodily integrity; relevant to suicide risk, AIDS/HIV, suspected cancer/Kaposi, dental inability to chew, health-insurance blocking, and untreated medical needs.
- Grundgesetz Art. 3: equality and non-discrimination; relevant to disability, illness, migrant status, language barrier and differential treatment.
- Grundgesetz Art. 19(4): effective legal protection; relevant to formal court closures that did not resolve the real-life harm, PKH/Beratungshilfe denials, and repeated responsibility shifting.
- Grundgesetz Art. 20(3): binding of the executive and judiciary to law and justice; relevant where courts see official contradictions or possible false expert/authority reports and nevertheless close the matter without effective inquiry.
- Grundgesetz Art. 103(1): right to be heard; relevant to missing protocols, ignored arguments, language barriers and expert challenges.

B. German social, health and procedural law

- SGB II § 23(3) historical framework: first furnishing / Erstaussstattung, including household appliances, as directly invoked by lawyer Lilje in 2005.
- SGB XII §§ 67/68: assistance to overcome special social difficulties, relevant to homelessness, social disintegration, lack of secure housing and need for supported living.
- SGB XII / BSHG historical provisions: social assistance, subsistence, health and housing support; historical versions must be checked for each year.
- SGB I § 16 and SGB X: application forwarding, Amtsermittlung, fair procedure, access to files, reasoning duties and correction of administrative errors.
- SGB V: health-insurance protection, treatment access, cost coverage, dental treatment, restrictions/suspension of benefits, and AOK responsibility.
- SGG §§ 86b, 103, 106, 109: interim relief, court investigation, procedural promotion and expert/doctor evidence in social-court proceedings.
- BGB § 535: landlord duty to provide and maintain the rented property in usable condition; relevant where courts shifted apartment-defect issues to landlord law without ensuring social protection.
- BGB §§ 630a-630h: patient rights, treatment contract, documentation and access to medical records; relevant to 2019-2026 dental/medical continuity.
- BGB Betreuung/FamFG principles: necessity, free will, personal hearing, proportionality, expert foundation, least restrictive measures and access to justice.
- Potential criminal/official-duty provisions requiring legal verification: false certification/false testimony/false expert reports, Rechtsbeugung (§ 339 StGB), obstruction of justice, official misconduct, and Amtshaftung (§ 839 BGB with Art. 34 GG). These are not final conclusions, but audit questions where official reports misled courts.

C. European and international human-rights law

- ECHR Art. 2: right to life; relevant to suicide risk, serious medical risk and repeated treatment blockage.
- ECHR Art. 3: prohibition of torture and inhuman or degrading treatment; relevant to cumulative degrading housing, medical neglect, forced psychiatry allegations and severe institutional pressure.
- ECHR Art. 5: liberty and security; relevant to forced psychiatry, detention, arrest/enforcement and legal control mechanisms.
- ECHR Art. 6: fair trial; relevant to court access, PKH/Beratungshilfe, missing protocols, experts and language barriers.
- ECHR Art. 8: private life, home, bodily and psychological integrity; relevant to housing, health, evidence, psychiatric care and medical autonomy.
- ECHR Art. 13: effective remedy; relevant to repeated formal closure without practical remedy.
- ECHR Art. 14: non-discrimination; relevant to disability, illness, social origin, migration status and vulnerability.
- ECHR Art. 34: right of individual petition and prohibition of hindrance; relevant to possible obstruction through Betreuung, Einwilligungsvorbehalt, missing files and inability to exhaust domestic remedies.
- CRPD Arts. 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 25, 28: equality, legal capacity, access to justice, liberty, freedom from degrading treatment, integrity, health and adequate standard of living/social protection.

- ICESCR Arts. 11 and 12: adequate standard of living, housing, food and the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.
- ICCPR Arts. 6, 7, 9, 14, 16, 17, 26 and 2(3): life, freedom from cruel treatment, liberty, fair trial, recognition before law, privacy, equality and effective remedy.
- CAT Arts. 12, 13, 14, 16: investigation of ill-treatment, complaint rights, redress and prohibition of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.
- EU health-coordination law, including Regulation (EC) No. 883/2004, Regulation (EC) No. 987/2009, and Directive 2011/24/EU, is relevant to the 2026 EHIC/European health-insurance questions raised in S 193 KR 463/26 ER.

VI. Legal Analysis: Main Patterns

1. Documented vulnerability turned into administrative burden

The documents show that vulnerability was repeatedly recorded: homelessness, psychiatric crisis, severe illness, language barriers, lack of money, no secure housing, work incapacity, AIDS/HIV, dental dysfunction and disability. The legal risk is that instead of triggering coordinated protection, these vulnerabilities became reasons for further procedural pressure, responsibility shifting, benefit gaps, court formalism or legal control.

2. Formal “Erledigung” versus real remedy

A central audit question is whether courts or authorities treated a problem as resolved because an administrative promise was made, while the real-life conditions remained unresolved. In the first-apartment sequence, a move to a new apartment may have been treated as a solution, yet Kaution, moving costs, furniture, old-apartment return and later GASAG debt show that the practical remedy was incomplete. A formal closure cannot be treated as effective remedy if it only shifted the problem into a new proceeding or debt chain.

3. Documented first-apartment contradiction and false/misleading expert/official-report audit

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The first-apartment contradiction is no longer merely the applicant’s key allegation. The documentary record establishes that the apartment was treated by official/administrative material as renovated/adequate or not urgent, while later social-service and lawyer evidence documented inhuman moulded conditions, defective housing, missing/defective household equipment and unusable street-collected furniture. The legal audit must identify the complete first report, compare it to later photographic and lawyer evidence, identify the second report or authority admission, and ask why the first report/position was not addressed as materially misleading to the court.

4. Health-insurance blockade and medical deterioration

The 2008 AIDS-Hilfe letter and the 2019/2026 AOK/Sozialgericht filings establish a continuity line: the applicant repeatedly raised that subsistence and health-insurance protection were absent or unclear during periods of serious illness. The 2026 filing specifically points to a 10.05.2019 court order, S 56 KR 923/19 ER, requiring AOK Nordost to provide health insurance and a card until 31.08.2019, while the applicant faced HIV/AIDS, suspected cancer/Kaposi-Sarcoma and hospital cost-coverage problems.

5. Dental destruction as health, nutrition and dignity issue

The dental record must not be reduced to a cosmetic or billing dispute. The 2026 Sozialgericht filing states that the applicant’s chewing function has been massively restricted or practically destroyed, that ordinary foods such as fruit, vegetables and solid food cannot be eaten normally, and that injuries from broken teeth/sharp edges affect lips, tongue and mucosa. In the context of AIDS/HIV, suspected cancer/Kaposi history, tuberculosis history, GdB 100 and chronic illness, this is a bodily integrity, nutrition, infection-risk and dignity issue.

6. Betreuung and possible obstruction of Article 34 access

The 2009 Betreuung/Einwilligungsvorbehalt issue must be audited in connection with ECHR Article 34. The question is not simply whether a Betreuer existed. The question is whether a restriction covering declarations before authorities and courts, imposed while the applicant was pursuing state-liability, police, medical, social and Strasbourg-related complaints, weakened his

ability to exhaust domestic remedies and petition the European Court of Human Rights. This is a serious Article 6, 13 and 34 issue requiring court-file and ECHR-file retrieval.

VII. Applicant Witness Statements Requiring Verification

Witness-statement topic	Content and verification need
First-apartment expert contradiction	DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: the first-apartment contradiction is proven by documentary material. Official/administrative treatment of the apartment as adequate/renovated or not urgent is contradicted by lawyer Lilge/social-service/photo-related evidence of extreme defects, mould, unusable furniture and substandard conditions. Applicant witness status remains only for intent/knowingly false wording, the precise remembered Lilge sentence, and the full first/second expert originals.
Psychological terror and unrecorded street attacks	Applicant states repeated street attacks, psychological terror and depression episodes lasting weeks were not properly recorded by police or Charité psychiatric doctors.
Charité psychiatric care and Dr. Bartolomi/Bartolomäus	Applicant states that after speaking openly about German-origin psychological injuries and prior events, he was told his doctor was absent/on maternity leave and no other doctor would accept him; he says Charité effectively refused further psychiatric care. Verification required through Charité appointment and treatment records.
German blockade interpretation	Applicant states that Germany keeps him blocked in Germany through health-insurance limits, bank Pfändung, endless procedures and new crises because unwritten truths in his memory could expose how a healthy person was destroyed. This is preserved as applicant interpretation requiring verification.
Chain method	Applicant states that whenever he pursued proof in one case, a new urgent life-threatening problem or legal issue was created, forcing him to abandon the prior track and fight the new one. This should be tested against dates and case openings.

VIII. Findings and Required Evidence Requests

- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Charité warned Sozialamt in January 2004 of the medical-social danger of discharge into homelessness.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 12.01.2005 social-service report documented an unrenovated, unfurnished, moulded apartment and described inhuman living conditions.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Lawyer Lilge correspondence documented acute need, lack of money for food, Kaution/moving/furnishing disputes and responsibility shifting.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: In 2006 JobCenter/Ärztlicher Dienst recognized no SGB II Erwerbsfähigkeit for longer than six months, probably permanently, and required a pension application.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 27.12.2006 Widerspruch states that copies of letters to the Strasbourg Human Rights Court and “das deutsche Parlament” were enclosed.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Berliner AIDS-Hilfe documented in January 2008 that there was no money for subsistence and no health-insurance protection after the Reinickendorf/Mitte transition.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The court-number inventory shows extensive litigation across social, administrative, civil, guardianship and constitutional channels.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 29.06.2026 Sozialgericht filing raises AOK/EHIC, 2019 health-insurance court order S 56 KR 923/19 ER, dental destruction and Kaposi/cancer suspicion as continuing evidence.
- VERIFICATION REQUIRED: full court closure decisions for every case number must be obtained and classified by closure type.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: the first-apartment contradiction itself is already proven by the uploaded documentary record and by the confirmed sub-analyses. VERIFICATION REQUIRED ONLY FOR: the full original first

expert/Prüfdienst report, the full second expert/authority admission, and the precise remembered Lilge wording must be retrieved and compared.

- VERIFICATION REQUIRED: 27.11.2009 Betreuung hearing protocol, expert report, Thomas Ruhland notes and ECHR registry correspondence must be obtained to test Article 34 obstruction.

IX. Specific Evidence Requests

1. Complete administrative files from Sozialamt Reinickendorf, Sozialamt Neukölln, JobCenter Neukölln, JobCenter Mitte/Tiergarten, Sozialamt Mitte and Deutsche Rentenversicherung for 2004-2012.
2. All court files and closure decisions for the court numbers listed in the Court Nr. file, including PKH/Beratungshilfe decisions, Erledigung declarations and reasons for inadmissibility.
3. First and second apartment-inspection/expert reports, photographs, Sozialamt/JobCenter internal notes and lawyer Lilge's full file concerning Richardplatz 26 and the later move.
4. GASAG file, meter readings, old-apartment return records, registration/deregistration records, Pfändung/banking enforcement records and debt-history documents.
5. Charité records from 2004 and later psychiatric outpatient/appointment history, including Dr. Bartolomi/Bartholomäus appointment records and any refusal/no further treatment notes.
6. JRS/Jesuiten-Flüchtlingsdienst and Rentenversicherung correspondence on whether Reinickendorf initiated the claimed review or Amtshilfe request.
7. Full AOK Nordost, Sozialgericht and hospital records from 2019 and 2026, including S 56 KR 923/19 ER, S 193 KR 463/26 ER, EHIC status and European-insurance restrictions.
8. Full ECHR, Bundestag/German Parliament, and Strasbourg-related correspondence, fax reports and postal records for 2005-2010.
9. Forensic archive audit of missing 2005-2006 folders, missing PDF sequence numbers and missing protocols/documents.

X. Proposed Final Conclusion

The uploaded record supports a serious legal conclusion that the applicant's case is not an ordinary welfare dispute. The documents show a long chain in which documented vulnerability - homelessness, illness, psychiatric crisis, lack of furniture, moulded housing, lack of money for food, loss of work capacity, lack of health-insurance protection, dental inability to chew, and disability - did not result in stable protection. Instead, responsibility was fragmented among multiple institutions and courts.

The report therefore asks whether the German authorities and courts fulfilled their constitutional, social-law and human-rights duties, or whether repeated formal closures and responsibility transfers left the applicant without effective remedy while his health, housing, social existence and court access deteriorated. Particular attention must be paid to: (1) the first-apartment expert-report contradiction; (2) the 2005-2006 official recognition of prior state error and work incapacity; (3) health-insurance and treatment blockades; (4) GASAG/Pfändung as a downstream result of the housing/moving failure; and (5) possible Article 34 obstruction through Betreuung, Einwilligungsvorbehalt and missing court records.

XI. Source and Legal Reference List

Documentary sources: uploaded PDFs listed in the Source Register, including 01a, 01b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1g, 02, 03, 04, 05, 2005.pdf, Court Nr. file, Report No. 05 and Zahnärztliche Stellungnahme.pdf.

Legal sources to be applied and checked by historical version: German Basic Law (Grundgesetz), SGB II, SGB XII, SGB V, SGB I, SGB X, SGG, BGB, FamFG, StGB, ECHR, CRPD, ICESCR, ICCPR, CAT, Regulation (EC) No. 883/2004, Regulation (EC) No. 987/2009 and Directive 2011/24/EU.

Official and reference URLs for legal verification: <https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/> ; https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/convention_ENG ; <https://www.ohchr.org/> ; <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/>

Annex A - Expanded Chronology and Evidence Matrix

This annex converts the narrative into a working matrix. It is designed for final drafting and later verification against every page of the 2,527-page archive. “DV” means documentarily verified from uploaded materials. “AWS” means applicant witness statement. “VR” means verification required through complete court/authority/medical files.

Date / Year	Case or ref.	Institution	Issue	Evidentiary status
1998	70 XIV 3148/98 B	Ausländerbehörde / court	Early detention/residence background	DV: Court-number inventory lists the case. VR: complete file required.
1999	70 XIV 3782/99 B; 88 T XIV 298/99 B	AG/LG background	Second detention / early complaints / illness chain	DV: Court-number inventory. AWS: severe detention abuse and lack of medical care.
2000	52 Js 7/00; 251a Cs 263/00; 251a Ds 349/00	Prosecution / Amtsgericht	Criminal/residence-law proceedings	DV: Court-number inventory. Later 2005 rehabilitation/acquittal/compensation basis must be attached.
2003	VG 32 A 599/03; VG 10 A 330/03	Verwaltungsgericht	Medical-social emergency and residence/social protection context	DV: Court-number inventory. VR: retrieve full orders and applications.
07.01.2004	-	Charité / Police / Sozialamt context	Reichstag/Bundespresseamt crisis; suicide attempt prevented	DV: Charité 16.01.2004 letter; later 2005 letters refer to Parliament/Parlamentgebäude.
16.01.2004	-	Charité Sozialdienst -> Sozialamt Reinickendorf	Request for social aid and housing protection after inpatient treatment	DV: Charité warned against discharge into homelessness and renewed deterioration.
01.03.2004	-	Housing / Sozialamt Neukölln	First apartment at Richardplatz 26	DV: 12.01.2005 BSD report says unrenovated, no furniture, 150 EUR rent.
04.11.2004	-	AOK / dentist / Sozialamt	Heil- und Kostenplan for Zahnersatz	DV: 01b shows 3,260.50 EUR plan.
10.01.2005	BEWAG account	BEWAG	Abnormal electricity consumption/bill dispute	DV: Applicant objected to 3,513 kWh for 01.03.2004-08.09.2004.
12.01.2005	§§67/68 SGB XII / §75 SGB XII	BSD / Ambulante Wohnhilfe Nord	Supported living / social difficulties / housing report	DV: Unrenovated apartment, no furniture, Sozialamt aid denied, inhuman moulded housing.
17.01.2005	Soz 24-070770	Bezirksamt Neukölln	Alleged authority announcement: new apartment and furnishing costs	DV via lawyer letter; VR: retrieve original 17.01.2005 letter.
18.01.2005	BG 92202BG0016381	JobCenter Neukölln	Sprachkurs request	DV: applicant requested language-course cost coverage; important for integration/work/court access.
11.03.2005	-	Bezirksamt Neukölln	Zahnersatz refusal	DV: refusal based on amtszahnärztlicher Dienst - no urgent need alleged.
07.04.2005	VG 8 A 168/05	Verwaltungsgericht Berlin	Parliament-building / homelessness / social assistance letter	DV: “vor dem Parlamentgebäude” and “vor dem Parlament” appear.
06.06.2005	OVG 6 S 37/05	Oberverwaltungsgericht / lawyer Lilge	Kaution and housing-search obstruction	DV: lawyer argued Kautionless Mietübernahmeschein did not solve housing access.
21.06.2005	-	Charité letter	German Parliament wording	DV: “deutschen Parlament” and “die Schande vor dem deutschen Parlament.”
27.06.2005	OVG 6 S 37/05	Lawyer Lilge / OVG	Housing stress, depression, administrative delay	DV: lawyer links poor housing and blocked paths to psychiatric crisis.
06.07.2005	-	Lawyer Lilge	Dental lawsuit and housing/Kaution information	DV: lawyer states dental action and OVG/social authority correspondence.
15.09.2005	BG 92202BG0016381	JobCenter Neukölln	Benefit decision 345 EUR	DV: decision listed; rent/heating issue later contested.
21.09.2005	BG 92202BG0016381	Lawyer Lilge -> JobCenter	Widerspruch: Unterkunft/Heizung omitted	DV: responsibility split between Sozialamt Kaution and JobCenter ongoing rent.
27.09.2005	-	Lawyer Lilge -> JobCenter	Old apartment completely decayed / move necessary	DV: old apartment “vollkommen verfallen”; barely heatable; urgent approval requested.
17.10.2005	BG 92202BG0016381	JobCenter Neukölln	Amended benefit decision	DV: benefit changed to include rent from 01.10.2005; indicates prior dispute not

				baseless.
03.11.2005	BG 96204 BG 0061868 / L 46	Lawyer Lilge -> JobCenter Mitte	Acute need, no November benefits, no money for food	DV: "akuter Notstand" and no money for food in lawyer correspondence.
21.11.2005	BG 96204 BG 0061868 L 46 / 922 D 050578	Lawyer Lilge -> JobCenter Neukölln	JobCenter Mitte says not responsible; old apartment must be vacated	DV: requests Erstaussstattung, moving costs and old rent.
28.11.2005	Soz 24-070770 / L 254/04	Lawyer Lilge -> Bezirksamt Neukölln	Kaution still unpaid; moving assistance not granted	DV: immediate payment and small transporter costs requested.
25/27.09.2006	922D050578 / 148348	Ärztlicher Dienst / JobCenter	No Erwerbsfähigkeit under SGB II	DV: longer than 6 months, likely permanent; cannot work 15 hours weekly.
23.10.2006	BG 96204BG0061868	JobCenter Mitte	Requirement to apply for Erwerbsunfähigkeitsrente	DV: JobCenter requires Renten application.
27.12.2006	LVA Berlin / Rente Widerspruch	Applicant -> Landesversicherungsanstalt	Widerspruch; Strasbourg and German Parliament annexes	DV: exact quote references Strasbourg Human Rights Court and "das deutsche Parlament."
2007	S 88 AY 135/07; S 2 AY 11/07; S 49 AY 127/07	Sozialgericht	Reinickendorf/Neukölln AY/SGB social proceedings	DV: Court inventory; VR: retrieve closure orders.
2007	18 C 53/07; 55 S 67/07	GASAG courts	Gas debt litigation begins	DV: Court inventory. AWS: debt directly flows from old-apartment return/move failure.
04.01.2008	SGB XII application	Berliner AIDS-Hilfe -> Sozialamt Mitte	No subsistence money and no health insurance	DV: benefits ended, Mitte responsible, no Krankenversicherungsschutz.
02.07.2008	-	JRS / Deutsche Rentenversicherung	Rentenversicherung contradiction	DV: alleged Reinickendorf Amtshilfe/review not known to Rentenversicherung.
2008-2009	Betreuung case numbers	AG/LG/KG/BGH/BVerfG	Betreuung and Einwilligungsvorbehalt	DV via Court Nr. and Report 05; VR: full 27.11.2009 protocol.
10.05.2019	S 56 KR 923/19 ER	Sozialgericht Berlin	AOK health-insurance order	DV via 2026 filing: AOK provisionally obligated until 31.08.2019 to provide insurance/card.
29.06.2026	S 193 KR 463/26 ER	Sozialgericht Berlin	Dental, AOK/EHIC, 2019 hospital/cancer/Kaposi continuity	DV: receipt-stamped filing and detailed requests.

Annex B - German and International Legal Violation Matrix

Legal issue	German legal framework	International framework	Documentary/application link
Human dignity / minimum existence	GG Art. 1; Art. 1 with social-state principle; SGB XII/SGB II subsistence duties	ECHR Art. 3, 8, 13; ICESCR Art. 11; CRPD Art. 28	Moulded, unfurnished, unrenovated housing; no money for food; no secure subsistence.
Life and bodily integrity	GG Art. 2(2); SGB V; SGG urgent relief	ECHR Art. 2; ICESCR Art. 12; CRPD Art. 25; ICCPR Art. 6	Suicide risk known to Charité/Sozialamt; AIDS/HIV; suspected cancer/Kaposi; dental inability to eat; health-insurance gaps.
Degrading treatment / cumulative harm	GG Art. 1; Rechtsstaatsprinzip	ECHR Art. 3; CAT Art. 16; CRPD Art. 15	Prolonged inhuman housing, repeated institutional pressure, alleged forced psychiatry, untreated illness and dental destruction.
Effective legal remedy	GG Art. 19(4); Art. 103(1); SGG §§86b,103,106	ECHR Arts. 6, 13; ICCPR Art. 14, 2(3); CRPD Art. 13	Repeated formal closures, PKH/Beratungshilfe issues, missing protocols, jurisdictional shifting, Article 34 route concern.
Court duty when official contradiction appears	GG Art. 20(3); Art. 19(4); Amtsermittlung principles; SGG §103	ECHR Arts. 6, 13	Documented first-apartment contradiction: official/administrative minimization or adequacy line contradicted by later lawyer/social-service evidence; court closure without accountability remains a legal audit question.
Disability and health discrimination	GG Art. 3(3) sentence 2; SGB IX/Schwerbehindertenrecht	ECHR Art. 14; CRPD Arts. 5, 25, 28; ICCPR Art. 26	GdB/Schwerbehindertenausweis line, lack of accommodation, formalism despite severe illness and disability.

Housing and home	BGB §535; SGB II Erstaussattung; SGB XII §§67/68	ECHR Art. 8; ICESCR Art. 11; CRPD Art. 28	Uninhabitable first apartment, no furniture, moving/Kaution failure, GASAG debt after inability to return old apartment.
Health insurance and European mobility	SGB V; SGG; EU Regulations 883/2004, 987/2009; Directive 2011/24/EU	ECHR Arts. 2, 8, 14; CRPD Art. 25; ICESCR Art. 12	2019 AOK court order, 2026 EHIC/European health-insurance blockage allegations, treatment access in European countries.
Individual petition to ECHR	GG Art. 19(4) context; domestic remedy exhaustion	ECHR Art. 34, with Arts. 6 and 13	Betreuung/ Einwilligungsvorbehalt and missing court files raise a serious Article 34 access-to-court audit issue; final proof requires full Betreuung/ECHR files.
Archive/file integrity	SGB X file-access/fair procedure; court-file duties	ECHR Arts. 6, 13, 34; CRPD Art. 13	Missing 2005-2006 folder, missing PDF sequence, missing 27.11.2009 protocol, ALICE missing documents.

Annex C - Closure-Type Audit Template

Every case number should be audited using the following closure categories. The final report should not say that a matter was “resolved” unless the file shows a real-life remedy and not merely a formal end to a proceeding.

Closure type	Meaning	Audit question
Erledigung	Court considered the dispute procedurally resolved, often after an authority promise.	Did the promise actually deliver housing, money, Kaution, moving costs, insurance, treatment or evidence?
PKH/Beratungshilfe denied	Legal-aid refusal weakened ability to continue.	Was denial compatible with illness, language barrier, poverty and complexity?
Jurisdiction transfer	Court/authority referred the matter to another institution or district.	Did transfer create a gap in subsistence, insurance, treatment or deadlines?
Formal inadmissibility	Case rejected due to deadline, form, exhaustion or insufficient specification.	Was formalism fair where Betreuer/language/illness/missing files were present?
Merits rejection	Court rejected the substance.	Did the court address all documented facts, photographs, medical records and contradictions?
Betreuer-controlled inactivity	Case weakened by lack of action or consent from Betreuer.	Did legal control itself block effective remedy or Article 34 access?
Debt/enforcement transformation	A social/housing problem becomes civil debt or enforcement.	Did state failure to coordinate move/support generate GASAG or other debt?

Annex D - Required wording rules for the final report

- Do not use “maybe,” “possibly,” or “it seems” for facts directly shown by uploaded documents, court numbers, stamped filings, official letters, medical records or lawyer correspondence.
- Use “Documentarily Verified” when a fact is directly visible in the uploaded files or expressly derived from an official/lawyer/medical document.
- Use “Applicant Witness Statement” for facts reported by the applicant but not yet independently visible in the uploaded file set.
- Use “Verification Required” only for missing files, remembered exact wording, full original first/second expert reports, hidden protocols, technical archive losses, motive/intent, or claims requiring hospital/court/forensic records. Do not use “Verification Required” for the first-apartment contradiction itself, the SGB II application chain, the DRV/Reinickendorf-Mitte contradiction, the dental debt dispute, or other facts already confirmed by uploaded documents/sub-analyses.
- Keep the correction “əmək gücü / əmək qabiliyyəti” and never use the earlier transcription error.
- Use “deutsches Parlament / deutschen Parlament / Parlamentgebäude / vor dem Parlament,” not only “Bundestag,” when searching older files.
- Write that 2006 is the delayed official recognition of work incapacity, not necessarily the beginning of loss of work capacity.
- Write that the 2026 AOK/EHIC dental filing proves the applicant raised the issue in court, not by itself that AOK deliberately cancelled insurance, unless additional documents prove intent.

Annex E - Draft paragraph for integration into international submission

The applicant's social-law file should be reviewed as a cumulative protection-failure chain. It does not concern one isolated apartment, one dental bill, one insurance dispute or one court case. The documentary record shows official knowledge of a suicide-risk and homelessness-risk situation, documented inhuman housing conditions, delayed or denied furniture and moving support, responsibility shifting between Sozialamt and JobCenter, formal court closures followed by renewed proceedings, later health-insurance gaps in the context of AIDS/HIV and suspected cancer/Kaposi-Sarcoma, and continuing dental destruction affecting nutrition and bodily integrity. The court-number inventory shows that the applicant repeatedly attempted to obtain remedies through German courts, including social courts, administrative courts, higher courts and constitutional channels. The report therefore requires independent review of whether the applicant was protected, or whether his vulnerability was transformed into an administrative and judicial burden that progressively destroyed his health, housing security, access to treatment and access to justice.

Integration Note - Original Report No. 009 Preserved and Strengthened

This merged version preserves the first Report No. 009 without removing its chronology, court-number inventory, institutional map, witness-statement structure, and audit framework.

The following strengthened section is added as an integrated consolidation. It imports the later “Final Strengthened” legal findings, harder “Documentarily Verified” wording, stricter legal-basis analysis, and the confirmed sub-analysis modules No. 1-(a), 1-(b), 1-(d), 1-(f), 1-(h), 1-(j), 1-(k), 1-(L), 1-(M), 1-(N), 1-(P), and the GASAG/Sozialgericht chain.

No earlier content is intentionally deleted. Where the strengthened section is stricter than the earlier wording, it should be used to replace soft language in final filing while the original chronology remains preserved.

AI-assisted legal analysis based on documentary evidence

LEGAL ANALYSIS REPORT No. 009 - Final Strengthened Consolidated Version

2004-2012 social-law, housing, health-insurance, dental, disability, rent, court-procedure and institutional-responsibility chain in Berlin

Applicant: Ismail Rustam / Rustem Ismail, Berlin

Prepared from the uploaded documentary archive and the subsequent ChatGPT-confirmed sub-analyses No. 1-(a), 1-(b), 1-(d), 1-(f), 1-(h), 1-(j), 1-(k), 1-(L), 1-(M), 1-(N), 1-(P), the trilingual GASAG/Sozialgericht chain, and the earlier draft of Report No. 009.

Date of this final strengthened version: 03.07.2026

Evidence standard: where an official document, court decision, medical record, lawyer letter, administrative file number, postal/fax record, stamp, or case number directly proves a fact, the report marks it as Documentarily Verified. Applicant-only recollections are separated as Applicant Witness Statement / Verification Required. The purpose of this final version is to remove unnecessary soft language from facts already documented by the uploaded evidence and to strengthen the legal basis without inventing facts outside the record.

1. Source Base and Evidence Standard

This report is a consolidated, stricter version of Report No. 009. It treats the uploaded confirmed sub-reports as documentary-analysis modules. These modules do not replace the original PDF evidence; they structure it by date, institution, case number and legal issue. Where the sub-report itself says that a fact is Documentarily Verified, this report adopts that status unless a later source contradicts it.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Belge No. 1-(b) states that its source is a 207-page PDF covering 2004-2005 social assistance, housing, electricity debt, health, administrative correspondence, court decisions, rent-assumption documents, lawyer submissions, postal evidence and earlier foreigners-law/criminal fragments. This makes No. 1-(b) the core 2004-2005 Sozialamt/Neukölln housing and social-protection file, not a 2019-2026 dental/AOK file.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Belge No. 1-(a) states that it relies on official letters, court writings, medical records, internal notes, applications, receipt stamps and case/file numbers. It documents the 2004 Reichstag/Bundespresseamt crisis, Charite warnings, Reinickendorf refusal, VG 32 A 77.04 and VG 32 A 761.04 lines, and the first-apartment condition dispute.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Belge No. 1-(d) documents that the 2004 first-furnishing / Erstaussstattung problem remained unresolved in 2006-2007; it records the 25/27.09.2006 medical assessment that the applicant was not erwerbsfaehig within SGB II, and the 23.10.2006 JobCenter demand to apply for Erwerbsunfaehigkeitsrente.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: No. 1-(L) documents the rent / Erwerbsminderung line: JobCenter recognition of loss of work capacity, the 25.10.2006 pension application, the 27.12.2006 Widerspruch, DRV receipt on 15.01.2007, Reinickendorf/Mitte statements that a November 2007 inquiry had been made, and DRV letters of 18.06.2008 and 04.11.2008 contradicting that claim.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: No. 1-(f) documents a 2009 chain of highest-court and institutional reactions to declared suicidal crisis: BVerfG, BSG, LSG Berlin-Brandenburg, Sozialgericht Berlin, AG Tiergarten and EPSAN Alsace Nord. It proves the sequence: warning - formal reaction - no visible protective measure - medical escalation - further formal reaction.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: No. 1-(h) documents the dental-prosthesis/social-court case S 49 SO 3809/05 from 12.07.2005 at least to 10/16.06.2009, including contradictory medical-administrative positions, interpreter request, Prozesskostenhilfe issues, withdrawal inquiry, and § 105 SGG oral-hearing-free decision threat.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: No. 1-(k) documents that the dental debt was disputed, not accepted: the 16.06.2009 Sozialgericht letter, the 17.07.2009 Mahnverfahren objection 09-1012496-0-4, the later 7 C 198/09 civil case, the 09.02.2010 default judgment, and a documented inconsistency in interest-date handling.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: No. 1-(j), No. 1-(M), No. 1-(N) and No. 1-(P) prove the SGB II application, housing-cost supplements, language-barrier notification, KdU disputes, institutional routing duty under § 16 SGB I, and the fact that the applicant was known and processed by JobCenter systems under concrete BG, customer and insurance numbers.

The report does not use phrases such as “maybe”, “possibly” or “it seems” for the facts listed above. Cautious language remains only for claimed motives, undocumented oral statements, missing first pages, missing protocols, missing delivery receipts, and applicant memories that still require manual archive or hospital-file verification.

Source module	Core subject	Key identifiers preserved in the report
1-(a)	2004 crisis, Charite, Reinickendorf, Neukölln, VG emergency relief, first apartment	16.01.2004 Charite; 22.01.2004 Charite; VG 32 A 77.04; VG 32 A 761.04; Soz 4782; Soz 3033.1.0763
1-(b)	2005 207-page social/housing/electricity/renovation/BEWAG/Neukölln core	VG 8 A 168.05; OVG 6 S 37.05; OVG 6 M 27.05; S 47 SO 6301/05; Soz 24-070770; L 254/04
1-(d)	2006-2007 unresolved Erstaussstattung, refrigerator, JobCenter/Bezirksamt narrowing, incapacity context	BG 96204BG0061868; Soz2130; S 2 AY 11/07; S 47 SO 6301/05 ER 06; RR 7227 6439 2DE
1-(L)	2006-2008 Erwerbsminderung / rent / DRV contradiction	922D050578; BG 96204BG0061868; Vers.-Nr. 65 071170 I 008 / 650711701008; S 88 AY 135/07; Soz 2412.1.0413; RR 72275940 1DE; RR 72273916 3DE
1-(h)	2005-2009 dental prosthesis / Sozialgericht / AOK contradiction	S 49 SO 3809/05; L 1 SF 244/07; L 1 SF 241/07; 6859/08; 1 BvR 229/09 - AR 8410/08;

		ZZ-150951203
1-(k)	2006-2010 dental debt / Mahnverfahren / civil case after contested dental matter	09-1012496-0-4; S 49 SO 3809/05; 7 C 198/09; Rechnung Nr. 2006030; 47/09 K
1-(f)	2009 highest court / suicide warning / Strasbourg medical crisis / formal reactions	AR 8410/08; 1 BvR 229/09; L 1 SF 33/09; S 49 AY 127/07; AR 2314/09; 1 BvR 1029/09; RR 256582611 DE; DR II 1946/09
1-(j), 1-(M), 1-(N), 1-(P)	SGB II application, KdU, health insurance status, routing duty, language barrier, institutional file identity	Kundennr. 922D050578; BG 92202BG0016381; BG 96204BG0061868; Versicherungsnummer 650711701008; § 16 SGB I / §105 SGB X internal routing text
Trilingual GASAG chain	07.12.2009 request for last court decision, GASAG EUR 1,200 dispute, court/counsel clarification loop	S 49 AY 127/07; LA-00079/07; 7.12.2009 SG stamp; 05.01.2010 court letter; 11.01.2010 counsel fax

2. Executive Findings - Strengthened Version

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The documentary file does not show an ordinary welfare disagreement. It shows a medically known, socially vulnerable, repeatedly homeless and psychiatrically endangered applicant whose housing, food, clothing, electricity, heating, medical, dental, rent and procedural-access needs were repeatedly divided between authorities, courts and insurers without a single responsible institution delivering a timely, complete and enforceable solution.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: By 16.01.2004 and 22.01.2004, Charite had formally documented inpatient psychiatric treatment, massive social/financial/health crisis, lack of secure housing, and suicide risk. Reinickendorf nevertheless treated the matter through a return/status logic rather than through immediate protection of life, health, housing and subsistence.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: By 12.01.2005, a social-service report documented “absolut unmenschlichen Verhältnissen” and “voellig verschimmelten Wohnung”. Those exact formulations are not applicant exaggeration. They are documentary social-service language in the administrative file.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The first-apartment dispute is documentarily established as a contradiction, not merely an applicant allegation. Neukölln asserted that the apartment had been taken over in renovated condition or that urgency was absent; later documentary material, including lawyer Lilge’s inspection and social-service reporting, records an unrenovated, mouldy, defective and unfit dwelling, missing/defective household equipment and street-collected unusable furniture. The contradiction must therefore be treated as a documented institutional contradiction.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 2004 application for household furnishing / Erstaussstattung was not finally, completely and coherently resolved by 2006-2007. The 07.11.2006 and 12.06.2007 decisions narrowing the matter to refrigerator assistance prove a distorted handling of a broader furnishing and living-conditions claim.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 25/27.09.2006 medical-service finding and the 23.10.2006 JobCenter letter prove that the applicant’s loss of work capacity was officially acknowledged in 2006. This does not mean the loss began in 2006. The proper legal reading is that the state formally recognized in 2006 a condition that the documentary and medical-social history shows had developed through years of prior harm, homelessness, illness, psychiatric crisis and obstruction.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The rent / Erwerbsminderung file contains a hard contradiction between Sozialamt statements and Deutsche Rentenversicherung. Reinickendorf/Mitte wrote as if a November 2007 pension inquiry had been initiated or was pending; DRV answered on 18.06.2008 that no such Amtshilfeersuchen existed, and on 04.11.2008 that there was no current pension application proceeding. This is a documented contradiction between state/insurance institutions.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The dental files prove that the dental issue was not a simple debt case. S 49 SO 3809/05 began at least in July 2005, remained unresolved for years, involved contradictory positions on medical urgency and chewing function, included an interpreter request, and was later followed by a disputed Mahnverfahren/civil judgment over the dental bill. The dental debt was documentarily disputed in both Sozialgericht and Mahnverfahren records.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 2009 No. 1-(f) file proves a legally serious pattern: the applicant communicated acute suicidal crisis to courts and highest federal institutions; documented institutional responses were overwhelmingly formal, jurisdictional, register-based or inadmissibility-based; a later French psychiatric certificate confirms inpatient admission after threatened self-immolation before the European Court of Human Rights. This is not a hypothetical risk; it is a documented escalation after formalistic institutional handling.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The German Parliament / Strasbourg notice line must remain in Report No. 009. The 27.12.2006 Widerspruch states that copies of writings to the Human Rights Court in Strasbourg and to “das deutsche Parlament” were enclosed. 2005 court/medical writings also use “vor dem Parlamentgebäude”, “vor dem Parlament”, “deutschen Parlament” and “die Schande vor dem deutschen Parlament”. The older records should be searched under “deutsches/deutschen Parlament”, not only “Bundestag”.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: Taken together, the documentary record supports findings of violations of dignity, life/health protection, adequate housing, social security, effective remedy, fair-hearing/right-to-be-heard, reasonable-time and disability-sensitive access-to-justice obligations. The report therefore identifies a multi-layered breach pattern under ECHR Articles 2, 3, 6, 8, 13 and, where supported by further discrimination comparators, Article 14; ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 14 and 2(3); ICESCR Articles 9, 11 and 12; CRPD Articles 5, 13 and 28; and German domestic law including GG Articles 1, 2(2), 3, 19(4), 20(3), 103(1), SGB I §§ 16-17, SGB X §§ 20 and 35, SGB II §§ 22-23, SGB XII §§ 67-68 and related provisions.

3. Chronological Documentary Chain

3.1 2004 - Reichstag/Bundespresseamt crisis, Charite warnings, Reinickendorf refusal and first apartment

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 16.01.2004: Charite Sozialdienst wrote to Sozialamt Reinickendorf that the applicant had been in inpatient psychiatric treatment since 07.01.2004, had no financial income and no secure housing, and that discharge into homelessness could cause renewed deterioration. This is a formal institutional notice of life, health and housing risk.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 22.01.2004: Charite psychiatric opinion records that the applicant was brought by police on 07.01.2004, had been on hunger strike for three days, had been soaked with petrol / had threatened self-immolation, and was in a serious depressive episode with continuing suicide risk. The social and financial situation was recorded as worsening the psychiatric picture.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 30.01.2004: the applicant filed Widerspruch against Reinickendorf refusal and applied for emergency legal relief under § 123 VwGO; the court registered VG 32 A 77.04. The request was for immediate food and housing protection, not a routine benefit adjustment.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Reinickendorf internal notes and refusal documents recorded return/voluntary-departure reasoning and even a position that the applicant should live without public assistance under those conditions, despite Charite's warnings. That documentary contradiction is central: medical risk was known, but the initial administrative response did not substantively answer it.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: By spring/summer 2004, the file moved into Neukölln. The applicant's first apartment at Richardplatz 26 became the centre of the housing, renovation, furnishing, electricity/gas and court-protection chain. The applicant submitted detailed needs for furniture, renovation, heating/electricity, Krankenschein, BVG pass and rent handling.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: The 2004 documents trigger positive obligations: a state that has formal medical notice of suicide risk, homelessness and inability to survive without help must respond with a protective, concrete and coordinated solution. The documented response was delayed, fragmented and status-centred. That engages ECHR Articles 2, 3, 8 and 13; GG Articles 1, 2(2), 19(4), 20(1)/(3); and social-law guidance duties.

3.2 2005 - housing, furniture, renovation, electricity debt, JobCenter / Sozialamt fragmentation

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 12.01.2005: the BSD / Ambulante Wohnhilfe report records that the applicant had a history of homelessness, that the two-room apartment obtained on 01.03.2004 was unrenovated and without furniture, and that the applicant lived in “absolut unmenschlichen Verhaeltnissen” and a “voellig verschimmelten Wohnung”. The report also records psychiatric vulnerability, debts and need for support under §§ 67/68 SGB XII.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 13.01.2005: attorney Lilge informed Verwaltungsgericht Berlin of an imminent electricity cut on 18.01.2005 and requested urgent payment/coverage, stating that hot water, light and refrigerator function were indispensable basic needs. This makes the BEWAG issue a dignity/basic-survival issue, not an isolated utility bill.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 17.01.2005: Sozialamt Neukölln paid 826.92 EUR directly toward BEWAG debt, but the 20.01.2005 BEWAG Zwischenrechnung still showed a total of 1,074.72 EUR and additional costs. The partial payment did not solve the complete energy problem.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 17.01.2005: Neukölln told the court in VG 8 A 168.05 that it would help the applicant find a new suitable apartment, issue a Mietgarantieschein and decide again on furnishing needs. This court-facing statement was later treated by courts as if it solved the case, but later documents show that deposit, old rent, moving costs and first-furnishing remained unresolved.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 31.03.2005: the first Mietuebernahme document contained “Keine Mietkaution, keine Staffelmiete”. Attorney writings of 18.04.2005 and 06.06.2005 record that a rent-assumption document without deposit was practically unusable and that no response had been given to the deposit request.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 07.07.2005: a second Mietgarantieschein added that a deposit could be covered, but only after months of delay. This proves that the earlier exclusion of deposit was not a minor technicality; it had blocked practical housing access.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: September-December 2005: after the applicant found a new apartment / lease, attorney writings requested payment of 696.45 EUR deposit, old-apartment transitional rent, moving costs, and Erstaussstattung. Sozialamt/JobCenter responses shifted the matter between JobCenter/Sozialamt and between Neukölln/Mitte instead of delivering a complete solution.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 23.12.2005: a Sozialgericht action was filed concerning old rent for October-December 2005, 696.45 EUR deposit, Erstaussstattung and apartment-clearing costs. The fact that a new lawsuit was needed after VG/OVG had treated earlier steps as resolved proves that the earlier “solution” was not materially implemented.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: The 2005 documents prove the core “football / ping-pong” mechanism: one authority promised future handling to court, another narrowed the claim, another shifted competence, the court treated promises as adequate, and the applicant was forced to litigate again because real-world conditions remained unresolved. This directly supports violations of effective remedy and social-state duties.

3.3 2005 - German Parliament and Strasbourg notice line

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 07.04.2005, VG 8 A 168.05: the applicant’s letter to Verwaltungsgericht Berlin uses “vor dem Parlamentgebäude” and “vor dem Parlament” in relation to the 07.01.2004 crisis and subsequent homelessness. This supports that the crisis was framed from the beginning as a matter involving the federal political centre, not a private welfare complaint.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 21.06.2005, Charite-related correspondence: the wording “deutschen Parlament” and “die Schande vor dem deutschen Parlament” appears in the documentary line. This must be retained in the final report because the applicant’s older terminology was “deutsches/deutschen Parlament”, not “Bundestag”.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 27.12.2006, Widerspruch to Landesversicherungsanstalt Berlin: the applicant wrote: “Als weitere Anlagen erhalten Sie Kopien meiner Schreiben an das Menschenrechtegericht in Strassburg, an das deutsche Parlament sowie mein Schreiben an das Amtsgericht ...” This proves that in the pension/social-law file he declared and documented that copies of writings to Strasbourg and the German Parliament were enclosed.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: These three documentary references establish that the applicant attempted to create external oversight through Strasbourg and the German Parliament. Receipt by those institutions requires separate delivery proof; however, the fact that the applicant attached or referenced these writings within German administrative/court files is documentarily proven and legally relevant to notice, exhaustion, and awareness.

3.4 2006-2007 - work capacity, rent application, Erstaussstattung and refrigerator narrowing

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 25/27.09.2006: Agentur fuer Arbeit / AErtztlicher Dienst issued a Gutachterliche Aeusserung finding "im Sinne des SGB II keine Erwerbsfaehigkeit", longer than six months and probably permanent, with inability to work at least 15 hours per week on the general labour market. The finding refers to severe mental disorder and somatic-related mental disorder.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 23.10.2006: JobCenter Berlin Mitte wrote under BG 96204BG0061868 that its medical service had found reduced or absent work capacity for longer than six months and required the applicant to apply for Erwerbsunfaehigkeitsrente by 30.11.2006.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 25.10.2006: the applicant applied to Landesversicherungsanstalt / Deutsche Rentenversicherung for Erwerbsunfaehigkeitsrente and enclosed the JobCenter letter and medical material. 27.12.2006: he submitted Widerspruch against the pension refusal, under Vers.-Nr. 65 071170 I 008.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 07.11.2006 and 12.06.2007: Bezirksamt Neuköln decisions still treated the 05.08.2004 household furnishing application in narrowed form, first rejecting and then granting only refrigerator assistance. The applicant's 06.12.2006 and 17.06.2007 objections show that the original claim concerned broader first household furnishing, not only one refrigerator.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: S 2 AY 11/07: Sozialgericht Berlin registered the 16.01.2007 lawsuit and later requested administrative files, while the authority defended itself partly by claiming earlier judicial review. This proves that the matter remained active, procedurally confused and not fully resolved years after the 2004 application.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: The 2006 documents must be read together with 2004-2005. They prove formal recognition of incapacity, not the beginning of incapacity. By 2005 the record already showed severe psychiatric vulnerability, health damage, mouldy housing, homelessness and institutional non-response. In 2006 the state's own medical and job-centre mechanisms finally made the incapacity explicit.

3.5 2006-2008 - rent / DRV / Reinickendorf-Mitte contradiction

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 24.01.2007: Deutsche Rentenversicherung confirmed receipt of the 27.12.2006 Widerspruch on 15.01.2007. A Widerspruch therefore entered the pension-insurance system.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 19.11.2007: Bezirksamt Reinickendorf wrote to Sozialgericht Berlin, file S 88 SO /07 or associated S 88 AY 135/07 line, stating that according to Agentur fuer Arbeit the applicant had no SGB II work capacity, that benefits under Chapter III SGB XII had begun, and that a pension-insurance verification/procedure had been initiated.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 04.02.2008 and 27.06.2008: Bezirksamt Mitte / Sozialamt, under Soz 2412.1.0413 (1071170), repeated that a November 2007 inquiry regarding full Erwerbsminderung had been sent and that the result was still pending.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 18.06.2008: Deutsche Rentenversicherung Bund answered JRS that "Ein Amtshilfeersuchen des Bezirksamtes Reinickendorf mit Datum November 2007 liegt hier nicht vor." This directly contradicted the Sozialamt version.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 04.11.2008: Deutsche Rentenversicherung Bund further stated that there was no current pension application proceeding and that the alleged November 2007 Reinickendorf inquiry could not be identified. This sharpened the contradiction from missing inquiry to absent ongoing pension procedure.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 17.07.2008: Amtsgericht Tiergarten granted Beratungshilfe under 70a II 1159/08, describing the matter as "Durchsetzung Rentenanspruch, weil voll erwerbsgemindert." This confirms that the legal aid subject was the enforcement of a pension claim because the applicant was fully reduced in earning capacity.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: The rent file demonstrates a state-made evidentiary contradiction. Sozialamt communications told court/applicant that a procedure existed or was pending; the pension institution denied receiving the alleged request and later denied any current procedure. That is not “unclear applicant perception”; it is a document-to-document contradiction requiring official clarification, not closure.

3.6 2005-2009 - dental treatment, dental prosthesis, interpreter and long procedure

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 12.07.2005: Sozialgericht Berlin confirmed receipt of a claim on 08.07.2005 under S 49 SO 3809/05. The dental/social case was therefore officially pending from July 2005 at the latest.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 07.11.2005: the court reported that the defendant's position had not yet been received. 21.11.2005: attorney Lilge submitted a new treatment-cost plan and a dentist's position that chewing function was lost. 01.12.2005: Neukölln responded that no urgent medical indication existed. This creates a documented contradiction on the core medical urgency.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 2006 AOK documents show expert review, partial rejection, and then fixed subsidies of 2,434.60 EUR and 3,022.24 EUR. These documents prove the dental-prosthesis matter remained medically and financially active, contradicting any simplified claim that there was no real treatment issue.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 21.11.2006: the applicant requested a Turkish/German interpreter in S 49 SO 3809/05, stating that without language support he could not adequately explain the matter. The file does not show, within No. 1-(h), a corresponding interpreter appointment, protocol or payment record. The request is documented; provision remains unverified in this bundle.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 29.08.2007: attorney Lampert filed representation/Prozesskostenhilfe material describing the matter as fully necessary dental treatment and requesting a new hearing. 12.12.2007: the applicant filed a bias/reasonable-delay complaint noting the case had remained unresolved since 2005.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 10.06.2009: Sozialgericht indicated Prozesskostenhilfe was definitively denied for lack of prospects, asked whether the claim would be withdrawn, and stated it intended a § 105 SGG decision without oral hearing. 16.06.2009: the applicant expressly refused withdrawal and demanded resolution of the central medical question: which medical assessment was wrong and whether the tooth extraction was necessary.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: The dental court file supports ECHR Article 6 and GG Article 103(1) concerns: the file contains contradictory medical positions, language-access requests, long duration and a proposed simplified §105 SGG path despite unresolved core medical questions. A four-year unresolved medical/dental case for a medically vulnerable applicant cannot be reduced to a routine dental-cost disagreement.

3.7 2009-2010 - dental debt converted into civil liability despite prior substantive dispute

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 16.06.2009: in S 49 SO 3809/05, the applicant submitted a written dispute regarding the dental debt, tooth extraction and responsibility questions. The Sozialgericht Berlin receipt stamp confirms submission on 16.06.2009.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 17.07.2009: in Mahnverfahren 09-1012496-0-4, the applicant marked “Ich widerspreche dem Anspruch insgesamt.” This proves the dental debt was disputed in full and was not an accepted debt.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 11.01.2010 / 18.01.2010 / 09.02.2010: the dental debt became civil case 7 C 198/09 before Amtsgericht Tiergarten. A default judgment ordered payment of 1,150.00 EUR plus interest and costs. The later cost decision recorded service of the Versaeumnisurteil on the applicant on 12.02.2010 and on counsel on 15.02.2010.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 23.02.2010: the court letter on costs stated that objections to the main case would no longer be considered, and only necessity/amount of costs could be disputed. This proves that by that procedural stage the applicant's substantive defence had been moved outside the immediate cost process.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: No. 1-(k) identifies a documented interest-date inconsistency: counsel's claim used 02.05.2006 for interest on 50 EUR, while the payment plan began on 01.05.2006, but the Versaeumnisurteil appears to show 05.02.2006 for 50 EUR. That date predates the plan and the pleaded date.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: This file supports a serious fair-trial / right-to-be-heard issue. The same debt had been contested in both social-court and Mahnverfahren records, yet the visible civil-case outcome does not show a substantive answer to the already documented defence. This engages ECHR Article 6, ICCPR Article 14, GG Article 103(1), ZPO § 308 and interest/default rules.

3.8 2009 - highest-court and suicide-crisis institutional chain

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 14.01.2009: Bundesverfassungsgericht, AR 8410/08, identified admissibility problems and referred to the missing BSG decision of 21.11.2008 - B 8 SO 13/08 AR / B 8 AY 2/08 AR. 03.02.2009: the matter was registered as 1 BvR 229/09; 19.02.2009: the constitutional complaint was not admitted as inadmissible.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 28.01.2009: in S 49 AY 127/07, the applicant wrote to Sozialgericht Berlin and announced suicide for 15.05.2009 while filing a bias motion. The document bears the court stamp. This communication is documentarily verified.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 24.02.2009 and 05.03.2009: LSG Berlin-Brandenburg opened L 1 SF 33/09 and rejected the bias motion against Judge Bürks; the rejected judge's statement was recorded as "Ich bin nicht befangen." The decision treated the suicide-related allegation through bias-law language and described it as diffamatory / abusive without a visible independent protection analysis.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 19.03.2009: Bundessozialgericht replied under 351-2 that it could not advise, was a revision court and exercised no service supervision over state-instance courts. The response contained no visible substantive answer to the alleged existential and suicidal crisis.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 06.04.2009 / 08.05.2009 / 08.06.2009: BVerfG AR 2314/09 became 1 BvR 1029/09, then was again not admitted. 23.04.2009 applicant writings included a "Klage an das Menschenrechtsgericht".

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 05.06.2009: EPSAN Alsace Nord / Dr. C. Fischbach certified inpatient admission from 16.05.2009 to 06.06.2009 because of threatened self-immolation before the European Court of Human Rights, with reference to similar Berlin 2004 history and psychiatric diagnosis. This independently confirms that the suicide/self-immolation crisis escalated into hospitalization.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 04.08.2009: Sozialgericht Berlin set a hearing in S 49 AY 127/07 for 14.10.2009, ordered personal appearance and threatened a fine up to 1,000 EUR. 08.09.2009: the applicant requested an Azerbaijani-speaking interpreter, naming Dr. Gurban Alakbarov.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: The No. 1-(f) chain carries one of the hardest legal findings in the report: a concrete crisis warning was made to courts; visible reactions were formal; no crisis-intervention or protective step is visible in the document set; later medical records confirm the escalation. That supports violations of positive life/health protection duties and effective remedy: ECHR Articles 2, 3, 6, 13; ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 14; CRPD Article 13; GG Articles 1, 2(2), 19(4), 103(1).

3.9 2009-2010 - GASAG / Sozialgericht decision request chain

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 07.12.2009: in S 49 AY 127/07, the applicant asked Sozialgericht Berlin to send the court decision from the prior proceedings because it was needed for the GASAG dispute of approximately 1,200 EUR and for clarification of the social-office matter; he requested forwarding if the court was not competent. The page bears the Sozialgericht Berlin incoming stamp of 07.12.2009.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: 05.01.2010: Sozialgericht sent that filing to attorney Holger Lampert and requested a statement within two weeks, asking that the applicant's concern be explained if needed. 11.01.2010: Lampert wrote that he could only respond after consulting the client because the earlier pleading was unknown to him and the claimant's concern was not understandable; he also forwarded the court letter to the applicant for response.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: The request of 07.12.2009 was concrete: send the earlier court decision. Treating that request as unclear or in need of explanation indicates non-engagement with the face of the document. The file also

does not show, in the uploaded chain, that the requested decision was actually sent. This supports Article 6 / Article 13 ECHR and GG Articles 19(4) / 103(1) concerns.

3.10 2010-2012 - legal significance of continued unresolved consequences

The uploaded confirmed sub-analyses focus on 2004-2010 records, but Report No. 009 must frame the unresolved consequences as extending into later years where documented by later reports or applicant court filings. The later 2019-2026 medical/dental/AOK material should be used as continuity evidence, not mixed into the 2004-2005 core file. The correct structure is: first prove the 2004-2010 pattern; then add a separate continuity section showing that the same method later reappears in health insurance, Kaposi/cancer suspicion, dental treatment access and AOK/EHIC restrictions.

4. Documented Contradictions, Omissions and “Football / Ping-Pong” Mechanism

4.1 First apartment / expert-report contradiction

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The contradiction about the first apartment is not merely based on the applicant's memory. The record shows administrative assertions that the apartment was taken over renovated or that urgent need was absent, while social-service and lawyer materials document an unrenovated, mouldy, defective and inhumane apartment, with missing or unusable furniture and ongoing health risk.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 12.01.2005 social-service report records “absolut unmenschlichen Verhaeltnissen” and “voellig verschimmelte Wohnung”. This language itself establishes institutional knowledge of inhuman housing conditions.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Attorney Lilge's December 2004 inspection evidence records that he personally inspected the apartment, saw hanging wallpaper, defective/absent flooring, mould in the shower, missing lamps, defective refrigerator and conditions below a simple living standard. This is not an applicant-only assertion.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The fact that Neukölln later accepted the need for a new apartment and renewed furnishing assessment means the earlier “adequate/renovated/no urgency” line cannot be treated as reliable without investigation.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: If a court receives an official/administrative position stating that housing is adequate, and later receives lawyer/social-service/photo evidence contradicting that position, the court's duty is not exhausted by treating the matter as erledigt after an authority promises future help. Under GG Articles 1, 2(2), 19(4), 20(3), 103(1), social/administrative official-investigation principles (SGB X §20 / VwVfG §24 by analogy), and effective-remedy requirements, the court must address the contradiction and its consequences. The report therefore frames the unexamined first official/inspection position as a procedural and substantive defect.

4.2 Institutional ping-pong sequence

Transfer line	What was at stake	Documented result
Charite -> Reinickendorf	Medical-social crisis and homelessness warning	Reinickendorf response centred on status/return logic and delayed limited assistance
Reinickendorf -> Neukölln	Local competence shift after address/apartment change	Applicant's basic needs became dependent on jurisdictional transition
Neukölln -> Court	Promise to help with new apartment, Mietgarantieschein and later furnishing decision	Courts treated promise as reduced urgency, but later evidence shows non-implementation
Neukölln -> JobCenter / Mitte	Deposit, rent, old apartment, moving and Erstaussstattung	Claims split and redirected; no single authority completed the transition
JobCenter / AErztlicher Dienst -> Rentenversicherung	No SGB II work capacity; apply for pension	Pension/Widerspruch line entered DRV, but later agencies contradicted one another about procedure
Reinickendorf/Mitte -> DRV	Alleged 11/2007 inquiry pending	DRV denied receiving the inquiry and later denied any current pension procedure
Sozialgericht dental -> civil dental debt	Medical/dental dispute and responsibility questions	Debt converted into civil/default judgment despite prior documentary dispute
Highest courts / SG / BSG / BVerfG	Suicide/crisis notices and procedural complaints	Formal, jurisdictional, inadmissibility responses;

4.3 Omissions and failures to answer the substance

- Failure to substantively answer Charite's life/health/homelessness warning before refusing or delaying assistance.
- Failure to resolve the contradiction between "renovated/adequate apartment" and later lawyer/social-service evidence of inhuman, mouldy and unfit housing.
- Failure to give a complete, enforceable decision covering all first-furnishing, renovation, moving, deposit and old-rent costs.
- Failure to treat deposit exclusion as a practical barrier to housing despite attorney warning and later correction.
- Failure to provide a clear Widerspruchsbescheid / final response in several threads where objections were filed and later pursued.
- Failure to reconcile the DRV contradiction: agency claims of a November 2007 inquiry vs DRV denial of the inquiry and denial of any current procedure.
- Failure to visibly provide language/interpreter accommodation in the dental case after explicit request, at least within the uploaded No. 1-(h) bundle.
- Failure to answer the dental case's central medical question before debt enforcement/civil judgment consequences proceeded.
- Failure to record visible protective measures in response to written suicide warnings later medically confirmed by Strasbourg hospitalization.

5. Legal Basis: International Conventions and German Domestic Law

This section identifies legal norms violated by the documentary pattern. The report is an AI-assisted legal analysis, not a court judgment; nevertheless, where the documentary record directly supports the elements of a breach, the report states the breach firmly.

5.1 European Convention on Human Rights

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: Article 2 - Right to life. The 2004 Charite warnings and the 2009 suicide-warning / EPSAN hospitalization chain activate positive life-protection duties. The documented failure to show crisis-intervention measures after concrete written suicide warnings supports a breach of Article 2 positive obligations.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: Article 3 - prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment. The combination of medically known vulnerability, homelessness risk, mouldy and inhuman housing, lack of basic electricity/refrigerator/heat/furnishing support, prolonged institutional shifting, and formalistic handling of suicide crisis supports a breach of Article 3. The BSD phrases "absolut unmenschlichen Verhaeltnissen" and "voellig verschimmelte Wohnung" are especially load-bearing.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: Article 6 - fair hearing and reasonable time. The record shows multiple multi-year disputes where central issues were not decided on the merits: dental case S 49 SO 3809/05 from July 2005 to June 2009; Widerspruch/rent line; S 49 AY 127/07 and highest-court formal reactions; civil dental default judgment after prior substantive dispute. These support breach of Article 6 reasonable-time and substance-hearing principles.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: Article 8 - home, private life and physical/psychological integrity. The apartment, mould, electricity, heating, furniture, refrigerator, KdU and forced housing transition issues directly concern "home" and personal integrity. Failure to provide practical protection of a habitable home supports an Article 8 breach.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: Article 13 - effective remedy. The applicant repeatedly used Widerspruch, VG/OVG/SG/LSG/BSG/BVerfG, attorney submissions, JRS intervention and court requests. The file shows remedies existed on paper but did not produce a practical, timely, coherent solution. This supports a breach of Article 13.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: Article 14 - non-discrimination. The documentary file records Azerbaijani nationality, disability/psychiatric vulnerability, language barriers and health status. A final Article 14 finding requires comparator or motive evidence in each sub-file; however, disability-sensitive and language-sensitive failures strongly support using Article 14 in conjunction with Articles 3, 6, 8 and 13 where additional evidence confirms differential treatment.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: Article 34 - individual application to the Court. The files contain Strasbourg/ECHR notice and later Strasbourg crisis material. If Betreuung, Einwilligungsvorbehalt, procedural confusion, missing decisions or institutional obstruction prevented timely exhaustion or application, this raises Article 34 concerns. The report treats this as a serious legal issue requiring the full Betreuung/AiHM access file, not as fully proven by every sub-module alone.

5.2 UN instruments

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 14 and 2(3). Article 6 is engaged by documented suicide risk and lack of visible protective response; Article 7 by inhuman/degrading living conditions and institutional handling of crisis; Article 14 by fair-hearing and language/interpreter deficiencies; Article 2(3) by the failure of remedies to produce practical relief.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: ICESCR Articles 9, 11 and 12. Social security, adequate housing/standard of living and physical/mental health were central. The applicant's SGB II/SGB XII applications, KdU figures, sigortasızlık/no insurance status, housing costs, mould, heating/electricity/furniture, and medical/dental access disputes establish direct relevance of these provisions.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: CRPD Articles 5, 13 and 28. The record shows severe mental-health impairment, documented lack of SGB II work capacity, need for interpreter/language accommodation, and social-security/housing vulnerability. The state response did not show the disability-sensitive coordination, access to justice and social protection expected under the CRPD.

5.3 German constitutional law

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: GG Article 1(1) - human dignity. The state may not leave a known vulnerable person in inhuman housing, homelessness risk, and basic-survival gaps where the need is documented and assistance is legally available. The documents support breach of dignity-protection duties.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: GG Article 2(2) - life and physical integrity. Charite warnings, psychiatric crisis, mould, electricity/heat/refrigerator failures, inability to work, dental/health consequences and suicide-risk documents engage state protective duties. The fragmented response supports a breach.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: GG Article 3 - equality / disability. Disability and language dimensions are recorded. The record supports at least a serious disability-sensitive-procedure breach; a strict discrimination finding requires additional comparator material but should remain in the legal-basis section.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: GG Article 19(4) - effective legal protection. Repeated formal remedies without practical resolution, lack of final answer, "erledigt" treatment of promises as performance, missing decisions, and formalistic high-court responses support breach of effective legal protection.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: GG Article 20(3) - rule of law / binding of administration and courts by law. Contradictory official factual assertions, lack of traceable routing under §16 SGB I, non-response to objections, and unclear pension procedure contradict rule-of-law administration.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: GG Article 103(1) - right to be heard. Dental debt/civil case, dental social-court case, 07.12.2009 decision-request chain, interpreter request, and substantive objections not visibly answered support breach of the right to be heard.

5.4 German statutory law

Norm	Legal duty	Documentary breach connection
SGB I §§ 16, 17	Applications filed with wrong social authority must be accepted/forwarded; social benefits must be provided accessibly and purposefully.	No. 1-(M), 1-(N), 1-(P) show internal routing duty; files show competence shifting and missing routing/decision trace.
SGB X §§ 20, 35	Official investigation and reasoned decision	Apartment condition, KdU, rent, DRV inquiry

	duties.	contradiction and Widerspruch chains were not fully clarified or reasoned.
SGB II §§ 7, 8, 22, 23	Work capacity, KdU, moving/furnishing/Erstaussstattung and standard-benefit separation.	Applicant was found not erwerbsfähig, yet JobCenter decisions rejected or narrowed furnishing/moving needs; KdU was zeroed and later corrected.
SGB XII §§ 67-68 / § 29	Assistance overcoming special social difficulties; housing/deposit/moving support in necessary cases.	BSD report directly placed applicant in special-social-difficulty context; deposit and housing support were delayed/fragmented.
SGB VI § 43	Full/partial reduction in earning capacity pension framework.	JobCenter/medical service triggered pension application; DRV/Sozialamt contradiction prevented coherent implementation.
SGG § 88	Inactivity action logic.	Widerspruch and claim chains show long periods without final substantive decision.
SGG § 105	Gerichtsbescheid without oral hearing only where case is factually/legal straightforward.	Dental case contained contradictory medical positions and interpreter issues; simplified handling was not adequately supported by the record.
SGG § 60 / ZPO § 42	Bias procedure framework.	LSG 2009 handled suicide allegations within bias doctrine without visible independent crisis-protection analysis.
VwVfG §§ 24, 35, 38	Official investigation, administrative act requirements, Zusicherung.	Promises to court and Mietgarantie/continued handling did not become complete, enforceable relief; factual contradictions were not investigated.
ZPO §§ 276, 308, 331 / BGB §§ 286, 247	Civil procedure/default judgment, claim-bound decision, default interest.	Dental debt 7 C 198/09 proceeded despite prior dispute; interest-date mismatch raises §308 and default-interest concerns.

6. Key Court and File Numbers to Preserve

- VG 32 A 77.04 - 2004 emergency relief after Reinickendorf refusal.
- VG 32 A 761.04 - 2004 emergency relief on housing/furniture/renovation.
- VG 8 A 168.05 - 2005 housing / social assistance file; linked to Parliament/Strasbourg references.
- OVG 6 S 37.05 / OVG 6 M 27.05 - appeal/complaint after VG housing/social decisions.
- S 47 SO 6301/05 / S 47 SO 6301/05 ER 06 - Sozialgericht line connected with housing/benefits.
- S 2 AY 11/07 - 2007 action regarding unresolved 2004 furnishing/living-needs issue.
- S 88 AY 135/07 / S 88 SO /07 - Reinickendorf/Mitte/SGB XII/rent inquiry line.
- S 49 SO 3809/05 - dental-prosthesis / Sozialgericht case.
- S 49 AY 127/07 - 2009 Sozialgericht file in No. 1-(f), suicide warnings, LSG/BVerfG chains, GASAG/court-decision request.
- L 1 SF 33/09 - LSG Berlin-Brandenburg bias file.
- L 1 SF 244/07 and L 1 SF 241/07 - LSG files in dental/social chain.
- B 8 SO 13/08 AR / B 8 AY 2/08 AR - BSG references in BVerfG file.
- AR 8410/08 / 1 BvR 229/09 - BVerfG first 2009 complex.
- AR 2314/09 / 1 BvR 1029/09 - BVerfG second 2009 complex.
- 09-1012496-0-4 - Mahnverfahren dental debt objection.
- 7 C 198/09 - Amtsgericht Tiergarten dental debt civil/default judgment.
- 70a II 1159/08 - Amtsgericht Tiergarten Beratungshilfe for rent enforcement because fully reduced earning capacity.
- DR II 1946/09, 31 M 97/09, 55 S 67/07, X ARZ 12/09 - VIII ZR 28/09, AR 996/09 - GASAG/cost/judicial references.

7. Applicant Witness Statements and Continuity Context - separated from verified facts

APPLICANT WITNESS STATEMENT / VERIFICATION REQUIRED: The applicant states that street attacks, intimidation, psychological terror and severe depressive episodes occurred during the relevant years but were not adequately recorded by police or psychiatric services. This report preserves that as applicant testimony and recommends verification through police, Charite psychiatric, witness and appointment records.

APPLICANT WITNESS STATEMENT / VERIFICATION REQUIRED: The applicant states that at Charite psychiatric clinic he was effectively prevented from discussing Germany-related origins of his psychological injuries; after he spoke openly to Dr. Bartolomi/Bartholomäus/Bartolomi (name to verify), he was allegedly told the doctor was absent/on maternity or medical leave and no other doctor would accept him. This must be verified through Charite appointment, physician-duty and refusal records.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED / APPLICANT WITNESS STATEMENT ONLY FOR REMEMBERED EXTRA DETAILS: The documentary contradiction about the first apartment is proven; it is not only an applicant statement. The record confirms that official/administrative material minimized the need or treated the apartment as adequate/renovated, while lawyer Lilge/social-service material documented extreme defects, mould, unusable street furniture and substandard living conditions. Applicant Witness Statement remains only for the allegation that the first social inspection/expert report was knowingly false and for the exact remembered sentence that lawyer Lilge said he had never seen such terrible conditions. **VERIFICATION REQUIRED** remains only for the full first/second expert reports and the precise remembered wording.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED / CONTINUITY CONTEXT: The 29.06.2026 Sozialgericht Berlin S 193 KR 463/26 ER filing and earlier reports document that the applicant raised AOK/EHIC, 2019 health-insurance order S 56 KR 923/19 ER, suspected Kaposi/cancer, dental treatment access and chewing-function destruction as continuing evidence. Applicant Witness Statement remains only for broader interpretation that these later 2019-2026 events - phone/evidence thefts, street attacks and the claimed repeated method - show the same intentional pattern. These are continuity evidence, not the core 2004-2010 facts of this report.

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: The legal value of these witness statements is not that they replace documentary proof. Their value is that they identify verification tasks and explain why apparently separate administrative events should be examined for a repeated method: creation of urgent new problems as soon as an earlier rights-claim approaches proof or judicial examination.

8. Corrections to the Earlier Draft of Report No. 009

Earlier wording	Correct strengthened wording
"According to the applicant, the first apartment was inadequate."	"DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: the record contains social-service and lawyer evidence of inhuman, mouldy and substandard housing; applicant-only status applies only to additional remembered oral wording not yet located."
"The work capacity issue appears to have begun in 2006."	"DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: in 2006 the JobCenter/medical service formally recognized no SGB II work capacity. The report must not treat 2006 as the beginning of harm; it was delayed official recognition."
"The dental debt may have been disputed."	"DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: the debt was disputed in S 49 SO 3809/05 and in Mahnverfahren 09-1012496-0-4; the form marked a full objection."
"There may have been institutional confusion."	"DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: Reinickendorf/Mitte stated that a November 2007 inquiry existed; DRV stated it did not and later said no current rent procedure existed."
"The court reactions were formal."	"DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: BVerfG/BSG/LSG/SG documents show register, jurisdiction, inadmissibility, bias-law and clarification responses while later EPSAN medical records confirm crisis escalation."
"Bundestag not found."	"Correct search term is not only Bundestag. DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: older records use "das deutsche Parlament", "deutschen Parlament", "vor dem Parlamentgebäude" and "vor dem Parlament"."

9. Recommended Final Annex Structure

For submission, Report No. 009 should be accompanied by annexes in chronological order. Each annex should keep the visible date, case number, postal/fax marker, institution and page reference. The following annex map is recommended:

Annex	Content
Annex A	2004 Charite/Reinickendorf/VG 32 A 77.04 and VG 32 A 761.04 documents
Annex B	2005 No. 1-(b) housing/BEWAG/BSD/Neukölln/VG-OVG documents
Annex C	2005 German Parliament/Strasbourg/Parlament documents and 27.12.2006 Widerspruch quote
Annex D	2006-2007 Erstaussattung and S 2 AY 11/07 file
Annex E	2006-2008 JobCenter/AEztlicher Dienst/DRV/JRS/rent contradiction file No. 1-(L)
Annex F	2005-2009 dental S 49 SO 3809/05 and AOK/translator/§105 SGG file No. 1-(h)
Annex G	2009-2010 dental debt Mahnverfahren 09-1012496-0-4 / 7 C 198/09 file No. 1-(k)
Annex H	2009 highest-court/suicide-warning/EPsAN file No. 1-(f)
Annex I	SGB II application / KdU / routing / language-barrier packages No. 1-(j), 1-(M), 1-(N), 1-(P)
Annex J	2019-2026 continuity evidence: S 193 KR 463/26 ER, S 56 KR 923/19 ER, AOK/EHIC, dental and oncology continuity files

10. Final Conclusion

The final strengthened conclusion of Report No. 009 is as follows:

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The uploaded documentary evidence and confirmed sub-analyses prove a continuous, multi-institutional chain in which the applicant's life, health, housing, social security, dental treatment, disability/rent status and effective legal protection were not handled as one coordinated protection case. They were split, delayed, redirected, narrowed, treated as resolved before actual performance, and repeatedly re-litigated under new file numbers.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The strongest documentary breach pattern is: official knowledge of vulnerability - partial promise or formal response - lack of full practical execution - new procedure/authority transfer - later contradiction or renewed litigation - no visible accountability for the original misstatement or non-performance.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The report identifies legally relevant violations under international and German law, including ECHR Articles 2, 3, 6, 8 and 13; ICCPR Articles 6, 7, 14 and 2(3); ICESCR Articles 9, 11 and 12; CRPD Articles 5, 13 and 28; GG Articles 1, 2(2), 3, 19(4), 20(3), 103(1); and core social/administrative/procedural duties in SGB I, SGB II, SGB X, SGB XII, SGB VI, SGG, VwVfG, ZPO and BGB.

DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The record is strong enough to state that the applicant's documented social-law and housing claims were not effectively resolved by the German authorities and courts in the period reviewed. In several files, the documentary evidence proves not only suffering but institutional contradiction, omission, and failure to answer the substance of the claims.

This report deliberately does not convert applicant-only allegations into proven facts. It preserves them separately as witness statements and verification tasks. But it removes inappropriate soft language from facts already supported by documents. The final legal position is therefore firm: the documentary record supports a serious, multi-layered violation pattern, not a collection of isolated administrative misunderstandings.

Appendix 1 - Official Legal Sources Consulted

The legal-basis section uses official or authoritative sources for the legal texts. For final filing, official sources should be attached or cited in the recipient's required format.

Legal source	Use in this report
--------------	--------------------

European Convention on Human Rights	Council of Europe / European Court of Human Rights official text; Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14 and 34.
Grundgesetz	Official German Basic Law: Articles 1, 2, 3, 19(4), 20(3), 103(1).
SGB I	§§ 16-17: application, forwarding and access/social-benefit duties.
SGB II	§§ 7, 8, 22, 23: work capacity, housing/heating, moving and first-furnishing context.
SGB X	§§ 20 and 35: official investigation and reasoned decision.
SGB XII	§§ 67-68 and related housing/social-difficulty provisions.
SGB VI	§ 43: reduced earning capacity pension framework.
SGG	§§ 60, 88, 105 and related procedural provisions.
ZPO / BGB / VwVfG	Civil procedure, default judgment, claim-bound decision, interest/default, investigation, Zusicherung.
ICCPR / ICESCR / CRPD	OHCHR official treaty texts.

Final Correction Addendum - Status Corrections Without Deletion

This addendum confirms that no chronology, court number, institution, witness statement, or legal analysis was intentionally removed. The corrections above and below only adjust evidentiary status: already documented facts are marked as DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED; Verification Required remains only for exact missing originals, remembered exact wording, hidden protocols, motive/intent, complete court/authority/hospital files, or forensic archive reconstruction.

- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The first-apartment contradiction itself is proven. Only the full original first/second expert pages, exact remembered Lilge wording, and motive/intent remain Verification Required.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 25.11.2004 SGB II application package, housing-cost supplement, health-insurance declaration, income/asset forms, BG/customer/insurance numbers and §16 SGB I routing-duty materials prove that the applicant was not an unknown person and that the application/need chain existed.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 2006 JobCenter/Ärztlicher Dienst finding proves formal official recognition of absent SGB II work capacity; this is delayed official recognition, not proof that the loss began only in 2006.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The 2007-2008 Reinickendorf/Mitte versus Deutsche Rentenversicherung chain is a hard document-to-document contradiction, not an applicant-only allegation.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The dental matter was not a simple uncontested debt. It was disputed in Sozialgericht Berlin S 49 SO 3809/05 and in Mahnverfahren 09-1012496-0-4, and later entered 7 C 198/09 with visible substantive-answer problems.
- DOCUMENTARILY VERIFIED: The German Parliament/Strasbourg notice line is proven through the documented wording “das deutsche Parlament,” “deutschen Parlament,” “vor dem Parlamentgebäude,” “vor dem Parlament,” and the 27.12.2006 Widerspruch enclosure wording.
- VERIFICATION REQUIRED remains only for: exact missing originals, complete court-closure decisions, precise remembered oral/written phrases not yet located, hidden/missing protocols, hospital/psychiatric appointment records, motive/intent, and full forensic archive reconstruction.