

## **KATJA SECOND STATEMENT - ENGLISH VERSION**

There is now a 'part two' to the outrageous incidents which took place last weekend, as we have now been able to find out exactly what went down. My client did by no means exaggerate or claim anything incorrect about what he had described to me, his lawyer. On the contrary, the entire incident took place exactly as follows. On Friday after the court hearing, my client was not taken to his normal unit. His cell is on A2, which is on the second floor. He was not taken back to this ward at all, but was instead brought straight from the reception to A0, which is the general reception area. This is where prisoners on remand are taken first and are kept under even tighter observation than usual when they are in custody for longer periods. The client's cell was scanned by search dogs and electronic search devices. The door of the cell was removed and examined to see if anything was being hidden in the door frame. The bed was completely taken apart, they looked for some kind of recording device or a cell phone or a small laptop or some kind of voice recording and playback device. My client was then put under a total contact ban, which means that he was not even allowed to have any contact with the other inmates at first. All his belongings were taken down from his old cell on A2 to the cell in the reception ward. This cell is located in a place in the detention center where he was placed so that it would be impossible for him to hear what was happening outside the prison, as it faces the inner courtyard. It does have a window, but it faces the inner courtyard, so that nothing can be heard from the outside. Indeed, my client was isolated and was not allowed to speak to anyone from his old ward, not even to the other prisoners. As I have already mentioned, this reception ward is under particularly strict surveillance compared to all the other wards. At the time, there were only four or five other prisoners in this reception area, who, according to the client, were not very responsive in terms of their constitution. My client did not know these four to five other prisoners. He hardly made any contact with them either, as they were kept apart anyway. He was not allowed to have any contact at all with any of the prisoners from the other wards, i.e. from A1, A2 to A3. The inmates had no idea where the client was. Yes, the client repeatedly requested to speak to his lawyer, i.e. to me or to his wife. This was completely denied him. The prison staff also refused to call one of the lawyers or inform his wife on his behalf. It was only on Monday morning that a friendlier member of staff was available who cared about my client. He gave him the hint to write a letter to his lawyer and got him a stamp. However, he was not able to arrange a phone call for him either. So the client was

isolated from all the other inmates for the entire weekend. He was in a special, closely monitored area where it was impossible to see or hear what was happening outside the prison. Incidentally, he also learned that a report was written about him once a week. He finally managed to talk to the head of the department on Monday morning, who then hummed and hawed and finally admitted that they deliberately intended to keep him away from this event for his birthday. Essentially, they wanted to prevent any contact being made with the people who were gathering outside the prison for his birthday. My client was all alone on his walkway that weekend. An inmate actually tried to exchange a few words with him from a window. The staff on site intervened immediately and said that the other inmates were not allowed to have any contact with him at all, not even through open windows. The windows to the outside area were probably also kept closed during the gathering on Sunday. There was also an announcement to the other prisoners that the windows were to be kept shut and that they were not allowed to have any contact with the people outside the prison who were speaking or making music.

There is actually a fitness room with a window facing outwards to the side where they could have heard something. It was probably a fellow inmate from this fitness room who had shouted back "freedom". But we don't know for sure. The other prisoners were threatened with a total lockdown of all inmates in the prison or further disciplinary measures if they made contact with the people attending the birthday party. Indeed, as I have said earlier, my client had been isolated. The other prisoners from different wards apparently decided to start a hunger strike on Monday if they didn't get any information about Reiner Fuellmich's whereabouts or health. However, this was prevented because on Monday morning the measures were finally lifted and the client was able to return to his old ward, A2, on the second floor, where he was able to reconnect with the other inmates. The reasoning for the entire operation has still not yet been explained to him. He has requested another interview and an explanation by the prison management. That is still pending. It is quite clear that they obviously wanted to prevent him from finding out about this event for his birthday and, above all, to prevent him from making contact with the people outside the prison. Of course, the prison might justify its decision by claiming that a certain level of security was required, a level of danger that could only be explained by the risk of collusion, rather than the risk of escape. In the case of my client, pre-trial detention has merely been ordered due to flight risk. However, it is increasingly obvious that the primary purpose of the targeted isolation and separation of my client and his transfer to a cell on the ground floor facing the inner

courtyard was to prevent any contact with the people outside the prison or any awareness of the event for his birthday. In the light of the events described, it is highly questionable whether there really had been an anonymous criminal charge for the allegedly prohibited voice recordings. These had already been authorized by the court in written form. The reason for the lifting of the isolation and the relocation of my client may indeed have been the fact that I, as a lawyer, had called the prison on Monday morning to arrange a visit of Reiner Fuellmich for Monday afternoon. It's possible that this was the decisive factor in the prison saying: "Oh, here comes the lawyer, we better restore the 'normal' conditions. At the time being, however, this is still speculation. We are still awaiting a statement on the incident by the management of Rosdorf Prison. In my opinion, the incidents described above in the case of my client clearly indicate incommunicado detention. This is no longer solely solitary confinement. Solitary confinement only means that the client is detained separately from the other inmates. Incommunicado detention, however, means that he was not only isolated in the prison itself, but that he was also cut off from all contact with the outside world. And that was exactly what happened here. That's the completely reprehensible thing about the whole situation. As already stated, he was not allowed to speak to his lawyers or his wife or anyone else, for that matter, for over three days. Then, after three days, he was allowed to write a letter. In my opinion, this very clearly met the requirements for incommunicado detention. Even if the word has very negative connotations, it has to be named here in order to adequately point out that the conditions of detention here no longer met the requirements of the rule of law under any circumstances. That is the current situation at present. If we have any news, we will keep you informed. Good-bye until we report again.