March 25th 2025

Pladoyer by Dr. Reiner Fuellmich's defense lawyer Edgar Siemund on trial day 47
Translation from German to English (Summarized and Key Points):

Defense attorney Edgar Siemund pleas, asserting his role is limited to providing the court with necessary corporate and contractual tools to evaluate whether his client, Dr. Reiner Füllmich, committed embezzlement regarding the funds of a corporate entity that never came into formal existence, or if these accusations are merely figments of the complainants' imagination.

Key Points in Defense

Personal Motivation of the Defense:

The lawyer Edgar Siemund explains his motivation is driven by civic duty, supporting Dr. Füllmich, whom he views as one of the early whistleblowers regarding measures related to the COVID-19 pandemic, along with figures like Prof. Dr. Bhakdi, Prof. Ioannidis, and Dr. Wodarg.

He explicitly mentions he has not billed for his work and is not motivated by financial gain.

Corporate Law Context:

The defense argues that the entity at the heart of the case, the "Corona Foundation Preliminary gUG" (gemeinnützige Unternehmergesellschaft), never existed legally as it was never properly registered.

Consequently, there could be no embezzlement of funds from a non-existent legal entity.

Prosecutorial Issues:

The lawyer criticizes the prosecutor's aggressive pursuit, highlighting irregularities in the investigation, including issuing a "Red Notice" by Interpol for alleged embezzlement before investigations were properly completed.

He notes disparate treatment compared to other involved individuals, notably V.F., whose case was dropped despite similar circumstances.

Chronology of Events:

Detailed chronological overview, emphasizing the arrest of Dr. Füllmich, and procedural irregularities.

FROM THE DESK OF
Daisy Papp
Founder, CEO/President

March 25th 2025

Legal Status and Financial Handling:

Clarifies financial arrangements, stressing that all funds were received into private accounts held jointly by Dr. Füllmich and V.F., not by the corporate entity (which lacked its own bank account).

Asserts there was mutual consent and agreement on how the funds were managed between Füllmich and V.F.

Purpose and Nature of the Group (GbR – Gesellschaft bürgerlichen Rechts):

The original informal partnership (GbR) was created for the purpose of public education and exposure of issues related to COVID-19 policies.

The subsequent "preliminary gUG" was merely a transitional vehicle intended eventually to become a formal foundation, which never materialized due to refusal by authorities to recognize its charitable status.

Implications of Failed Registration:

Because the corporate entity was never legally registered, the intended structure reverted to an informal partnership (GbR), meaning the strict requirements for financial management and fiduciary duties attached to corporate entities did not apply.

Criticism of Prosecution and Court:

Strongly criticizes the prosecution and court for misinterpretation or ignorance of established German corporate law, asserting their stance is legally unsustainable.

Questions the neutrality and impartiality of the court proceedings.

Conclusion of Defense Argument:
There was no fiduciary breach or embezzlement because there was no legal corporate entity, thus no damage or misappropriation occurred under German civil and criminal law standards.

The defense demands a dismissal of all charges and asserts confidence in eventual acquittal based on the legal principle "in dubio pro reo" (benefit of doubt to the accused).