

Wilfrid Schmitz

Lawyer

Lawyer Wilfrid Schmitz, member of the Cologne bar Association

In
Prime Minister of the Federal State of North Rhine-
Westphalia
Mr. Armin Laschet
Landtag Square 1
40002 Dusseldorf

Office in the 52538 Selfkant:

De Plevitz Street

Phone: 02456-5085590

Fax: 02456-5085591

Mobile: 01578-7035614

Mobile Landline No.:

02456-9539054

E-mail: ra.wschmitz@googlemail.com5

The home page is available at:

Rechtsanwalt-Wilfried-Schmitz.de

Control number: 210/5145/1944

VAT number: DE268254583

| |
|---|
| When paying always specify: _____ |
| Account number: _____ |
| When answering always specify: _____ |
| Registration number: 41 / 2019 |

Selfkant, from 30.6.2019

Addressed:

1. Armin Lachet, Prime Minister of the Federal State of North Rhine-Westphalia,
2. Bodo Löttgen, Chairman of the CDU parliamentary group,
3. Christoph Rasche, chairman of the FDP parliamentary group,
4. Monika Düker and Arndt Klocke, Chairman of the GREEN parliamentary group, 5,
- Markus Wagner, Chairman of the AfD parliamentary group

By mail:

armin.laschet@landtag.nrw.de
bodo.loettgen@landtag.nrw.de
christof.rasche@landtag.nrw.de
monika.dueker@landtag.nrw.de
arndt.klocke@landtag.nrw.de
markus.wagner@landtag.nrw.de

On the disenfranchisement of a Jewish mother and her minor child on a Kafka scale in the context of a "multi-billion dollar business" involving children and adolescents.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister Lachette,

in the name and on behalf of my client, the Jewish fellow citizen Mrs. Helene Abrams, Großer Kamp 18, 49328 Melle, I inform you in your capacity as prime minister about a scandalous discrimination against my client, which is apparently motivated by anti-Jewish due to the placement of her child Adrian Jungbluth in

an orphanage by the decision of the youth welfare Department of the district of Minden-Lübbecke.

In this context, I would first like to refer to my client's letter to federal President Frank-Walter Steinmeier dated 19 June 2019 in the **Appendix 1** to this message, the contents of which should give sufficient reason to provide comprehensive clarification of the scandalous behavior of the youth welfare Department of the district of Minden-Lübbecke as well as the background to a series of incomprehensibly arbitrary judgments and conduct of some judges of the Federal state of North Rhine-Westphalia, preferably even within the framework of an investigation committee.

We have decided to take this step because we have to assume by now that the Youth Welfare Department of the district of Minden-Lübbecke will continue to do everything in its power to place my client without a legal right for the benefit of the child's father, who has been legally convicted for his brutal acts of violence to my client's detriment of and has also repeatedly physically abused his son Adrian, de facto without rights. In addition, after so many years of litigation – especially due to strange decisions of the 12th family senate of the OLG Hamm in the family court proceedings, my client has to AZ. II-12 UF 157/18-by now, there is every reason to believe that she will not be heard in court if her story is not now made public.

Before turning to my client's experience and Person, I would like to draw attention to the fact that in the context of the external accommodation of children and adolescents, they have long been talking about a vicious business model that has long since developed into a downright child-robbing Monster without any (effective) public control.

So this is not only about my client, but also about a very fundamental problem that affects the whole society. My client's fate, however, stands out even in this context, because there are numerous very concrete points of contact with her for the fact that she has been and will be deliberately discredited, harassed and formally deprived of her rights on the basis of her Jewish faith.

To confirm the statement that the accommodation of children by third parties has long since become a problem of greatest importance for society as a whole, it is sufficient to enter terms such as "Child theft (mafia)", "child trafficking"

Wilfrid Schmitz

Lawyer

or "billion-dollar business with children" in connection with the term "youth welfare Department" in search engines such as Google or YouTube to come across a long list of publications.

To make clear the "billion-dollar business" in connection with the "privatization" of placing children and adolescents outside the family, I would like to limit myself to the following two publications, so as not to go beyond this open letter:

1.

"Billion-dollar business with home-grown children", available online at:

<https://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article150385271/Das-Milliardengeschaeft-mit-den-Heimkindern.html>

2.

"Privatization and the consequences: why is it necessary to create independent and effective public control (outside the sphere of influence of youth welfare departments and non-governmental bodies of such institutions) for children's and youth homes and transfer of children and youth to such institutions", available on the Internet at:

<https://www.nachrichtenspiegel.de/2019/05/19/die-privatisierung-und-die-folgen-warum-fuer-kinder-und-jugendheime-und-die-verbringung-von-kindern-und-jugendlichen-in-solche-einrichtungen-sofort-eine-unabhaengige-und-effektiven-oeffentliche-kont/>

A printout of these articles, to which reference is made in order to avoid repetition, will be sent to you in **the Appendix 2**.

But please always keep in mind: there are thousands (!) such reports on the Internet, quite a few of these publications come from lawyers, doctors, psychologists and representatives of other professions who have been confronted with the devastating consequences of this misdevelopment by profession or because of their private contacts with victims, have faced the devastating consequences of such a vicious development.

My client's very scandalous experience with representatives of

The Department of youth welfare and justice has long attracted a professional scientific

interest, as follows from the report of representatives of societies on ethics and psychology, for example Society for ethics and psychiatry. Walter von Bayer,

whose annual meeting on April 27, 2019 revealed that he is widely engaged in the" history "of my client (as a "teacher working in Westphalia"), which is also available online at the link:

<http://www.psychiatrie-und-ethik.de/wpgepde/>

A printout of this SEP report will be provided to you in **Appendix 3**, and a full reference will be made to avoid repetition.

Chairman of the SEP, Dr. med. Friedrich Weinberger, also knows exactly what he was talking about in his above-mentioned article, because he is a very respected expert who became known throughout the country, in particular, thanks to his work on the case of Gustl Mollat, see here, among others. video on YouTube " Friedrich Weinberger: the case of Mollat and other", available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yqUZ4ploVNA>

Dr. med. Weinberger, in his psychiatric and psychotherapeutic report on my client dated September 26, 2017, which we will be happy to provide if necessary, summarized (quote):

"Mrs. Helen Abrams, born on 14.9.1971, a mentally healthy, highly qualified professional teacher, full of life, came under surveillance because of the continued accusations by her of her financially unreliable, previously convicted ex-husband to an employee of the youth welfare Department, and then, probably through her, under suspicion in the district court of Rahden, that she is unable to perform parental duties and is not able to provide adequate care for her son Adrian Jungbluth, born 15.04.2009. The immediate reason that she was also affected by psychiatric examinations was due to health "abnormalities" in her son. However, according to the medical expert's opinion, Ms. Abrams did not make any omissions, and accordingly, she was also denied the deprivation of her parental rights and recommended to leave her son in the family.

Nevertheless, with the decision of the District Court of Rahden from 9.12.2016, both parents, including the mother, were deprived of custody of the son, which was transferred to the youth welfare Department. Adrian was placed in an orphanage.

Wilfrid Schmitz

Lawyer

Following the mother's direct objection to the District Court decision, the case went to the Supreme court of Hamm. This was commissioned by Mrs. Möhrle, a specialist in child and adolescent psychiatry, who, based on her by no means universally recognized "deep psychologically oriented basic understanding", blamed Mrs. Abrams for the most serious deficits in her mental health and thus her ability to educate. Subsequently, Ms. Merle provided the Rahden district court with an "excuse" for her previous one, clearly based on bias and false guesses (incorrect) judgments. The undersigned regards the conclusion of Madame Merle as pseudo-scientific, as ideological, and, in spite of its scope, as meaningless.

He comes to recommendations:

1). The deprivation of custody was unfounded in Mrs. Abrams's case. Custody of her son Adrian must be restored to her immediately.

2) the external accommodation of her underage child Adrian Jungbluth, born. 15.4.2009, was also unfounded. The boy must, according to his repeatedly expressed wish, be immediately placed under the care of his mother again..." (unquote)

The fact, that Möhrle's report of "unforgivable malpractice" is so overblown, was also shown by a consistent assessment of the medical couple Jett Limberg-Diers and Joseph J. Diers of Aumühle and 10 other doctors and psychologists, as can be seen from their submission to the Hamburg Medical Association on March 19, 2019, which is transmitted here as **Appendix 4** (but due to the he considerable extent without the annexes referred to it). The unscientific nature of this report was clearly demonstrated by these doctors and reviewers, over which the Judiciary up to the Supreme court of Hamm has simply ignored until today.

The manipulations of youth welfare Department of the district of Minden-Lübbecke are so extensive that they cannot possibly be compressed here. However, so that you can at least have an idea of how degrading my client is treated by this youth welfare Department and the forces exposed to influence on her, I refer here only to my briefs in the Warburg District Court dated June 5, 2019 and June 11, 2019, which I transmit to you **in Appendixes 5 and 5**.

So, the question arises: is this really the "state of law" in which the people of this country – as well as he institutions of justice that want to maintain legal peace - really want to live? Or we have lived for long in a state model "GDR 2.0" with

youth offices that act like a new version of the Stasi?

Does this really correspond to the Ideal of a Liberal rule of Law, whose primary task is to protect the freedom and self-development of a person, if a child is arbitrarily taken away from a loving mother and even accompanied by her (!) contacts at home with her child, who desperately wants to go back to his mother, are monitored and documented in the most thorough way, as if she was a serious criminal who could cut her child's neck at any time?

Is it not clear to everyone that such treatment of a mother who has never harmed anyone can only be perceived as sadism, prescribed and practiced in accordance with the "rule of law", which is ultimately justified by the superficial pseudo-scientific nonsense of inadequately trained employees of the youth welfare Department, which can only be assessed as very discriminatory and biased?

Do we really want the Jewish child's mother to be treated as a serious criminal and separated from her child on the basis of undisputed manipulation and partiality?

Has it become so easy in this country to tear children out of their families and literally the heart out of their mother's breast and injure children just because the youth welfare Department deliberately turns a blind eye to the fact that the child's father is a a legally convicted female thug who has also abused his son Adrian?

Interest in this case will very soon leave the forums of scientific discussions and lectures. We will take care of that. This submission to you, dear Mr. Laschet, represents only the beginning of our efforts to ensure that the interests of my Jewish client and her child are now as widely known as possible.

With best regards

Wilfrid Schmitz
Lawyer