

The Kinder-Robber-Klan

About a Munich justice scandal and corrupt advocates for children

#ChildProtection #Corruption #Munich

That almost half of all marriages are divorced in the so-called Western Developed Countries is known to many around the world. Each of these cases has its own drama and tragedy, especially when children are involved and when there is a separation from one of the two parents. Courts are involved, and judges are busy looking at the claims of the two parties, as well as bringing light to the circumstances of the divorce.

Since the legislation in Germany in recent decades has been changed so unilaterally that mostly the rights and claims of mothers are considered - while fathers mostly have to settle with 14-day overnight visits of their children - there are also here and then rather grotesque divorce cases and which are rarely reported about.

A case from Germany however has a lot to tell in this regard and is worth to taking a closer look at. After all, it contains everything that makes up a real thriller: child robbery, slander, lies, intrigues, corruption, ignorance, almost attempted murder. Even **Inspector Colombo** would have probably enjoyed this case...

It started more than 7 years ago. Olaf K. (name changed) is married at that time with Katja K. from U., they have two children. Like in every marriage there are disputes, one day not really much worse than at other times. His ex-wife leaves the home after a dispute with Olaf K. with one of the children to a friend; Olaf K. leaves with the smaller child. When he returns home in the evening with the younger child happily sleeping, the police welcomes him at the door and tells him that his wife had filed a criminal complaint against him at the nearby police station. They ask him to pack his backpack. Olaf K. is more than surprised, quietly packs his stuff and leaves the apartment escorted by the two police officials.

His wife filed a criminal case against him and even obtained a contact ban because of false statements, as it turns out later. She files later for a divorce during the 6-months contact ban, a divorce that Olaf K. initially warns about, but has no other legal instrument in Germany than to recognize the will of his ex-wife for such.

Olaf K. tried several times to persuade his ex-wife to engage in mediation talks in the weeks before the divorce. An appointment with a well-known lawyer was prepared due to the sole initiative of Olaf K. and to which his ex-wife appeared. But after a short waiting time in the offices of the lawyer she stood up and went outside without any words being said. Even a job offer from Asia - flight already paid - could not be taken by Olaf K. shortly after, since because of the contact ban and hence a complete - and probably intended - lack of any communication, he did not even know at that time whether or not a divorce with child custody proceedings would be upcoming or not.

The public prosecutors rather purposely begin to believe the false statements of the ex-wife, he is even sought for by Interpol for a short time - surely also in Asia - although he is duly registered with distant friends in their house at that time. He is also present there when a police officer on command by the judge and state attorney show up in their illegal and worldwide man-hunt for the so-called 'subject'.

Even a trial in court takes place. There, his ex-wife suddenly states in front of a more than stunned judge - after the divorce, as well as the monetary rewards for child education time is settled in her favor - that she suddenly wants to "take back" her criminal complaint against Olaf K. now. A female police officer as witness confirms in the courtroom that there had not been any evidence of harm whatsoever to the body of the ex-wife at the time when she filed the criminal case at the police station. Olaf K. is officially acquitted from the court; no one can explain the allegedly "slightly reddish skin markings on the neck of the plaintiff", so the judge - markings that are invisible on the photos of the court files.

About half a year after being acquitted by the court, Olaf K. finds a flat through a truly miraculous coincidence, one directly in the eleventh floor of the same house where his ex-wife lives with the children. A stroke of luck, since apartments are very hard to find in that city. So he moved in.

But his ex-wife did not like that at all in the beginning. She shouted and screamed at Olaf K. in the hallway and in front of the children when she found out that he moved in and even ran to the property management to complain there. Olaf K. did not understand any of that, after all he thought she would at least be able to understand that he wanted to be near his children again.

It took a while for the ex-wife to get used to Olaf K. in the upper apartment. Around Christmas of 2014 there were finally reconciliations again, they kissed and also had intimate relationships again for a few months. The Youth Welfare Office confirmed such good relations a few months later when they came to visit - a get together at which the ex-wife and the two children were also present in his upper apartment. The Youth Welfare Department wrote an official report to the court shortly after that the situation was relatively okay again and that the exchange of the two children was organized in mutual agreement between the two in a spontaneous way. The business friend from Asia also witnessed this, since he visits Olaf K. for some days in his flat to also talk about a possible assignment in the far East again, now that the family dust had at least temporarily settled.

Only a few weeks later, the parents of Katja K. came to visit. And they apparently whispered into her ear again that the children should see their father as little as possible, now that he might be earning a good income soon. Olaf K. was mobbed again. Out of nowhere, his ex-wife no longer maintains a mutual and spontaneous exchange of the children and she made it clear to him that there is no interest in his presence again, all while her parents from U. are living with her coincidentally.

Olaf K. is now not only fed up, but must watch the children being mentally broken. He writes several letters to the Youth Welfare Office, also because of child endangerments. Exactly one day after the parents are gone after their yearly three months visit, the Youth Welfare Office replies - and ignores all complaints and letters issued by Olaf K. detailing the many child endangerments over the past months.

Sometime at the end of these months both children are with Olaf K. in his apartment - in the same house where his ex-wife lives - and slightly sick with a minor cold. His ex-wife does not show up once, but instead bombards the school and even runs to the court where she applies for a so-called "release" of the children which she justifies with the claim that Olaf K. would allegedly not possess a sick leave and school exemption from a medical doctor for the elderly child.

Exactly this sick leave plus school exemption however is handed over to the police officer by Olaf K. when they ring the door to actually take his children from his flat, based on false and intentionally so made statements by his ex-wife in front of the court. Olaf K. also sends the doctor's examination letter

with proof of the slight sickness of his sons to his lawyer, as well as to the judge. The judge, in turn, does not answer for a few months because she allegedly was on further educational leave, as she writes. And his lawyer happened to move to another law firm outside of the city - coincidentally at exactly the same time when the children are being illegally taken away from him. Strangely, the lawyer decides to not respond to any of Olaf K.'s letters or phone calls any more until years later when the Bar Association gets involved.

A court hearing is ordered after around five months by the judge. In the meantime, Olaf K. had to file two criminal complaints against his ex-wife, he writes several complaints to the court as well and a request for the release of both children from his ex-wife's home because she willingly and knowingly decided to undermine any contact with the father for around five months.

Olaf K. also tried to find a new lawyer for himself and his children, of course. But in the tightly-knit Southern German City, that was not such an easy task. A neighbour recommended a lawyer who Olaf K. meets three times. Each time the matter is postponed after very short talks mostly due to economic reasons - and also because he needs a paper from the court which guarantees him monetary support. When he finally had acquired the document, he is looked at a bit strange in the law office and the case is then rejected, also because the lawyer is in good hope and leaves for baby vacation. Another lawyer would not be available, so the statements.

Olaf K. meets two additional lawyers, the first has no interest because of economic reasons. At another law firm his case folder stays idle for almost three weeks and then needs to be almost sued for being returned to Olaf K. A first conversation had actually been arranged for, but after an initial discussion the case had been simply ignored by the law office.

Finally, Olaf K. finds a lawyer from one of the richest areas in Germany. However, after he is officially and validly appointed as the lawyer representing Olaf K., he decides to simply not appear at the upcoming hearing at the family court. Even more so, he does not hesitate a few weeks later to present a legal bill over 600 € to the court for his not-appearing - charges that even the district court later complains about. Also, a personal meeting with this lawyer never really takes place for all sorts of reasons and at some point the lawyer tells Olaf K. that he should look for "another one". Olaf K. keeps contacting lawyers now and then, mostly things are rejected because of financial reasons in the rather wealthy city.

Sometime before the next court hearing the story reaches one of its highlights. Because of the several times that Olaf K. had witnessed evidence of child endangerments - and whose detailed descriptions were completely ignored by the local Youth Welfare Office - he sees no other option than to tape an extreme incident with his ex-wife and one of the children. A few days before the court hearing Olaf K. has a meeting with the children's official legal counsel - a social worker and lawyer - and presents to him the recordings.

One would assume that the officials finally become active now, but instead the opposite happens.

Olaf K. is barked at by the legal counsel that he should refrain from such recordings. Olaf K. is outraged, he writes shortly before the upcoming court hearing a complaint to the judge. But the judge ignores more or less the recordings, and threatens Olaf K. at the court hearing that such recordings would be illegal and should never be made again.

After five months of horror for Olaf K., any of the previously happened incidents and endangerments of the children are pretty much ignored. Instead, a new contact arrangement is issued. The judge has to even order an external contact supervisor to organize the handover of the children, because Katja K. was and is unable to bring them to Olaf K. According to the new regulation, a contact supervisor arrives every 14 days at the weekends, rings at the second floor, picks up the children there, heads with them to the elevator, presses the button and rides nine floors upwards where he delivers the children at the father's doormat. He rings there 36 hours later again to bring the children back to the second floor.

The Catholic Church is also involved in the matter. Since both children were baptized in the Catholic Church, Olaf K. wrote a confidential letter with explanations regarding the legal scandal to the local archbishop. This letter was personally handed over to him by one of his deacons. Then, at the court hearing five months later, a Youth Welfare Office staff member suddenly and out of nowhere stands up and screams out loud in the court room that Olaf K. would allegedly write "hate-letters against the Youth Welfare Office to Cardinal M." (Quote staff member).

In addition, the contact supervisor - a so-called "Advocate for the Children" as he calls himself - turns out to be anything but this shortly after his appointment by the judge. The first contact with the children is arranged almost one month after the new agreement is crafted at the court meeting. A handover of the children two weeks earlier at Christmas was intentionally arranged without an overnight stay at the father. One of the sons cries and begs, because after five months he finally wants to stay longer with his dad. But the contact supervisor has no mercy on the evening of the first Christmas Day. The boy has to go down again, although the court arrangement clearly states that the children are to stay overnight with their father every 14 days.

After a few weeks, the contact supervisor begins to arrive at highly unpredictable times. Longer talks with Olaf K. are not made possible by him on purpose. After about eight weeks, the contact supervisor issues his first written report to the court - a document full of so many lies and wrong statements that Olaf K. is forced to not only write a complaint to the court, but even a criminal complaint for defamation and coercion at the local Public Prosecutor's Office.

When he begins to file criminal charges also against employees of the Youth Welfare Department, an invitation letter from the criminal police department flies Olaf K. into his mailbox. The interested and friendly official questions him calmly and objectively regarding the Youth Welfare Department and his ex-wife a few weeks later. Nevertheless, after talking with Olaf K. for almost an hour, the officer needed to take a deep breath outside in the fresh air and smoke a long cigarette.

In the meantime, Olaf K. is also rejected the basic income by the German Employment Office to secure his living expenses now and then. This is nothing new to him, his basic income was denied for a total of eight months exactly after he moved back into the vicinity of the children. Even a threat of criminal charges did not change much at the German Job Center at that time. The eight-month retention of the basic income is later explained with the simple claim that a clerk allegedly did not forward certain paper documents.

After another incident with the contact supervisor, Olaf K. has to write further complaints to the court. These are ignored, the same with further charges by Olaf K. against employees of the Youth Welfare Department, and also against the legal counsel for the children. Not only are basically all well explained, justified and necessary criminal charges denied, but the local state as well as the general state attorneys begin to respond to the criminal charges with defamations against Olaf K. in their rejection letters.

Another highlight of the Kinder-Robber-Klan takes place a few weeks before an additional court hearing in mid-2016. The contact supervisor writes a document to the court six weeks before the next hearing that he has decided to not enable the contact of the children for the father any more. A resolution from the district court for this does not exist. Since Olaf K. has not only the right but also the - punishable if disobeyed - duty according to the court regulation to enable a contact of the children, he goes to the police station after the children were simply not brought to him by the contact supervisor the following weekend.

Olaf K. presents the court rulings regarding the contact of the children there. The police officer tries to call the contact supervisor who does not pick up the phone.

As usual, Olaf K. sends complaints to the court because of this incident and refers to the other criminal charges already filed with the public prosecutors. At the family court hearing four weeks later, the incidents are practically all ignored not only by the Youth Welfare Department employees, but also and especially by the judge. Olaf K. is unable to participate in the court meeting because of psychologically induced vomiting attacks shortly before the court hearing. The protocol of the court hearing accuses him of allegedly having - despite the year-long experience with his ex-wife and the courts - demolished the bicycle trailer of his ex-wife coincidentally a few days before the court hearing. The protocol further states that his criminal charges with the Public Prosecutor's Office are not to be taken seriously, and that the in quasi-criminal methods engaging contact supervisor would be one of the best the Youth Welfare Department would have.

Even after the court meeting, the contact supervisor simply decides to not appear any more to enable a contact of the children with the father. Olaf K. has to revoke the decisions of the last court hearing and officially challenges of the impartiality of the judge now. Additionally, because of the many sick-minded and unpunished defamations of the Youth Welfare Department employees, Olaf K. is forced to voluntarily restrain from a contact regulation.

The judge, in turn, replies another four weeks after the hearing - in addition to the contact supervisor's four-week blockade of any contact of the children with the father earlier - by officially suspending the contact of Olaf K. with the children retroactively for two months now.

Olaf K.'s multiple challenges of impartiality of the judge are all rejected with partly catastrophic legal motions and justifications. Some reach the Higher Court. The matter takes time, a request by Olaf K. is apparently forwarded to the Federal Court of Germany.

Because of the more than questionable and close connection of the District Court with Youth Welfare Department and local Public Prosecutor's Office, which remind to the evil witch in the fairy tale 'Haensel and Gretel', Olaf K. even turns to the Minister of Justice of the Southern German State and personally asks him to initiate an investigation of especially his many state prosecutors and their defamatory responses to Olaf K.'s justified charges against employees of the Youth Welfare Department.

But even there one rather prefers to embrace the Kinder-Robber-Klan. Olaf K.'s letters are answered politely, they land on the desks of three different and higher officials of the state's Department of Justice before ultimately being sent back for review to the exact same prosecutors against which Olaf K.'s complaints were issued. As a result, Olaf K. receives a friendly feedback a few weeks later from just this Public Prosecutor's Office, stating that no mishandling of any of the cases could actually be identified by

their own state attorneys.

Olaf K. must now not only file compensation claims for character assassination against the Social Department and their Youth Welfare Department employees and also against his ex-wife - all rejected or simply not being admitted to the courts - but also complaints against even the State Minister of Justice for the handling of the matter.

But the State Minister of Justice - and/or his subordinates - remain silent. So much, that a criminal complaint against the State Minister of Justice needed be filed by Olaf K. at the local Public Prosecutor's Office - and which is then of course rejected by the state attorneys in such an irrational way, that additional criminal obstruction of justice charges against some prosecutors needed to follow.

The matter goes to the Judiciary Committee of the German Bundestag, even Germany's Federal Attorney General Office receives a notice of the case. After a few months at the Judiciary Committee in Berlin, the matter is forwarded to the Petitions Committee, and after a few more weeks a senior legal adviser responds with this friendly message from Berlin:

“According to the constitutional order of the Federal Republic of Germany, the law is entrusted exclusively to the judges. **The judges are independent in their decisions and subject only to the law [!]**. As a consequence of this constitutional provision, judicial decisions can only be annulled or amended by competent courts and only in the context of the procedures prescribed by the legal system (appeal, revision proceedings, etc.).“

In the meantime, the judge in partnership with the president of the district court files criminal charges against Olaf K. because of a so-called alleged "threat", this because of one of his letters (!) to the district court. A little later, even a second so-called "threat" charge follows, this time because of 15 words in a letter to the legal counsel of the children. The responsible prosecutor decides to reveal Olaf K. the reason for these charges only after about four weeks or so. Meanwhile, the state attorneys seem to have fun temporarily ordering surveillance for Olaf K. - whereas the executing police people appear rather bored for a few days/weeks.

Olaf K. has never been a member of any so-called "right-wing extremist organisation" and does not support them either. On the contrary, Olaf K. can call some peaceful Muslims his friends and also visits the Jewish community from time to time. Needless to say, Olaf K. does not own a weapon, has no weapons license and also does not have the money to illegally purchase a gun on the black market.

His ex-wife, meanwhile, had already implanted the crazy idea that he would be a "threat" into the children's minds. In any case, we have witnessed one of the rather rare encounters of Olaf K. with his ex-wife and her now very own children in front of the house entrance - one should rather call it: strangers passing by.

Further refusals of Olaf K.'s criminal complaints by the local prosecutors follow, one is particularly interesting. In an evaluation report of Katja K. she again accuses Olaf K. - after having been acquitted four years earlier of any allegations regarding alleged 'injuries' to his ex-wife - of having inflicted such a damage, and more, to her back then. A corresponding criminal complaint for defamation issued by Olaf K. to the local Public Prosecutor's Office is ignored for almost three quarters of a year. Olaf K. has to write an inactivity complaint after four months which had been ignored as well. After eight months, the local prosecutors finally respond, they reject to follow up on the complaint. They further write that

"mere assumptions would not justify indicting someone" and additionally state that the allegations of the psychologically examined Katja K. would also be in the court records.

After Olaf K. gets in contact with the Bar Association of the city, the lawyer from three years ago finally responds and states that he had not received any contact requests from Olaf K. in the weeks following the events surrounding an illegal request of his ex-wife for a release of the children. She had claimed back then that Olaf K. would allegedly not possess a doctor's medical examination and sick leave document for the school for the elderly boy, which Olaf K. handed over to the police when they came to take the children.

Since Olaf K. had - among others - send a registered letter to the lawyer back then which was returned by the postal service with the notice "unclaimed", he needed to also file a criminal complaint against the lawyer. This criminal complaint is also rejected by the public prosecutors with the following twisted rationality in their letter:

“That he [the ex-lawyer, who had not responded to any of the many contacts by the plaintiff in 2015] had made deliberately false statements in his letter to the Bar Association cannot be proven, since a personal contact between defendant and plaintiff had not happened in the respective timeframe and also because the plaintiff's certified postal mail had returned and marked as 'unclaimed' (meaning not having been delivered successfully).“

Oh and by the way, Olaf K. presents this case to another so-called "lawyer" in the city in the very-very-last days. This one listens briefly to the incidents, says that the criminal complaints would be worthless, and then dares to ask what Olaf K.'s issue would actually be ?

Because of the many completely irrational actions committed by his ex-wife, Olaf K. demands from the District Court to initiate a biological DNA test in order to prove his paternity for the younger child. The female judge at the court creates a full blown court process and orders the Catholic church to act as an intermediate educator for the two children, this despite Olaf K.'s criminal complaints against the local Ordinariate. Month after his court complaints are as usual rejected, the female judge declares a so-called "declaratory paternity" of Olaf K. for the two children without having listened to him once. The court does also not hesitate to present Olaf K. with a sadistical bill of over 850 Euros for having refused to perform a biological DNA test, which has not been done until today. Olaf K. refuses to pay it, of course the bill goes to a dubious court officer who even threatens a foreclosure and even imprisonment for the court's neglection to provide a more than required service - a court that further seems to be in urgent need of income.

Since, as expected, further threats from the local court follow - for example a threat from the (female) President of the District Court to file criminal charges -, Olaf K. is finally forced in mid-October 2018 to apply as a political refugee at the local US Consulate, as well as with the Russian Embassy in Germany. His criminal complaint against the president of the district court is of course: rejected ! And some weeks later, also the President of the Higher Court reaches out to Olaf K. and threatens him to issue a "criminal complaint" after his organisation as well refuses to deal with reality and the issues as outlined in Olaf K.'s complaints.

The President apprently finds it to be "criminally offensive" that Olaf K. has no other choice but to compare the court's legal process handling and the utterly biased decisions of the judges with those of the times of National-Socialism in Germany.

Another criminal complaint against the Social Department for attempted murder follows. Last but not least, the case goes to Germany's Federal Attorney General again since the State Ministry of the Interior had refused to answer Olaf K.'s calls for an investigation into the many more than obvious corruption schemes, allegedly stimulated from a foreign nation. Since the Federal Attorney General claims the matter not to be in his responsibilities, Olaf K. writes to the US Administration, also to remind them of his application as a political refugee.

Olaf K. has worked meanwhile on an extensive web platform which lists all relevant documents and events from the courts and public prosecutors regarding the more than five year affair. He presents it in form of a DVD to the local state attorney's to justify a number of criminal referrals. But instead of engaging in corruption cleansing, the state attorney's seem to have fun scanning through the way over 500 documents to find words and spellings which would in their view fulfill the prerequisites for a 'threat'. They file additional criminal referrals themselves and influence policemen and women who show up at Olaf K.'s doormat.

His ex wife decides a few months later that she feels 'threatened' as well, this not because Olaf K. is actually that but because he leaves small presents about twice per week for his children at the doormat or throws them into the mailbox at the ex wife's apartment door. She presents not only those chocolate bars and cookie packages at the family court, but even a birthday present for the younger child and sells to the female judge that she feels 'disturbed' by this and hence would need 'protection'. The court seriously grants it to her. Olaf K. is now officially not allowed to donate presents to his children, is required by a so-called court decision to not use the staircase any more but only the elevator when leaving the building, forced to put his head down and not say hello to his ex wife and/or children when meeting them in front of the house and also not to contact the boys at their schools, which Olaf K. had not been doing for more than 3 years any way.

Olaf K. writes a complaint against this court decision of course and another challenge of the impartiality of the female judge. His letter finishes with the following sentences:

Do you actually enjoy to issue court resolutions like these ? How much are you being paid by George Soros for this ?

<https://www.sun24.news/en/the-kinder-robber-klan-about-a-munich-justice-scandal-and-corrupt-advocates-for-children.html>