

*** Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version) ***

Head of Authority and Public Prosecutor Petra Lundh page 1 of 18

petra.lundh@aklagare.se

The Prosecution Authority of Sweden, Stockholm Headquarters

Switchboard 010-562 50 00

Registrar

registrator@aklagare.se

This prosecutor's notification, now with a so-called decision with dnr AMR-4-22, concerning extremely serious criminal charges shall be duly registered by the Registrar of the Prosecution Service in Stockholm, head office in Stockholm, requesting the full contact details of the case officer appointed by the head of the authority and Prosecutor General Petra Lundh, together with a diary sheet/diary number or diary sheet, as proof and confirmation that the prosecutor's notification has been received and duly registered.

ALL COMMUNICATION IN THE CASE MUST BE BY E-MAIL

Please request this information by sending an e-mail to, see the e-mail addresses of the signatory/complainant at the bottom of this notification, and also to r.fuellmich@fuellmich.com , info@fuellmich.com and christine.anderson@europarl.europa.eu

Confidentiality; no confidentiality as this prosecutor's report is of very great public interest in Sweden and also of very great public interest internationally.

Other information; the notification will be served partly in Swedish and partly in English to the Swedish Prosecution Authority, based on what has been described above.

2022-10-13

1) Introduction

ADMINISTRATIVE CASE ON THE BASIS OF THE EU LEGAL BASIS AND THE LEGAL ORDER SERVED

Administrative case based on alleged decision of the Prosecutor's Office in Sweden; decision of the Prosecutor General dated 2022-09-28 with reference AMR-4-22

The so called decision is attached as Annex 1, 2 pages, see in that part the PDF file of the Prosecutor General's DECISION.....

IMPARTIAL, FACTUAL AND OBJECTIVE FULLY LEGALLY SECURE HANDLING IS WITHHELD AND OMITTED AS APPEARS BY THE PROSECUTOR PETRA LUNDH

Is the Public Prosecutor Petra Lundh engaging in criminal patronage? Is the Public Prosecutor, Petra Lundh, protecting the PCR TEST COMPANY and all the members of the Swedish Parliament and thus all the political parties in the Swedish Parliament?

The PCR TEST FRAUD is clearly already established within the EU, including in Portugal, in 2 judgements establishing that the PCR TESTS are not scientific and are not reliable, and have been proven and established in judgements establishing that the PCR TESTS are not scientific and are not reliable. About this acknowledged fact and notorious fact is communicated in the Attorney General's notification of 2022-09-10, and publicly published, the English and Swedish version is published here

<https://eueeshealthcare.bloggproffs.se/2022/09/16/riksaklagaranmalan-till-ytterst-ansvarige-myndighetschefen-och-riksaklagaren-petra-lundh-2022-09-11/>

Effects after PCR TEST FRAUD, some examples

2022-10-11

Analysts estimate that at least 20 million people have already been killed by the Covid "vaccine"

<https://futurenews.news/watch?id=6345b7942c33134ae393bd44>

Pfizer admits vaccine was NEVER tested for transmission during EU hearings

<https://futurenews.news/watch?id=6345b5072c33134ae3937321>

2) THE SO-CALLED DECISION OF 2022-09-28 WITH DNR AMR-4-22

The so called decision is not in legal order, the decision is not personally signed by any so called decision maker, hence nullity (invalid legal act).

If Attorney General Petra Lundh has a different opinion in this respect, the burden of proof is on the violator of the EU rights in the Charter of Fundamental Rights to prove where in the applicable legislation the Attorney General finds support for this so-called decision.

Requests in that respect a specific decision on where the Attorney General Petra Lundh finds legal support for

- to completely unlawful, discretionary and arbitrary in so called decision, without legal support in so called decision, and in addition failing and withholding inter alia in law fully reasoned decision signed by decision maker, with reference to appeal to administrative court very promptly

3) EU RIGHTS ARE OWNED BY THE RIGHT HOLDERS

The EU rights in the Charter of Fundamental Rights are demonstrably superior to the Swedish Constitution, see more on that in what is communicated to the Attorney General in this communication on the rule of law.

The EU rights in the Charter of Rights are owned by the right holders, i.e. all EU citizens, which includes all Swedish citizens, i.e. the right holders in this case are thus the complainants Ulf Bittner, Ulf Bejerstrand, Joel Widengren and Emil Borg.

The restrictor, in this case, is the Prosecutor General, who has the burden of proof to prove where in the legislation the Prosecutor General finds legal support for the restriction of the EU rights in the Charter of Fundamental Rights. Which takes precedence over Swedish law, see in that respect Regeringsformen 12:10 and in this letter on the rule of law.

Emotser in this part a fully legally sound decision with appeal to the administrative court based on a so-called decision of 2022-09-28 with dnr AMR-4-22.

The Public Prosecutor Petra Lundh is responsible for incorporating into the requested decision with reference to the administrative court in a fully legally correct manner what is communicated to the Public Prosecutor in this communication/notification.

To be noted in particular; the Public Prosecutor's Office in Sweden is a public authority, thus the Public Prosecutor Petra Lundh and her employees are demonstrably not a court at all, thus the Public Prosecutor cannot arbitrarily, discretionarily decide in a mass of text without legal support and contrary to the legal order the factual issue, according to the complainants' firm opinion, based on the legal order, which is served on the Public Prosecutor in this administrative case of legal certainty.

The parties; the complainants and the Prosecutor General thus have completely different views on legal certainty, and questions of fact in that regard should be decided in the administrative court chain, until the contrary is proven, i.e. the Prosecutor General has the burden of proof to prove that the Prosecutor General's Office in Sweden is also equivalent to the Swedish court.

4) THE LEGAL SYSTEM

Determination of the legal order is the basis of a completely legally sound administration of justice, arbitrariness and own discretionary judgments without support in the applicable law and right are contrary to legally sound administration of justice.

This is apparently also contrary to the Swedish Constitution and apparently a gross intentional fraud based on enormous financial incentives towards the complainants, who seem to be protected by the Attorney General of Sweden in the Riksdag.

5) NULLITY OF INVALID LEGAL ACT

A so-called decision that is not fully justified and fully enforceable, fully understandable from the point of view of the applicable law and legal order is thus nullity (null legal act).

Thus, a so-called decision that does not exist on the basis of the established legal order, and thus a failure and omission to act in accordance with the law on the basis of the applicable legal order. As it seems, a FRAUD against the complainants.

The burden of proof in this respect is on the Prosecutor General Petra Lundh, who is clearly not the representative of the Swedish court. The Prosecutor General and the head of the Swedish Prosecution Authority, Petra Lundh, are all employees of one authority, namely the Swedish Prosecution Authority.

6) NOTIFICATION IN THE PROSECUTOR GENERAL'S NOTIFICATION OF 2022-09-10 CONCERNING THE LEGAL ORDER

Already in the Prosecutor General's notification of 2022-09-10, the complainants' opinion on the legal order was set out, quote

.....

IN CONCLUSION

The legal order which, according to the notifying party, fully applies in this prosecutor's notification

The Swedish Constitution, which is superior to all other Swedish law and in particular to the Swedish Constitution 11:14(for courts) and 12:10(which applies to authorities, such as the Prosecution Authority in Sweden, which is not a court)

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the Lisbon Treaty.

The Charter of Fundamental Rights, which is an EU legal act, which applies as directly applicable Swedish law together with the case law of the European Court of Justice, must be ensured in the complete legally secure handling of the Prosecution Authority in Sweden, particularly on the basis of the principle of primacy, see in particular Regeringsformen 12:10, which fully applies to the Prosecution Authority in Sweden.

Reminds in particular of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the EU rights contained in this Charter, Swedish directly applicable law, the overriding Swedish constitution, the Swedish Constitution, and in particular Article 41 thereof

You can find the Charter of Rights here

<https://static.bloggproffs.se/wp-content/blogs.dir/38861/files/2022/06/R%C3%84TTIGHETSSTADGAN-I-LISSABON-F%C3%96RDRAGET-EURS-officiell-OJ-C-2007-303-FULL-SV-TXT.pdf>

Quote

Article 41 Right to good administration

1. Everyone has the right to have his or her affairs handled impartially, fairly and within a reasonable time by the institutions, bodies, offices and agencies of the Union.

2. This right shall include

(a) everyone has the right to be heard before any individual measure which would adversely affect him or her is taken

(b) every person shall have access to the files which concern him or her, subject to legitimate interests of confidentiality, professional secrecy and business confidentiality,

(c) the administration is obliged to give reasons for its decisions.

3. Every person has the right to receive compensation from the Union for damage caused by its institutions or by its servants in the performance of their duties, in accordance with the general principles common to the laws of the Member States.

4. Every person shall be able to address the institutions of the Union in one of the languages of the Treaties and shall receive an answer in the same language.

End quote

Of particular note, these EU rights are owned by EU citizens, i.e. all citizens of the nation of Sweden, and the violator of the Charter of Rights has the burden of proof if the violator, in this case/prosecution, the Prosecution in Sweden, again intends to restrict, withhold and omit e.g. Article 41 (or for that matter any other Article of the Charter of Rights).

Thus, as the Prosecution Authority in Sweden has done generally and systematically in previous prosecution complaints made by Ass Professor Doctor Björn Hammarskjöld and Ulf Bittner.

THERE IS PROOF THAT THE PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE IN SWEDEN, under the leadership of the Attorney General Petra Lundh, has demonstrably withheld and failed to comply with EU rights in previous prosecutor's complaints made by Björn Hammarskjöld and Ulf Bittner, the burden of proof being that the prosecutor's office in Sweden, under the leadership of the Attorney General Petra Lundh, has

- to prove the contrary is owned by the violator of EU rights, namely the Attorney General Petra Lundh, and in this respect a particularly full and legally sound DECISION with reference to the Administrative Court is requested very urgently.

If you have any questions, please read again all the SWEDEN REGISTERED mass mailings with all the information and data, which are duly registered by the Registrar at the headquarters in Stockholm, the Prosecutor's Office in Sweden, and in addition are duly registered by the Registrar of the Ministry of Social Affairs.

Questions may also be answered by the undersigned and the witnesses cited in the prosecution's complaint

.....

End quote

Noted in particular; In the so-called decision the Prosecutor General does not contest the legal order, thus acknowledged fact that the served legal order applies in full in the Prosecutor General's notification of 2022-09-10, this shall be added to the file and ensured fully disclosed by Prosecutor General Petra Lundh in the requested decision with the appeal reference to the Administrative Court.

7) NOTED IN PARTICULAR

Prosecutor Petra Lundh withholds and fails to request special decision with reference to administrative court in prosecutor notification of 2022-09-10, quote

BE IT FURTHER PROVEN THAT THE PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE IN SWEDEN, headed by the Attorney General Petra Lundh, has demonstrably withheld and failed to comply with EU rights in previous prosecutor's notifications, made by Björn Hammarskjöld and Ulf Bittner, the burden of proof being

- to prove the contrary is owned by the violator of EU rights, namely the Attorney General Petra Lundh, and in this respect a particularly full and legally sound DECISION with reference to the Administrative Court is requested very urgently.

End quote

What is the legal basis for the Attorney General Petra Lundh in this respect?

8) SO ONCE AGAIN, THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR PETRA LUNDH IS WITHHOLDING LEGALLY SOUND, IMPARTIAL AND OBJECTIVE PROCEEDINGS BASED ON THE APPLICABLE LEGAL SYSTEM

As seems to be a constitutional violation, see the Constitution, and as seems to be a fraud against the complainants, until the contrary is proven in a completely fair, impartial and objective court.

a)

- All complainants, including witnesses MEP Christine Anderson and lawyer Dr Reiner Fuellmich, have been denied the requested decision by e-mail.

What is the legal basis for the Public Prosecutor Petra Lundh in this respect?

- Previously, Mr Hammarskjöld has received e-mails from the Uppsala Prosecution Chamber via e-mail, i.e. requested decisions and documents, so equal treatment should be given to the complainants and witnesses in this case by the Prosecutor General, Ms Lundh.

What legal basis does the Prosecutor-General, Petra Lundh, have in this respect?

This was confirmed today in a telephone conversation with Björn Hammarskjöld, telephone 070-385 09 33.

Is there any legal basis for the discriminatory treatment of complainants and witnesses within the Swedish Prosecution Service?

What legal support does the Prosecutor General, Petra Lundh, have in this respect?

Noted in particular, no confidentiality, it has been lifted by the complainants, in the Attorney General's notification of 2022-09-10. So sending via email is perfectly legal, and is even done by the courts in Sweden. Why does the Prosecutor General fail and withhold to send so called transcripts and so called decisions by e-mail?

What legal support does the Attorney General Petra Lundh have in this respect?

Evidence from Jessica Seger, brought to the attention of the complainants on 2022-10-11, where it is proven that the diary sheets were sent by e-mail to Jessica Seger, in Case AM-82341-22 and in Case AM-139050-22, quote

From: Mattsson Tomas <Tomas.Mattsson@aklagare.se>

Date: Tue 11 Oct. 2022 19:46

Subject: Diary pages

To: jessicaseger72@gmail.com <jessicaseger72@gmail.com>

Hi,

I am sending the requested diary sheets from the cases we have in the chamber.

Please,

Tomas Mattsson

Tomas Mattsson

Deputy Chief Prosecutor

Stockholm Prosecution Area | Norrorts Prosecution Chamber in Stockholm

Box 950 | 191 29 Sollentuna

Tel 010-562 55 60 | Switch 010-562 50 00

www.aklagare.se

End quote

b)

The complainants have been deprived and withheld what was requested without explanation or legal support for the measure by the Public Prosecutor Petra Lundh.

Thus, a well-proven and systematic general domination technique that has been implemented in the past by the Attorney General Petra Lundh, evidence exists that this has happened several times in the past.

What is the legal basis for this completely arbitrary and discretionary action by the Public Prosecutor, Petra Lundh?

c)

Only the complainant Ulf Bittner has received the so-called decision, and this so-called decision was sent by letter, thus the so-called decision of 2022-09-28 with dnr AMR-4-22 has been withheld and omitted from the complainants Ulf Bejerstrand, Joel Widengren and Emil Borg.

Ulf Bittner has received confirmation of this in telephone conversations from Ulf Bejerstrand, Joel Widengren and Emil Borg.

What is the legal basis for this completely arbitrary and discretionary action by Petra Lundh, the public prosecutor?

d)

The witnesses MEP Christine Anderson and lawyer Dr Reiner Fuellmich have been withheld and denied access to the so-called decision, until the contrary has been proven and put beyond reasonable doubt by the Prosecutor General Petra Lundh.

It appears in the Prosecutor General's notification of 2022-09-10 the following, quote

Please request this information by return email to, see the email addresses of the undersigned/complainants, at the bottom of this notification, and in addition to r.fuellmich@fuellmich.com , corvin.rabenstein@corona-ausschuss.de, info@fuellmich.com and christine.anderson@europarl.europa.eu

End quote

None of the complainants has received by e-mail what has been requested, nor the so-called decision, and thus the complainants assume that neither MEP Christine Anderson nor lawyer Dr Reiner Fuellmich has received what has been requested to be sent by e-mail.

Of course, as it seems, the Public Prosecutor Petra Lundh has thus also withheld and omitted from the witnesses the so-called decision in e-mail communication or otherwise, since the complainants Ulf Bejerstrand, Joel Widengren and Emil Borg were withheld and omitted the so-called decision. The burden of proof to prove the contrary lies with the Prosecutor General Petra Lundh.

What is the legal basis for this completely arbitrary and discretionary action by Petra Lundh?

9) A legitimate question based on the so-called decision

DOES THE PROSECUTOR GENERAL PROTECT ALL MEMBERS OF THE SWEDISH PARLIAMENT AND THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE SWEDISH PARLIAMENT ON THE BASIS THAT THEY ARE WELL INFORMED AND NOTIFIED OF THE PCR TEST FRAUD?

Of particular note: the offence of omission exists in the Criminal Code, as does aggravated forgery. In addition, apparently intentional fraud based on enormous financial incentives to apparently protect the notified parties, e.g. as in the Prosecutor General's report against all members of the Swedish Parliament, and thus all political parties in the Swedish Parliament, as inter alia the Prosecutor General's report with reference AMR-4-22 informs about.

10) THE LEGAL SYSTEM

If a law, decree or regulation conflicts, there is a hierarchy that tells which of these takes precedence. According to the notifying parties, the legal order is as follows, based, inter alia, on the agreement to which Sweden committed itself when it joined the EU. The burden of proof to prove the contrary is on the Attorney General, Petra Lundh:

The case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union

Lisbon Treaty; in the EU legal act Charter of Fundamental Rights

Basic Law; see especially in the Constitution, see especially in the Constitution 12:10, citation

Legislative review

]Section 10 If a public body finds that a regulation is contrary to a provision of the Constitution or another superior constitution, the regulation may not be applied. The same shall apply if the statutory order has been infringed in any material respect at the time of its enactment.

When a law is reviewed under the first paragraph, particular account shall be taken of the fact that Parliament is the primary representative of the people and that the Constitution takes precedence over the law. Act (2010:1408).

Law

Decree

Regulation

What is the legal basis for the Attorney General and the head of the authority, Petra Lundh, to withhold and fail to observe legal certainty, impartiality, objectivity and objectivity in the so-called decision in the case of the Prosecutor General's decision of 2022-09-28, ref. no. AMR-4-22?

11) THE PRACTICE OF THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE

a)

C-189/03(2004-10-07) European Commission v. The Netherlands. From paragraph 19, quote; "In any event, it is settled case-law that mere administrative practice which, by its nature, is freely modifiable by the authority, and which has not been

sufficiently published, cannot be regarded as constituting a valid implementation of the obligations arising from the EC Treaty."

b)

In the Swedish Government's appearances before the European Court of Justice, the mandatory principle of legal certainty is frequently invoked, including the Bressol judgment (C-73-08 Bressol, paragraphs 41, 47, 48, 71).

It states that the onus is on the restricting authority -- the Attorney General and the head of the authority Petra Lundh and employees of the Prosecution Authority in Sweden -- to prove the necessity and proportionality of the restriction in law.

Precise facts with substantiated analyses including proportionality and legality must be presented in connection with proposed decisions and rulings.

This principle of legal certainty under EU law (which applies to all public authorities in Sweden) seems to be omitted and systematically withheld by the ultimately responsible Prosecutor General and head of authority Petra Lundh and her employees within the Swedish Prosecution Authority in general and towards the public (see in this respect, inter alia, previous decisions against Björn Hammarskjöld and Ulf Bittner) and towards the complainants of the Prosecutor General's notification of 2022-09-10.

c)

The Ciola judgment (judgment of the European Court of Justice in case C-224/97 Ciola paragraphs 26-33) states that public authorities are obliged to protect the rights of individuals by all available means, see also Articles 51, 52, 53, 54 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

These obligations are being generally and systematically disregarded and withheld from the public (see in this respect, inter alia, previous decisions against Björn Hammarskjöld and Ulf Bittner) by the Public Prosecutor ultimately responsible and the head of the authority, Petra Lundh, and employees of the Prosecution Service vis-à-vis the complainants of the Public Prosecutor's notification of 2022-09-10.

d)

According to Swedish law and EU law, the individual is the bearer of the right and the ultimate responsible prosecutor and head of authority Petra Lundh and employees of the Prosecution Authority in Sweden have the burden of proof to prove the contrary based on the applicable legal order.

In this case, the Prosecutor General and Head of the Public Prosecution Service Petra Lundh and her employees within the Public Prosecution Service in Sweden appear to have violated the law by

- omitting and withholding, and
- apparently protecting the suspects in the Prosecutor General's report of 2022-09-10, and not initiating a very justified suspicion with a preliminary investigation of apparently serious fraud offences and more of the members of the Swedish Parliament and thus of all the political parties of the Swedish Parliament, which in itself apparently should constitute a violation of inter alia RB 20 chapter 1 §.

A breach of the RB 20 chapter 1§ would normally be considered as minor misconduct. However, as this offence appears to have been committed in the exercise of official authority over individuals, it must be considered a normal offence.

As the ultimate responsible public prosecutor and head of authority Petra Lundh and her employees within the Prosecution Service of Sweden also seem to have violated RF 1:1 3 st, 2 § and also RF 1:9 and 12:10, a constitutional violation must be prosecuted and the suspected crime must then be considered as gross misconduct with a penalty of imprisonment for 6 months to 6 years.

It also appears that the ultimate responsible prosecutor and head of authority Petra Lundh and employees of the Prosecution Service in Sweden seem to omit and withhold

- to comply with EU law under the Swedish Constitution, Chapter 1 § 3, § 2, § 9, Chapter 2 § 19, Chapter 12 § 10, the European Convention on Human Rights and the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which is why the suspected offence must be raised to extremely serious misconduct with a penalty scale corresponding to other extremely serious offences such as murder and espionage.

We must also ask ourselves whether the ultimate responsible prosecutor and head of authority Petra Lundh and her employees in the Prosecution Authority in Sweden in the so-called decision, the decision of the prosecutor of 2022-09-28 with reference AMR-4-22, on

- that no investigation will be initiated could possibly be a political decision? If so, other suspects must also be sought.

e)

The important thing is the principle of legal certainty.

In the Swedish Government's appearances before the European Court of Justice, the mandatory principle of legal certainty is frequently invoked, e.g. [1] the Bressol judgment. This states that the onus is on the restricting authority to prove the necessity and proportionality of its legislation for the restriction. Precise facts with substantiated analyses must be presented.

The Government of Sweden through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Anna Falk, has argued in the Court of Justice of the European Union in a judgment delivered on 14 June 2012 in case C-542/09 European Commission v Netherlands, the principle of legal certainty by referring to case C-73/08 Bressol paragraphs 40-41, 47-48 and 71. quote;

Whether there is a difference in treatment

40 The Court recalls that the principle of non-discrimination not only prohibits direct discrimination on grounds of nationality, but also any form of indirect discrimination which, by applying other criteria of differentiation, leads in practice to the same result (see, for a similar reasoning, Case C-212/05 Hartmann [2007] ECR I-6303, paragraph 29).

41 If there are no objective reasons for a provision of national law or if it is disproportionate to the objective pursued, it must be regarded as indirectly discriminatory if, by its very nature, it is liable to affect nationals of other Member States more than nationals of that State and, consequently, to place the former at a particular disadvantage (Case C-195/98 Österreichischer Gewerkschaftsbund [2000] ECR I-10497, paragraph 40, and Hartmann, paragraph 30 above).

Whether there are grounds for the difference in treatment

47 As the Court held in paragraph 41 of the present judgment, differential treatment of the kind introduced by the Decree of 16 June 2006 constitutes indirect discrimination on grounds of nationality which is prohibited unless there are objective reasons for it.

48 Moreover, in order to be justified, the measure in question must be capable of ensuring the attainment of the legitimate objective which it pursues and must not go beyond what is necessary to attain that objective (see, for a similar reasoning, Case C-527/06 Renneberg [2008] ECR I-7735, paragraph 81, and Joined Cases C-171/07 and C-172/07 Apothekerkammer des Saarlandes and Others [2009] ECR I-7735, paragraph 81), [2009] ECR I-4171, paragraph 25).

71 However, it is for the competent national authorities to show that such a risk actually exists (see, by analogy, the judgment in Apothekerkammer des Saarlandes and Others, paragraph 39).

According to settled case-law, it is for those authorities which adopt a measure derogating from a principle laid down by European Union law to prove, in each individual case, that the measure is such as to secure the attainment of the objective pursued and that it does not go beyond what is necessary to attain that objective.

The reasons which a Member State may put forward must therefore be accompanied by an assessment of the appropriateness and proportionality of the measure taken by the Member State and the precise facts supporting its argument (see, for a similar reasoning, Case C-8/02 Leichtle [2004] ECR I-2641, paragraph 45, and the judgment in Commission v Austria, cited above, paragraph 63). It is important that such an objective, detailed and numerically supported analysis, supported by serious, consistent and convincing data, it can be shown that there is a real risk to public health.

End quote.

12) HD JUDGMENT, EU COURT PRACTICE, LAW & ECHR

The Supreme Court has ruled in case Ö 461-11 Billerud of date 2014-02-25, paragraphs 12-17 that Swedish authorities and courts may not change the content and effect of EU law.

From HD Ö 461-11 Billerud, paragraphs 12-17, quote;

The relationship between the ECHR and EU law

12. The fundamental rights as guaranteed by the ECHR are included in Union law as general principles. This is clear both from the EU Treaty (Article 6(3) of the Treaty on European Union) and from the case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union.

The provisions of the Charter of the European Union, which correspond to the provisions of the ECHR, must have the same meaning and scope as those of the Convention.

No provision of the Charter may be interpreted as restricting or infringing the human rights and fundamental freedoms recognised by the ECHR (Articles 52(3) and 53). The Court of Justice of the European Union takes account of the case law of the European Court of Human Rights when interpreting Union law.

13. The principle of proportionality is, according to the case-law of the ECtHR, a fundamental principle which permeates Convention law. It is also a general principle of law which is part of Union law (see Articles 5(1) and 5(4) of the Treaty on European Union and Article 49(3) of the Charter of the European Union).

14. The European Court of Human Rights (Grand Chamber) stated in a judgment in 2005, i.e. before the adoption of the provisions in question, that the protection of human rights in the EC had to be regarded as equivalent to the protection afforded by the Convention and that there was therefore a presumption that EC law respected the Convention.

The presumption may be rebutted if there are circumstances in the individual case which mean that the protection of Convention rights is manifestly deficient (*Bosphorus Hava Yolları Turizm ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Ireland*, no. 45036/98, judgment of 30 June 2005, see p. 165 with references).

15. The principle of primacy of Union law means that Swedish courts and authorities are prevented from interpreting a provision decided at EU level in a way that alters its substance or effect and that they are bound by the interpretation of EU law by the Court of Justice.

At the same time, Sweden has an obligation under international law and its own responsibility to ensure that the rights under the ECHR are not violated in the individual case.

16. In accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, the Supreme Court must base its examination on the presumption that the provisions of Articles 16(3) and 16(4) of the Trade Directive are compatible with the ECHR (see p. 14). In its preliminary ruling, the European Court of Human Rights has given guidance on how to interpret the provisions and has in particular examined their compatibility with the principle of proportionality, an examination which must be considered to include the principle of proportionality also in the sense in which the European Court interprets the term (see p. 13).

17. A Swedish court may depart from the interpretation of an EU provision by the CJEU only if its application in the individual case would otherwise constitute a serious and unambiguous violation of the ECHR. This means that the actual scope for such a deviation is extremely limited.

End quote.

13) SUMMARY

Ultimately, the Attorney General and Head of Authority Petra Lund and her employees within the Prosecution Service in Sweden are an authority, demonstrably so.

The parties, the ultimate responsible public prosecutor and head of the authority Petra Lundh and her employees within the Prosecution Authority in Sweden and the complainants have demonstrably different views on what constitutes fully legally secure handling and what constitutes fully impartial, factual and objective handling.

What applies based on the legal system, the case law of the European Court of Justice, the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the European Convention, the Swedish Constitution and more has been explained by the complainants to the Prosecutor General's notification of 2022-09-10, then based on the so-called decision, the Prosecutor General's decision of 2022-09-28 with reference AMR-4-22, and this now prompts very urgent handling from the "other party" ultimately responsible Prosecutor General Petra Lundh and his employees within the Prosecution Service in Sweden.

14) THE DELEGATION SYSTEM

Requests that the rules of delegation applicable to the Prosecutor General and Head of Authority Petra Lundh and her staff within the Swedish Prosecution Service be sent by e-mail as a matter of urgency.

15) HOW SHOULD FULL DUE PROCESS BE PURSUED?

Petra Lundh, the Prosecutor General and head of the Swedish Prosecution Authority, and her staff do not seem to ensure complete legal certainty, impartiality, objectivity, etc., based on the current legal system.

Who should then handle the case on the basis of this notification/letter?

Very urgent answer to this question, all communication should be by e-mail and this should be done partly in Swedish and partly in English.

16) VERY HIGH INTERNATIONAL INTEREST

Since the witnesses are very well known all over the world, Christine Anderson, Member of the European Parliament, and Dr Reiner Fuellmich, lawyer, should also be notified of everything that is notified to the complainants, but in English, directly from the Prosecution Service in Sweden.

If the Prosecutor General and the Head of the Authority, Petra Lundh, and her staff have a different opinion, please state it on the basis of the applicable law in a special decision with a reference to the administrative court

Best regards from the complainants

Ulf Bittner

Ulf Bittner, one of the three members of the AMBU working group

<http://eueeshealthcare.bloggproffs.se/>

SWEDEN UNDER REVIEW

<https://www.brighteon.com/channels/sverigegranskas>

Sweden

e-mail voulf56@gmail.com

e-mail eueeshealthcare@gmail.com

e-mail voulf5610@gmail.com

phone 070-357 46 59 (international 0046 70 357 46 59)

SKYPE nr voulf56

Ulf Bejerstrand

Fantastiska Nöjen AB & Nöjestorget.se

Box 10011

12126 Stockholm-Globen

Phone 073-370 76 01

Email ulf@nojestorget.se

Joel Widengren

Nyckelpigsgatan 19b

AX 220 70 Eckerö

Åland/Finland

E-mail widengren@gmail.com

Telephone +358 (0) 456 344 7330

Mobile phone +46 (0)76 276 49 49

Emil Borg

Bagaregårdsgatan 7 A

416 70 Gothenburg

Phone 072-003 04 24

Email emil@nojestorget.se