

House Search

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Welcome to another session of the Corona Extra-Parliamentary Inquiry Committee, ACU. Today I have the pleasure to welcome Mr. Michael Fritsch. Mr. Fritsch, you are a Police Officer, a Chief Superintendent. You recently held a public speech in your capacity as a citizen. That is the reason why you have been invited today, you will be speaking as a neutral witness in the Corona Extra-Parliamentary Inquiry Committee.

First of all, welcome, it's good that you reached out to us.

Mr. Fritsch, could you introduce yourself in a few words? You held your speech in Dortmund, but I believe you are not from Dortmund at all, you live in a different region, in a different city.

Michael Fritsch:

I work in Hannover, I have been working there for many years in the anti-burglary unit of the Hannover Police.

On August 9th I decided from the bottom of my heart to say a few words in public.

The reason was that I had participated in the demonstration for freedom and peace in Berlin. And the things that happened there, and what I later read about it in the media, it didn't correspond at all with what I experienced there in Berlin. I then got in touch with the "Querdenken" movement via e-mail. And based on that request, on that first contact I was asked what I thought about the prospect of saying something in public. I then wrote the speech that I held on August 9th practically overnight, it came from the bottom of my heart, and I could not imagine, I only wanted to state my opinion, I never thought it would lead to something like this.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

That's astonishing, I did not know this either, I actually thought that you worked on this speech for months, because it was so clear and precise, but you said it came into being of a single day or overnight.

Michael Fritsch:

Yes, there are different ways to come to a decision, some decisions come from our gut feeling and are taken very swiftly, others are more the result of a longer process, and the same thing happened here. And of course the subject matter, the way the state develops, is something that I have been

involved with for many years. I also obtained information from different environments, and in this process images took shape in my personality and in my mind. That which I wrote so to say overnight, that is that process that had already been going on for quite a period of time. I wrapped my thoughts into words so I could share them with other people.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

You just mentioned your experience at the mass demonstration in Berlin on August 1st 2020, where I was a participant myself, you said you observed things that were later presented differently. Can you be more concrete?

Michael Fritsch:

The terminology that was chosen in the media to describe the participants, it didn't correspond at all with what I had observed myself. I myself have experienced a lot of demonstrations, also as a member of the police, I have experienced violent clashes, I have experienced peaceful demonstrations, but I had never before experienced a demonstration on such a scale that exuded such peacefulness, such cordiality and such human warmth. And there was one moment when all those people, it doesn't matter how many people we actually were, when there was a moment of silence. You could have heard a pin drop. That moment awoke something in my heart. And then I said to myself: something very big is emerging here.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

This means, to come back to the plain facts: you observed the demonstration at different locations, and it was a completely peaceful demonstration, but it was later presented in a different manner.

Michael Fritsch:

Obviously with an event of that scale you can't see what is happening everywhere, there might have been a few scuffles, but there weren't any riots or violence. That peacefulness and the harmony among all the people that were there, you could really sense it, there was no way to ignore it.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Good, and then a few days later you held that speech in Dortmund. Could you summarize what it was about, especially for the people who haven't, or haven't yet, heard the speech? I should mention it again here, the speech is also available on our channel, Ärzte für Aufklärung, in the full-length version, so everybody can watch it on our channel. We always make an effort to mention our sources.

Michael Fritsch:

Yes, what I tried with my point of view is to draw a lot of people's attention and tell them: Take a look at a few points yourself, deal with the sources, think "what do I observe?". At the time, in the beginning of corona, I missed being able to exchange thoughts with other people in my personal environment. And as I got more informed, researched things from different sources, I arrived at a personal opinion. This goes for all of us, you evaluate certain information, and you tell yourself, that sounds credible, or that sounds far-fetched, I need to follow up on that, I need to collect some other sources about that. And then certain images start to form in your mind.

And I have tried to summarize that image, and along with the knowledge of the law I acquired as a police officer, that's what I wanted to explain to people. Because people don't always understand the law, they are complicated. At the top for me is the constitution, that stands firm above everything else, to guarantee human rights, that is a very important principle to me. And that is what I wanted to tell people.

I had the impression that the place where we find ourselves today, there are a lot of issues that from a legal point of view are no longer tenable. The way the police force, my police force, conducts itself, the way I understand policing, the way I got to know policing, the mandate it has, that it didn't correspond to our statutory mandate.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

What do you mean specifically? As it pertains to COVID-19?

Michael Fritsch:

When there is interference with fundamental rights, then the most important thing is that the interferences have to be proportionate and they have to be based on a legal basis.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

So it is about proportionality, that is what it is about for you, which is a fundamental policing and juridical principle. The proportionality...

Michael Fritsch:

So first of all there has to be a legal basis. Without a legal basis there is no point in checking the proportionality, because without the legal basis I simply cannot interfere [in people's rights]. And for the interference with fundamental rights there is a very high threshold, that means it is always required that it has to be a very specific, very concrete basis to interfere with fundamental rights,

there has to be a legal basis. That's a rule, an official law, and it has to be decided by the Federal Government via the official procedures.

And these "corona decrees" are individual state-level regulations, this means, on a federal level there is an infection protection law, which was decided by formal decision on the federal level, and underneath that, so you have federal laws, and underneath that you have individual state laws. And in every individual state there are also different levels: the individual state's constitution, then you have the formally decided laws, and then you have the decrees. That means we are now interfering in fundamental rights, using decrees, which are on the lowest level. This doesn't square with my understanding of the constitution, of law. This means we have a missing legal basis for the interference in fundamental rights and that means from my point of view that we have to at least check the legal basis, or we could also already say, from my point of view, no interference is allowed.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

From that point of view, no police measures are allowed to take place when this legal basis is very uncertain, that's what you are saying.

Michael Fritsch:

It is not just about the police measures, it is about the fines that are being imposed, the travel restrictions, not from the police, but from the different authorities that issued them. From my point of view, all the measures, whether the interference in fundamental rights or the legal persecution in regards to the payment of the fines, they are not legitimate. Because the basis, the legal basis is missing.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

And to express this is actually also a fundamental right for every citizen, which is also in our constitution. Every citizen can express his or her opinion, freedom of speech. Perhaps for all our viewers: are police officers excluded from this fundamental right? Are they not allowed to express their opinion as citizens?

Michael Fritsch:

That is a very difficult situation. Of course police officers also possess the rights that citizens have, they are also allowed to express themselves in public, they are also allowed to hold public political office, and express political opinions when they do it outside of their service as police officers. And this arranged in such a way, that as a police officer you cannot mix the political opinions which you express with your actions as a police officer. You have to separate this very clearly.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Where you wearing your uniform in Dortmund when you stepped up to the microphone?

Michael Fritsch:

No

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Where you on duty, when you stepped up to the microphone?

Michael Fritsch:

No

Dr. Heiko Schöning

And you were not even in your operating district, you were quite far away.

Michael Fritsch:

I was not on duty, not from a geographical point of view, nor from a professional point of view, or any other point of view.

Dr. Heiko Schöning,

And you also did, I have heard the speech, you also very clearly stated that it was your personal opinion as a private citizen.

Michael Fritsch:

Yes

I am now being told that I made myself known in public to be a police officer, and that I subsequently expressed myself on political issues.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

But a lot of other police officers do that, some of them are even politicians.

Michael Fritsch:

I also looked it up, I did not find a single source that prohibits the mention my job title in a public presentation, I couldn't find it. And when somebody says, "I'm a baker, I'm a hair dresser" when he presents himself, I wonder why I am not allowed to say that I am a police officer.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Exactly. We have something similar, the professional code of conduct for doctors of course, and that's obvious, we also just say "we are doctors" and we express ourselves mainly about medical issue but also about societal issues which of course also relate to our patients. And that is of course a normal right to be allowed to mention your job title or the title of one's public function. And that is also for the sake of transparency, just so people understand which background people have that are speaking to them.

Michael Fritsch:

It is also to make it clear to people which expertise you are bringing when you present yourself, why is he talking about rights and laws. Of course I could also have said "I am a private citizen". But in that case I am not sure if this would have been clear for the listeners? "Where did he get his expertise, where did he get his knowledge?"

Dr. Heiko Schöning

Exactly. And that which you addressed, what you said in Dortmund, was that on the one hand the legal basis is very dubious, and that on the other hand the proportionality is clearly not granted, isn't there. And have said this a few times, I'm a reserve officer in the Bundeswehr, the German army, I have pointed out, a similar basis is also paragraph 11, Army Law, one of the major important paragraphs, which states that you are not allowed to execute an order which is unlawful. As an officer, or as a soldier, this goes for everyone, there we also have this. If you even just suspect that something could be a criminal offence, then you are not just allowed to refuse to execute the order, you actually have to refuse to execute it.

Michael Fritsch:

For us this is called "Remonstrationsrecht" of "Remonstrationspflicht" (the right and even obligation to object to an unlawful order). This means that when a public servant recognizes that he is being order to execute an illegal act, he then has to refuse and say: "I don't agree to this", and if his superior takes note but consequently ignores it, and maintains that order, then you have to address yourself to your superior's immediate superior, when it's an immediate order you can do it orally, when it's an order that pertains to something in the future you have to do it in writing and state your reasoning. Every police officer has this duty.

Dr. Heiko Schöning

That is very important, this word "remonstrieren", to object and refuse an order, very few people know this word. If you could repeat it once again and explain in detail, and you said it is a duty, for a police officer, so it's not optional, I can't just give in and keep silent, pretend I didn't see or hear anything, on the contrary, you said it is the duty of a police officer. Where is this mentioned?

Michael Fritsch:

This is mentioned in the laws for civil servants. It was developed as one of the safety measures of our democracy. Because of the experiences, let's say everything that happened during the war, that was something people did not want to experience again. Safety measures were built in, because many people, when everything that happened was processed, many people claimed that, also when it was regarding the order to shoot, in the western part of Germany, the people who did the shooting always tried to justify and say "All I did was to follow an order". And precisely to prevent this "all I did was to follow an order" this duty to object was introduced. Every person has to check for his own actions, can I do this, is there a legal basis for my actions, can I do this or is there barrier? And that is this objection, when I recognize that something is not lawful then I have to object.

Dr. Heiko Schöning

And this is also what you did now, or in any case publically addressed...

Michael Fritsch:

What I did was not objecting to an illegal order. I expressed my political opinion in public.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Alright. So you did not yet object to an order.

And the basis, the reason was corona, so to speak, COVID-19. Can you tell us, what in this entire complex, one or two core issues that made you think, now I really have to open my mouth and say something, I can no longer keep quiet

Michael Fritsch:

One thing was the media coverage in public media, the fact that it did not correspond to what I observed, that really got me thinking. When you start to do research into alternative media you see films of people gathering who removed in a violent manner just because they held up the constitution. These were points that I could not fit into my understanding of the law. I told myself "This is not my police". I couldn't understand it, the way they were acting, of those people that are legally bound to uphold the law, that's the most important thing, we are bound by law. That means, we are not an arbitrary police. And what I saw there, simply did not fit with my understanding of the law. And this was for me the most crucial point, where I told myself, with my speech I would like to inform people, to reach them, and get them to inform themselves, to obtain information from different sources. I would like to get those who bear responsibility for implementing these measures to reflect on what they are doing, to think about what they are doing is right. That was my intention.

Dr. Heiko Schöning

Yes, thank you. This made clear to a lot of people why you held this speech, in which context you held this speech. I believe it is very understandable for a normal citizen.

So, I believe we can conclude this part, which concerns your speech in Dortmund.

You held another speech, I believe in Darmstadt. I believe this was within the same context. Is there something that you would like to add about that?

Michael Fritsch:

Yes, I addressed some additional points in which I expanded on the legal level, it was of course for a different audience. But there as well I received positive feedback from the audience after the speech, also during my speech. That means I seem to be finding a way of explaining things to people in a way that people are receptive to, they understand what I want to communicate to them.

And in Darmstadt I talked more extensively about the legal situation, about the background of the infection protection law which looks like a general clause, which is not very precise, which doesn't get to a specific point, it is not clear which measures can be taken

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

It's what is called an elastic clause

Michael Fritsch:

A "general clause" means everything you want to do with it, you can do with it. It is simply not specific enough. Very important for the lawfulness is the proportionality of the measures, and the specificity of the measures. Everyone who is concerned by the measures should be able to understand "what is happening to me, what is happening here, what does the law say, what am I doing wrong?" And that's what I tried again to make clear on that occasion.

Dr. Heiko Schöning

So, now we have, now a few days have passed. But now there is a very specific reason, that was not the immediate reason for this conversation, for this witness hearing, but you very recently have had to experience a "measure". What was that? I believe from the point of view of a doctor, we already talked about this earlier. I know that this is difficult for you, because it is still very fresh, very acute, and I must say, it also shocked me. But I think we should talk about it very objectively. What happened?

Michael Fritsch:

For this I also have to go a little bit back in time. I believe the news has already spread that on the day after my speech in Dortmund, on my following day on duty I drove to my department, I started to work, and I was suspended on that very day. This means that I was prohibited from carrying out my official duties, I was sent home, my service weapon and my police badge were taken from me, and I am not allowed to access my place of work. The advantage is, or the situation is such, that's the way it is justified, that after this speech I would have everyone coming at me. It was justified as being for my protection

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Protection? For protection purposes?

Michael Fritsch:

Protection. And also in the meantime they want to investigate if I committed an official violation, that was the second reason.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

So primarily it was justified that you are being relieved you of your duties, you have to hand everything over, you are taken off duty for your own protection?

Michael Fritsch:

Yes. There are two aspects. One is protection of an officer so he is taken out of the line of fire, and the other is to be able to prove within three months if I committed an official violation. There are civil servant regulations. What I am accused of in order to suspend me were the statements I made in that speech on August 9th in Dortmund could damage the image of the police and even endanger the functioning of the police, the entire police.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

If you look at the numbers, the facts, many many people saw this video, it's several hundred thousands of people, all channels together it has probably reached one million. And when you look at the approval rate, it's way above 90%, then it is very strange, again there seems to be some things that don't quite match. Everything you can see, you can hear now are rather such that people now regain confidence again in the police, after your speech.

Michael Fritsch:

[Sigh] I have received a lot of positive feedback from different people, from a whole range of groups in society, I see this largely as something positive. Of course if you now ask other people, negative or critical, the question is: whom am I asking in this particular place? It's like asking a butcher if he likes

meat, if I subsequently go to a vegetarian club, they will say no, we don't like meat, you see. In that case the result of the questions looks quite different.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

That's also why I simply just mentioned the numbers, to talk about the number of clicks and the number of likes and dislikes, meaning approval or not, it gives you an idea of the general mood, like you have with elections, and things like that. And in this case it was very clearly on your side.

Michael Fritsch:

Many of the comments touched my heart because some of people said that through my speech they gained a hope, that something is happening, that something is getting in motion. And for me, after the speech I, for many years, I have lost this feeling that I was being weighed down, for many years I had a feeling of joy in my heart, that I carry inside of me until this day. A huge burden has been lifted of me, of my heart, my conscious feels much lighter, I feel relieved, because now I have the feeling, this feedback from people, complete strangers take me in their arms and praise me for my courage. That gives me the certainty and the strength that I am on the right track and that I should continue on this road. And about the question, how was the "measure" that hit me just very recently, after the suspension.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

It's like a temporary relief of duties, perhaps we can conclude that subject, is that fine with you?

Michael Fritsch:

Yes, it's like a temporary relief of duties. Yes, that's fine.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

So it's like a temporary relief of duties, you were taken out of the line of fire, then it will be investigated if what you did was within the rules, this takes three months

You are absent with full pay.

Michael Fritsch:

Exactly, I'm not allowed to work but I still get paid, so at this moment I don't suffer any financial disadvantages. A few days after my suspension I received the message that an official procedure had been opened against me, in which the reasons were given, as I already said. And when you look at the subject of suspension, you see that it is one of the most serious measures you can take as a first step when you accuse a police officer or a professional error. And as a rule, the aim is the removal from service.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Didn't you even get a hearing? It just hit me, you say that on your next working day, you were there and were suspended the same day. That's a measure that's normally taken quite far into the process, didn't they have a conversation with you? So that the people who heard it could listen to your arguments, check your sources, that they could sleep on it? That doesn't seem to have been the case.

Michael Fritsch:

You are given the opportunity to state your position, it's just that in an effort to do things fast, this measure, I did count on a measure, but the severity also surprised me. And so I didn't have legal assistance. And so you find yourself in a situation where, because of your actions, you put somebody's 40-year career and pension on the line. So in that position, I would only do it in the presence of legal counsel, or at least upon having received legal advice. Things just went so fast, so I used my right to not make any statements at that point.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

That's understandable.

Michael Fritsch:

Then things continued, as I said before, I received the letter in my post box stating that a disciplinary investigation had been opened, I personally threw the envelope into my house when we arrived home, my wife and I. And yesterday something happened, I had given a speech in Darmstadt on Saturday, and Monday, meaning yesterday, my wife and I were having breakfast in the morning and the doorbell rang.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Can you tell us exactly, which day, what time?

Michael Fritsch:

It was August 24th at 9:15, the doorbell rang, and when I opened the door several of my colleagues were standing in the door with a police badge with a big loop, we have an electric doorbell which makes the sound of a dog, and when the colleagues came in they said "where is the dog?", we have a search warrant, my wife got scared and sat in the dining room and didn't dare to come out at first, and then she came and these people walked to her with that badge and with the loop and were looking for the dog and said "where is the dog", and we said "we don't have a dog", it was a scary confusion, things then slowly got cleared up, I then tried to bring some calm to the situation. I then was handed the search warrant and 10-12 colleagues then searched my house from top to bottom

for four hours, they searched my car, my motor, my garage, they took several things with them that they wanted to... I mean, it's not a criminal investigation that is being undertaken against me, for me there is an investigation based on civil servant regulations. And on the basis of the "serious professional error" that I was being accused of, my house was being turned inside out.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

That means, you had a raid squad in front of your door, that happened just now?

Michael Fritsch:

I wouldn't say a raid squad, it looked different, it was an objective dialogue, I also knew the operations manager from my previous professional activities, that was a colleague from a management level service, I even worked together with him at the same place at one point in time

Heiko Schöning:

So there was a house search, that is also an interference of fundamental rights.

Michael Fritsch:

Yes, there is a judicial decision, and my manager with authority, the Hannover police chief went to the Hannover administrative court and filed for a search warrant, which was granted by the court, and as a result of that my entire house, vehicles... were searched and on top of that, along with a friend I grounded a small company, and the company, which is located at his home because we don't need a whole lot of logistics, simultaneously there were other officers searching my friend's home.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

So they even involved your friend and business partner?

Michael Fritsch:

Yes

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

The proportionality of these measures is very questionable.

And did anything happen in between? Between the time of your speech in Dortmund until now, August 24th, when there was a house search at your house, did anything happen, did you do anything?

Michael Fritsch:

No. The speech in Dortmund, the speech in Darmstadt. I also consciously held back when it came to interviews, you and I already made this appointment before that had happened, this just now happened as a new given. And for me this is such an important event, so intrusive, that no matter the outcome of the investigation, this is something I don't want to keep to myself, I wanted to bring it out into the open, which effect the expression of your opinion, what the consequences can be.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

And this is also something I have to say, when you have to experience something like that, and on top of that from your colleagues, and also with the force of the power of the state standing in front of your door, then as a doctor I have to say, this is something that could lead to traumatizing people. Because the intrusion into your own private life, done by professionals, that can be difficult on a personal level. You are an accomplished, strong man, you have 40 years of police service if I understood correctly. But also for those around you and for your family, it has to be very hard.

Michael Fritsch.

Yes. You see me sitting here very calm and collected. I know how our system functions, I have performed measures like that myself. There of course always people with different points of view. I consider myself to be a very "human" person, so even when someone is the object of a police measure I still try to treat that person as a human being. And of course there are people who have no experience with these measures at all, like my wife. And because of previous experiences in her life, she went through a lot of things, and yesterday she simply couldn't grasp what was happening, she couldn't believe it. And the entire time she defended herself mentally against the measure, she raised her voice, she screamed, and colleagues don't understand that. Some of them consider that, but the colleagues present were very understanding, they tried to get through to her, I tried to get through to her, but it was as if everything was collapsing on top of her. It led to her being on this panic level yesterday all day. And yesterday we phoned my brother, who is also a police officer, he came very late at night, we sat together at 3:30 and then at 4 o'clock when we went to bed, we did not fall asleep right away, and then all of a sudden there was this huge blow, and we tried to locate where it came from, outside or inside. And since that second, she already cried constantly before, but since then she is all huddled up, she is afraid in the house, she is afraid that they will come back, she is totally traumatized, and an urgent investigation is needed. I explained this to my colleagues, of course they have to implement their measures, they cannot take this into account. But she also got hurt during the measure

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

You mean physically, not just mentally but also physically.

Michael Fritsch:

Exactly. Whether it was on purpose or not, that probably still needs to be investigated

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

You present it in a very objective way.

Michael Fritsch:

I was not present at the time. Also, I have a gun safe, because as a gun carrier we need to store our guns in a secured place, and we then take them with us to work, and I had opened everything so the colleagues could search everything, and the personal belongings had been taken out and were lying on the floor in the passage way. My wife wanted to put the items back into cupboards. My wife then saw my mobile phone lying on the floor, why did they want to take it with them, it was in a plastic bag, it was the first thing that was taken away from me and she probably wanted to put it aside. She asked the officer why it was necessary to take my phone away, the answer was that that stemmed from the judicial decision. He then said "is this the judicial decision for the search warrant?" and he said yes, and she then took the search warrant and my mobile phone in the bag. She was asked in a course way to immediately return the mobile phone in the bag with the search warrant, and she said "one moment, I want to read this"

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

So she wanted to read the search warrant.

Michael Fritsch:

Yes, she wanted to understand it and read it through. And then probably the arm of a colleague, who was wearing gloves was pulled away, and she immediately had a bleeding wound on her lower arm, you can see the scratches, it was a considerable wound, and she then complained about this and cried and immediately said that it hurt, and to that the colleagues said: "you perhaps cut yourself somehow, or bumped into something."

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Your yourself saw the scratch marks.

Michael Fritsch:

I have seen the scratch marks myself, she also described them to me. She addressed the colleague about it, the one that had handled her too roughly, and he said something to the effect: "I don't feel bad about it".

And those are issues, that is not my police, that's not how you behave towards other people. I have tried to explain, she was traumatized and of course people in such a state don't act rationally, they react emotionally, and that is very hard to understand. I also tried to bring calm to the situation,

there were also colleagues that tried to talk to her. That was a very, very critical situation, that can escalate very quickly.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Yes, I also have to say, I can confirm this from a medical point of view, I have spoken to your wife, I can confirm that there was psychological trauma that was inflicted, and that is something that needs to be processed. Very obvious damage. The question is, simply from a medical point of view, it's something that can be established, it's something that is also still being verified.

Michael Fritsch:

It also concerns fear for the future. My wife works for herself, we live in a small city, the neighbours of course found out about the whole situation since we had the police in our house for 4 hours, we had an ambulance in front of the door because a colleague phoned the emergency services and an ambulance as she was bleeding. And that leaves its marks in her surroundings.

Exactly; And now she is fearful for her livelihood, because her company was threatened. Her office was searched, her personal affairs. There is a disciplinary investigation against ME, that's something you shouldn't forget. And HER things get searched. There were books belonging to her that were taken away.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

So there is nothing else that had happened, that's something we kept in mind: between your speech and the house search nothing else happened. Was there anything in this judicial decision for the house search that points to something that potentially took place since you held the speech and before this tough house search? Nothing like that was stated, or am I wrong?

Michael Fritsch:

As a justification it said I had applied for an identity document, and that I had received this document, and the application of this identity document had apparently justified a suspicion as cause or as justification for this house search.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

Wait, I'm not a police officer, nor an attorney, you have applied for an official document. Where did you apply for this?

Michael Fritsch:

At Hildesheim district authority.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

So you applied for an identity document at the Hildesheim district authority. Did you receive this document via the official channel?

Michael Fritsch:

Yes, I did.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

From the Hildesheim district authority.

Michael Fritsch:

Yes, I did.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

And that was stated in all seriousness in black and white on the warrant?

Michael Fritsch:

Exactly.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

I see. I believe we don't need to get into this any deeper. Perhaps the "Anwälte für Aufklärung" ("Lawyers for Disclosure") which was founded in the meantime can also pick this up. But this also corresponds to the impressions that led to your speech in the first place; because you said on the one hand the legal basis and on the other hand and especially in this case, proportionality. And that is the situation that we currently experience. That is why I thank you very much for this witness statement.

Michael Fritsch:

Thank you very much, Mr. Schöning.

Dr. Heiko Schöning:

This was yet another session of the Corona Extra-Parliamentary Inquiry Committee, I thank you for your attention, please share this video, make a back-up of it externally, because I unfortunately have to inform you that even professional conversations between two doctors have been deleted,

between your humble servant and Prof. Dr. Sucharit Bhakdi; that did actually happen on YouTube, so please, make an external back-up, and perhaps upload it again. Thank you for your attention, I declare this session for closed.