

Press Release

Today, once again a search took place at the home of Christian Dettmar, a judge at the district court in Weimar. This search was ordered at the request of the Erfurt public prosecutor's office by order of the Erfurt district court on June 22, 2021. As in the previous search on April 26, 2021, his cell phone was once again seized (although it had already been mirrored). In addition, his laptop was again seized, where his correspondence with the defense attorney is located.

In addition to the search at my client's home, a search was also ordered and carried out at the home of another fellow judge in Weimar. Also, the homes and/or offices of the experts cited by Mr. Dettmar in his decision of April 8, 2021 were subject of house searches. At the same time a search took place at the lawyer who acted as legal counsel in the proceedings that led to the decision of April 8, 2021. And also at the same time, a search was conducted at the home of the mother whose children were exempted from wearing masks in the order of April 8, 2021.

In the order of the Erfurt Local Court, my client is again accused of perverting the course of justice. This is seen on the one hand with the opinion that it was not his jurisdiction to make the ruling on April 8, 2021, on the other hand, that he had been in contact with third persons, in particular the experts finally commissioned by him, in the run-up to his decision in order to initiate proceedings "under the cover of the alleged risk to the welfare of the child" in order to "spread his personal attitude and opinion on the protective measures for the containment of the Corona pandemic with publicity effect."

The following should be noted in this regard: Mr. Dettmar did not presume jurisdiction. The orders pronounced in his decision of April 8, 2021 were covered by the law (Section 1666 (4) of the Civil Code). Although the Nuremberg and Jena Higher Regional Courts (orders of April 26 and May 15, 2021) see this differently. However, both Higher Regional Courts have allowed an appeal

to the Federal Court of Justice on grounds of fundamental importance, thus making it clear that the question of jurisdiction remains open (at least) until the Federal Court of Justice reaches a decision. For this reason alone, it is absurd to accuse my client of bending the law.

Insofar as the Erfurt Local Court also refers to the fact that Mr. Dettmar spoke to various persons, in particular the experts, in the run-up to his decision and sounded out their willingness to provide an expert opinion, the Local Court fails to recognize that the proceedings under Sections 24 and 26 FamFG are ex officio proceedings. In preparing his decision, the judge can speak to anyone who is helpful to him as a source of information and knowledge. He can decide on his own initiative without having to rely on applications or even suggestions from third parties.

The development of these proceedings makes one deeply concerned for the rule of law. The effect is the intimidation of an independent judiciary.