

Evaluation of the cantonal Judge VD

Dominique CREUX

Senior Officer (Vaud) Switzerland. He called himself cantonal «Judge», and former President of the cantonal court. He used to «work» in the palace of the Hermitage, route du Signal 8, 1014 Lausanne.

Recycled as President of the Board of the *Journal des Tribunaux*.

Private address:

Chemin de Ponfilet 80, 1093 La Conversion VD

Phone working place: 021 791 20 54

Marital status: unknown



Dominique CREUX



The individual is living alone.

Shots of the house



East facade of the twin house of CREUX



South facade

Role assumed in the affair LÉGERET

CREUX has presided the Court of penal cassation of the Vaudois cantonal court which has confirmed the condemnation of François LÉGERET to lifelong imprisonment by decision of January 14, 2009. A typical job of «copy/paste».

Profile

Born in 1948?

He has started his career as a lawyer in Lausanne, before being elected cantonal Judge for the socialist Party. President of the cantonal court VD in 2007. Retirement in 2013.

Actually President of the Board of the *Journal des Tribunaux*, Deputy Member of the Assessment commission of the public functions of the State of Vaud, President of the Foundation for a new Organ in the Cathedral of Lausanne, Member of the Foundation for an ongoing training of the Swiss Judges...

Presumed Member of the Lions Club.

Among others, he has covered up two very serious medical mistakes.

Below you find two flyers distributed massively, concerning two serious medical mistakes covered by CREUX:

All Links in Red have been
illegally censured by the
Prosecutor Yves NICOLET by
secrete procedure.



**APPELL AL PIEVEL
APPELLO AL POPOLO
APPEL AU PEUPLE
AUFRUF ANS VOLK**

c/o Gerhard ULRICH

Avenue de Lonay 17

CH-1110 Morges

The Citizens Initiative which is defending the interests of the consumers of Justice

To the Vaudois Members of Parliament

The time has come for the Truth: For the Judges or for ULRICH?

Citizens,

*During the trial of February 23, 2005 in Vevey, one of our informers came to witness that a penal investigation had indeed been opened against the cantonal Judge **Dominique CREUX** in the past. But the brother of this witness, a former investigating Judge has testified that CREUX has just been called as a witness in that procedure.*

*Any wrong accusation is regrettable, even if it concerns a dishonest Magistrate. Therefore I assume the pronounced penalty on that point, that is to say to have blamed **CREUX** wrongly **to** have been under penal investigation in said procedure.*

*The paradox wants it on the other side that a Judge having abused of his power remains unpunished. The bad faith of the Vaudois cantonal «Judge» **Dominique CREUX**, **chemin de Ponfilet 80, 1093 La Conversion**, can be expressed in figures. Let's take the affaire of the surgeon Gaston-François MAILLARD. (documented on our Web Site, rubric «affairs », **number of reference VD116**), in which a victim of MAILLARD has been defeated and heavily condemned:*

***CREUX** and his pairs had the trial dragged on during 8 (eight) years. They have followed blindly an expert (a crony of MAILLARD). During our Hearing on February 20, 2005 in Lausanne, having this affair as a subject, we had demonstrated 15 lies of that expert, which were accepted by CREUX and his pairs, although these untruths had been unveiled to them. One singly should have had the surgeon MAILLARD condemned: According to that expert, the convened operation had been realized. As a matter of fact, MAILLARD had confessed himself in writing on May 28, 1993, not to have carried out the operation agreed upon in writing (agreement).*

*Those Judges have been perfectly aware to deal with a dangerous surgeon:
The file contains a letter of the Professor **H. TSCHOPP** of July 16, 1997, pointing out the following: «Years ago, I was in charge do compile an expertise against Dr. MAILLARD, which has caused to me unpleasant attacks of my colleague. This is the reason, why I do not want to act once more as an expert in that affaire, which will end up probably once more in a negative judicial decision.»*

*5 (five) other victims of MAILLARD came to witness at this trial. **CREUX** & Cie have just mentioned in their judgement of August 28, 2002 that these witnesses had been heard, but without taking into consideration their witnessing!*

The consequences of the bad faith of that Vaudois cantonal «Judge» can be expressed as well in figures: For 2000 distributed flyers, denouncing the surgeon MAILLARD, 1 victim of his reported to me. Presently, we know 15 of his customers which had been ill-treated by this surgeon, having been mutilated. Almost always, we speak of tragic destinies. By extrapolation, one can thus conclude that this butcher has de-figured hundreds of persons!

This slaughter can continue because of CREUX, who was in turn protected by a set of Magistrates, including 3 federal «Judges» (you will find their names on our Web Site, reference number VD 116).

*I leave it up to the reader to appreciate which mistake is having the higher weight in the balance of justice: the mine (mentioned in the beginning of this flyer), or that one of the Vaudois cantonal «Judge» **Dominique CREUX** in the affair of the surgeon-butcher.*

*What concerns me, I have recognized my error, and there are hardly any un-mendable damages. But the surgeon MAILLARD, he can continue his butcher job and ruin human destinies, since he is taking advantage of the abuse of power by the «Judge» **CREUX**. Such an abuse is a crime, in face of the ruined destinies.*

*That illegal protection can only be explained by a traffic of influence. Is it true that the surgeon MAILLARD and the Vaudois cantonal Judge **CREUX** are both two Members of the Lions Club?*

The time has come for the Truth. For the Judges or for ULRICH? That is not really the question! It is important to serve the Truth.

Sincerely yours

Gerhard ULRICH, President of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE



**APPELL AL PIEVEL
APPELLO AL POPOLO
APPEL AU PEUPLE
AUFRUF ANS VOLK**

c/o Gerhard ULRICH

Avenue de Lonay 17

CH-1110 Morges

May 5, 2007

cc: www.appel-au-peuple.org

*To the doctors J.-C. BERSET, U. KESSELRING, J.-M. FAVRE,
J.P. FRIEDRICH*

*To the «Judges» D. CREUX, F. JOMINI, P.-A. TÂCHE, [M. SCHUBARTH](#), H.
[WIPRÄCHTIGER](#), [G. KOLLY](#)*

Did you cover 2 irresponsible physicians? (VD119)

Pierre SCHOBINGER, to you!

On April 28 1994, Daniela SAUGY had her nose operated ambulatory at the hospital Cécil in Lausanne. In the evening of May 2nd, 1994 at 10 p.m. her nose started to bleed seriously and her husband drove her to the hospital Cécil.

*She was taken in charge by the physicians **Jean-Claude BERSET** and **Ulrich KESSELRING**. They did not realize a single measure to stop the bleeding (wicking/buffering). She was prevented to alert her husband by phone, and kept sequestered at the Cécil, in spite of her reiterated demands to get transferred to the CHUV. From midnight onwards, one started to compensate the massive blood loss by blood transfusions ([html-1](#)).*

The following morning at 9.15 a.m., a cardiac arrest almost occurred and she had a black out. At that point, she was operated one hour later as an urgency. Altogether, she had lost 7.5 l of blood, i.e. 1 ½ times her blood volume ([html-1](#) , based on the pieces [html-2](#), [html-3](#), [html-4](#)).

On June 10, 1998 the patient lodged a penal complaint against the irresponsible physicians for having exposed her to danger of life and health hazard, body injury and forgery. She claimed a symbolic civil pretention of one Swiss Franc.

*To start with, she was directed to an extra judiciary medical expertise which was established by the physicians **Jean-Marc FAVRE** and **J.P. FRIEDRICH** of the Hospital in La Chaux-de-Fonds NE ([html-5](#)). For covering their confrere they have retained (page 5) against any logic that only the first 3 transfusions (0.9 l) had to be taken into consideration, whereas the patient had lost 7.5 l! Their complicity is showing up as well in the fact to have picked up the lie of Dr. KESSELRING (pages 4 and 6), claiming to have applied a bilateral front buffering, although one cannot find any trace of such a measure in the medical files which they had at their disposal!*

In your quality as 1st investigating Judge of the Lausanne district at the time, you did let the investigations have delayed during 3 years, for closing it finally with a scandalous dismissal ordinance on October 12, 2001 ([html-6](#)). You just took over the mentioned complacency expertise, with the scatter brained argument that «only those (first) bottles (of preserved blood) have to be taken into consideration for assessing the activity of the physicians BERSET and KESSELRING».

Even worse, you did overshadow the following contradictions of Dr. KESSELRING:

- 1. On November 9, 1995 he has written to the physician consultant of his civil responsibility insurance (Zurich): «.. I was called to come urgently to the hospital Cécil.... At my arrival at 11.30 p.m., (...) and I noted that all measures had been taken (by the doctors BERSET/NAY) to stop the bleeding» ([html-7](#)).*
- 2. On June 20, 1996 the same KESSELRING has declared on the phone with the «experts», «to have made (him-self) a bilateral frontal buffering» ([html-5](#), pages 4 + 6).*
- 3. During the interrogation carried out by you on February 4, 1999, ([html-8](#)), KESSELRING pretended not to remember any longer the problem with the buffering.*

With this last answer, you could have cornered the suspect, referring to the medical file in your possession.

*As an investigating Judge you are trained to discover the contradictions of your clients. Therefore, your «blindness» cannot pass as a simple error. There exist too many obvious elements to prove your partiality in favour of those doctors. However, your iniquitous ordinance allowed you to be promoted. It is to be noted anyway that you were protected at your turn by the cantonal Judges **Dominique CREUX**, **François JOMINI** (retired), and **Pierre-Alain TÂCHE** (retired). The first one, CREUX, is today President of the cantonal court and your boss. This decision of the Tribunal d'accusation ([html-9](#)) is containing among other nonsense on page 4 the obviously idiotic and contradictory statement: « ...the applicant is wrongly accusing the experts not to have taken into consideration the quantities of blood and deep frozen Plasma which were effectively transfused to her... ».*

*At the Federal Court, your victim has been defeated by the splitter Judge **SCHUBARTH** and his partners in crime **WIPRÄCHTIGER** and **KOLLY**, adding another lie: « During the following days (of the operation), she (Daniela SAUGY) would have presented new bleedings, making new blood transfusions necessary » ([html-10](#)). The medical file is proving the opposite: After the operation, no new bleeding has occurred, and all the 7.5 litres of preserved blood transfused to Mrs. SAUGY during the 25 hours between midnight of May 2nd, 2005 and 1 a.m. of May 4, 1994 had been necessary to compensate the blood loss **before** the operation!*

*You all, «Judges» and mentioned doctors, you are in comfortable positions, whereas your victim, Daniela SAUGY, has been extorted by Thousands of Francs of judiciary and Lawyer fees, after having been defeated by a complacency expertise and obviously mendacious judgments. You are invited to present your version of the facts. **Did you cover irresponsible physicians, yes or no?** It goes without saying that all Magistrates/doctors reading me in copy are invited as well to comment. Your replies will be published on our Web Site. Regards*

Gerhard Ulrich, APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE

CREUX deserves to be called an «inverted liar». This can be demonstrated by two examples, in the roles he had played in petitions submitted to the Parliament of Vaud, which were finally filed with the help of the lies by CREUX, willingly swallowed by consenting and complacent politicians:

Pétition RC-PET (06/PET/073):

On May 30, 2006, the Parliament of Vaud has transferred this petition to the State Council, retaining that there was dysfunctioning of the judiciary apparatus. CREUX, who had been questioned concerning this matter in his quality as Deputy President of the cantonal court, had denied that there had been dysfunctionings!

My petition to the Parliament of Vaud

The petition commission of the Parliament of Vaud, presided by the radical Christian Pollin received me on my demand on February 7, 2007 for a hearing of half an hour: www.swiss-justice.net/id/petition-vd

In addition to POLLIN, the following politicians were commission members: Verena BERSETH HADEG, Jaqueline BOTTLANG-PITTET, Marcelle FORETAY Amy, Danièle KAESER, Mariela MURI-GUIRALES and Félix GLUTZ.

I had thoroughly prepared myself. Due to my job experience, I was used to give presentations. My collection of lies and law violations should convince the Members of Parliament at a glance. Since my presentation time was limited, I had prepared for every present politician a small documentation file. With the exception of a UDC representative, all wanted to get such a documentation set at the end of the hearing.

During the time put to my disposal, I looked straight forward into the eyes of these persons in front of me, observing and interpreting attentively their reactions and body language. At the end, there was no doubt for me that I had convinced a large majority of the present people.

It was only fairness that the commission wanted to get as well the version of the President of the cantonal court in the same affair. In 2007, his name was just Dominique CREUX. Because of this Judge, I shall purge 20 days in half liberty from February 20 to March 12, 2007 (during day time I could be on my job for

the ExpressPost Lausanne, my employer at that time. But I had to spend my nights and weekends in a jail located behind the Place de la Palud in Lausanne).

His position figures in the final report RC-PET 06/PET/083/090 of May 29, 2007. It would have been very easy to me to point out the untruths contained in it. But nobody called me to give me that opportunity. Already the fact that this obviously partial Magistrate in front of me - CREUX – has been invited to be questioned in this affair is disturbing. If this man had had a rest of intellectual honesty, he would have asked one of his colleagues to respond to that invitation.

Here the final summary pretensions of CREUX: *«Not only no dysfunctioning of the judiciary apparatus can be observed in this affair, but the petitioner is proving his stubbornness in his respect, demonstrating that he does simply not accept the decisions taken regularly by the Judiciary in his respect.»* Since it has been CREUX to have had the final word, and not me, the superficial politicians swallowed with relief this lesson.

It seems that nobody of these persons has had an adequate memory or enough interest to ask critical questions. By correspondence of August 29, 2007, this petition was simply filed. By the experience made by the Members of the Vaudois Parliament before with CREUX in above mentioned case, they should have been mistrusting this liar.

For what is concerning the accusation of CREUX, saying that I am failing introspection, I retain the following: Although CREUX had lodged a complaint against me, he did not recuse himself in my judiciary procedures. By decision of May 29, 2007, he had the intention to continue to be my Judge. By ATF 5A_324/2007/frs of November 29, 2007 he was corrected. It is to be noted that it is not ULRICH who is failing to have introspection, but in the opposite the Judges and CREUX in particular, who are projecting their own obsessional behaviour onto my person.

Hobbies

Art, among other Music.

Some victims of this malefactor government Officer:

Michel VALLOTTON

Michel BURDET

Marc-Etienne BURDET

Naghi GASHTIKHAH (Iranian)

Daniela SAUGY

A.K.

Gerhard ULRICH

Kumar KOTECHA (British university professor)

François LÉGERET

List of references (observations collected since 2000):

Number of negative references: 27

Number of positive references: 1

CREUX is a prominent judiciary tyrant in the History of injustices of the canton of Vaud, seen the very big number of victims known in our database.

Evaluation of the Lawyers

25.10.16/GU