

Evaluation of the Federal Judge Hans MATHYS

Retired Swiss supreme Bailiff (he has called himself to be a federal «Judge»).

He has «worked» at the palace of the Federal Court, Av. du Tribunal fédéral 29,
1000 Lausanne 14

Private address:

Bäumliweg 10, 8157 Dielsdorf ZH

Private phone: 044 853 01 79

e-mail: hansmathys@swissonline.ch

Wife: Irène, born GERBER

It has to be presumed that he got remarried after a divorce from a first wife, born
FREY.



Hans MATHYS

Shots of the house:



Mailbox at Bäumliweg 10, 8157 Dielsdorf ZH



North entrance. Notice the two lions – in the bottom left – and upper right under the loggia. The owner considers probably himself to be the king of predators, quite a realistic image.



View of the villa well-hidden southwest



View from the east on MATHYs' modest cottage, towered by the town of
Regensberg ZH

Role assumed in the affair LÉGERET

MATHYS has presided the court of penal law of the supreme Federal Court, rejecting the recourse of **François LÉGERET** against the condemnation pronounced by the courts of **COLELOUGH / EPARD** by decision of the Federal Court (ATF) 6B_683/2011 of November 20, 2011. He backslided in this affair three more times, rejecting the recourses of François LÉGERET, subsequently to three more revision requests. This is concerning the ATF 6B_118/2009, 6B_12/2011 of December 20, 2011, 6F_3/2012 of March 16, 2012 and 6B_731/2013 of November 28, 2013, always with the simple and comfortable «copy/paste».

Profile

Studies in Zurich. Doctorate in 1974. Bar Exam in 1975.

Began his career in Dielsdorf ZH at the district court and is named President in 1978. Cantonal «judge» of ZH 1993 – 2005. Elected federal «Judge» UDC on March 22, 2006.

We have not documented all known slippages by this «Judge». However, the specific achievements of the king of predators are the following:

By judgement of the Federal Court 6B_264/2011 of July 19, 2011, MATHYS and Co. rejected a decision of the cantonal Vaudois court; and the same team gave right to the Vaudois, notwithstanding an unchanged situation by ATF 6B_1/2012 of April 2012 (Kumar KOTTECHA case, UK university professor).

Recidivism in another matter: MATHYS et al. dismissed the Vaudois on the grounds that they had based their decision on «presumptions and suspicion» (ATF 6B_825/2012 of May 8, 2012). After repetition of these assumptions and

suspicious by the Vaudois and unchanged situation, MATHYS, as «President» of the court of criminal law at the Federal Court confirmed them to be right (ATF 6B_451/2012 of October 29, 2012).

Such an inconsistent course of action raises the worst fears as for the mental state of the perpetrators of such judgments.

Therefore it is not surprising to see that same individual dive into three judicial crimes. It is this predator who confirmed François LÉGERET's life sentence for alleged triple murder.

Recidivism in the SÉGALAT and Naghi GASHTIKHAH cases.

Another fact:

www.rutz-filz.ch/index.php/74.html?path=content&mode=print&contentid=440

Some victims of this arbitrary bailiff:

Kumar KOTTECHA (British university professor)

Josef RUTZ

Michèle HERZOG (Vaudoise)

François LÉGERET (Vaudois)

Laurent Ségalat (French)

Naghi GASHTIKHAH (ATF 6B_1007/2013 du 02.09.15), Iranian

Jakob GUTKNECHT, victim of a Freemason conspiracy

List of references (observations collected since 2000):

Number of negative references: 8

Number of positive references: 0

Example of inconsistency by Hans MATHYS, which let doubt about his lucidity:

The arbitrary condemnation of Kumar KOTECHEA for alleged violation of a maintenance obligation

In October 2000 his wife has suddenly left the conjugal domicile in London, for settling with the two children born in 1998 and 2000 in Lausanne/Switzerland, without informing her husband and without his consent. Arrived in Switzerland, she requested immediatly the separation, and subsequently the divorce, following a psychiatric expertise carried out by **Dr. Gérard SALEM**. Because of an incident of February 9, 2002 (at that time Kumar KOTECHEA was in the UK) a physician had to extract a bath cap from the anus of the son, than 3 years old. One could not establish, how this object got introduced there. The doctor speculated that the boy had introduced the item himself, because he would have been abused sexually by his father. At that period, the father was living in the United Kingdom, and saw his children only every 3rd week. The psychiatrist Gérard Salem confirmed the high probability of that untenable diagnostique. Subsequently, the «Judge» in charge of the divorce procedure, Marianne FABAREZ did cut the contact between father and children. Only 19 months later he could meet them again under surveillance. This phase shall last another 19 months, until May 2005, when the right of visit of the father was fully reestablished, to occure every second weekend and during half of all school holidays. Notwithstanding the ennoying circumstances, he imposed with tenacity his right of visits, which were bound to strict conditions. Apart from his travel costs, he was obliged to rent in addition to the family domicile in London (where he hosted his children during vacation) a small flat in the Léman region. In April 2002 KOTECHEA lost his job. He had terminated his Law studies, but not yet his Law doctorate. The right to

visit his children in Switzerland did cost to him a lot of money. Therefore, he was not in a position to assume pension payments.

Here we document, how the Vaudois judiciary scum did manage to condemn KOTTECHA for an alleged Violation of a maintenance obligation:

By the decision of the Federal Court (Arrêt du Tribunal Fédéral) ATF 6B_264/2011 of July 19, 2011 the federal Judges Hans MATHYS, **Laura JACQUEMOUD-ROSSARI** and **Christian DENYS** have coldly defeated the Vaudois glove puppets, because they had cheated in a too obvious a manner in that procedure.

Thereafter, the Vaudois cantonal «Judges» **Dominique CREUX**, **Blaise BATTISTOLO** and **Marc PELLET** had the insolence to simply repeat this arbitrary condemnation by decision of November 29. 2011. And this time, the same federal «Judges» Mathys and companions confirmed that condemnation forged with an arbitrary motivation by the inferior instance, although the whole situation had remained unchanged. They did make it easy to themselves : they just summarily pretended that the Vaudois cantonal «Judges» had argued «without arbitrary».

In his request for reconsideration the concerned, condemned arbitrarily communicated to his federal «Judges» the holy truth. He demonstrated to them that their last decision of April 18, 2012 was incompatible with the one of July 19, 2011. These Lawyers have outwitted the law, presenting fallacious allegations, according to which the Vaudois had argued «without arbitrariness», but they forgot to explain why. How could the Vaudois «Judges» impose to the condemned a hypothetical house rent for his home in London, picked from nowhere, and overshadow the real travel costs in relation with the right of visits? It is impossible to act in a more arbitrary way!

Quod erat demonstrandum.

PS: In the meantime, the mother has moved with the children to the Valais. With leverage of her new lovers cronyism with the authorities of that canton, she finally succeeded to alienate the children from their father and to sabotage his visits. A «pédopsychiatre» was found, having no education as a child psychiatrist, who furnished a complacency justification in cooperation with the Office of Childrens Protection, to have another scandalous judiciary decision issued by the «Judge» Jérôme EMONET. All contacts between the father and his children have ceased since spring 2012.

It is to be concluded that MATHYS is one of those useful idiots in the Swiss supreme Federal Court.

Evaluation of Lawyers

06.11.16/GU