

Evaluation of the cantonal Judge VD

Pierre-Henri Winzap

Swiss (Vaudois) senior officer. He calls himself a cantonal «Judge». «Works» in the palace of the Hermitage, route du Signal 8, 1014 Lausanne.

Private address:

Avenue du Général-Guisan 21, 1009 Pully

Private phone: 021 601 94 00

Marital status: unknown; is cohabiting with Anne-Laure PAGES.



Pierre-Henri WINZAP during a conference of the GRAAP at the Casino of Lausanne, April 18, 2016 – the hypocrisy in person



Inscription on the mailbox, glued on by the postman. WINZAP is obviously penny-pinching, and does not want to spend money for a simple engraving.

Shots of the house



Villa of WINZAP seen from the south – possession probably inherited from his parents, a few meters from the shores of Lake Geneva



View from north-west, with the lake just visible

Profile

Former partner of the Lawyer Christian BETTEX (Bâtonnier in 2007)

Later President of the district court of Lausanne.

Promoted cantonal «Judge» in 2009, after having committed the monstrous judiciary fraud of the first show trial against APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE in October/November 2006.

Freemason.

The first big show trial against APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE

The citizens' initiative APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE was founded in 2000 as a result of my efforts. In 2006 there were about 1000 followers united. Our objective was the sanitation of the judiciary system by non-violent means. Since August 2001, penal complaints had accumulated for pretended infringement of honour of Lawyers. The investigation of these complaints had dragged on during 5 years.

The court of WINZAP had offered to us the honour to run this trial in the main courtroom of the Palace of Montbenon in Lausanne, once built as the first Swiss supreme Federal Court. The rostrum was crowded with supporters, curious people and journalists. The atmosphere in the lobby was tense. Nine accused persons were facing the Substitute of the Attorney General, **Eric MERMOUD**, as well as fifteen plaintiffs, of which a dozen Judges and Lawyers, who were in turn assisted by their defenders, Lawyers as well. With our eight defenders ex officio (in reality only seven, since SAAL had abdicated), we were facing a phalange of twenty Lawyers.

According to the rules of jurisprudence, this trial should not have happened at all. On October 4, 2006, that is to say four weeks prior to the opening of the trial, my former Lawyer ex officio, SAAL, had requested in writing to WINZAP with copy to the cantonal court to be released from his mandate.

See next pages.

All Links in red have been
censored illegally by the
Prosecutor Yves NICOLET, by
secrete procedure.

Letter of the Lawyer SAAL of October 4, 2006, requesting to be released

from his mandate

BUDIN & ASSOCIES

AVOCATS

20, rue Sénebier - Case postale 166 - 1211 Genève 12 - Téléphone +41 22 818 08 08 - Téléfax +41 22 818 08 18
e-mail : urs.saal@budin.ch - www.budin.ch

PIERRE-ANDRÉ BÉGUIN
PATRICK SCHELLENBERG
CAMILLE FROIDEVAUX
PATRICK T. BITTEL
GABRIEL A. BENEZRA
CHRISTIAN GROSJEAN
PHILIPPE BONVIN
URS SAAL

MICHEL D'ALESSANDRI
Lic.sc.éc. HEC

JEAN DONNET

SILVIA TEVINI DU PASQUIER
Docteur en droit

SYLVIE HOROWITZ-CHALLANDE

INÈS FELDMANN-WYLER

JEAN-CHARLES LOPEZ

PASCAL DÉVAUD
LL.M. Georgetown
Admis au Barreau de New York

MALIKA SALEM THÉVENOZ

PATRICE HUGUENIN
M.B.A., New York University

PHILIPPE BURNAND

LUCIEN FENIELLO
M.B.L., Université de Genève

MARIE-CHRISTINE BALZAN
Lic.sc.éc.

NICOLAS BEGUIN

PHILIPPE SCHELLENBERG

PATRICIA COURTOIS
Clerc d'avocat breveté

Conseils

ANDRÉ KAPLUN

STEVEN J. STEIN
(New York)

PIERRE R. MONNEY

ROGER MERKELBACH

Genève, le 4 octobre 2006

Monsieur le Président du
Tribunal Cantonal
Palais de justice de l'Hermitage
Rte du Signal 8
1014 Lausanne

Par télécopie 021 316 13 28 et pli simple

Concerne : Mes mandats d'offices
Monsieur Gerhard Ulrich

Monsieur le Président,

Comme vous le savez, j'ai été commis d'office depuis quelques années maintenant à la défense d'office de Monsieur Gerhard Ulrich (dans son divorce ainsi que diverses procédures pénales).

Je viens par la présente requérir d'être relevé de l'ensemble de ces mandats, en raison de divergences d'opinions insurmontables et une confiance totalement disparue entre mon mandant d'office et moi-même.

La procédure de divorce de M. Ulrich (plus précisément les quelques questions encore en suspens qui sont plus d'ordre techniques que juridiques) ne nécessite par ailleurs pas ou plus l'assistance d'un avocat. De toute manière, Monsieur Ulrich refuse de participer à la procédure.

De plus, les procédures à venir, au-delà d'un certain tapage médiatique et des audiences fleuves devant une cour correctionnel (bien qu'au regard des infractions retenues, il s'agissait plutôt de matières relevant d'un tribunal de police) ainsi que la présence du Ministère public (probablement également en raison dudit tapage médiatique) ne présentent pas de difficulté particulière nécessitant la présence d'un avocat d'office (il s'agit encore et toujours d'infractions présumées contre l'honneur poursuivies sur plainte, les infractions présumées de contrainte ne reposant strictement sur rien ...).

J'adresse copie par courrier de la présente aux différents juges saisis (en l'état Monsieur le Président du Tribunal de l'arrondissement de Lausanne Philippe Colelough, Monsieur le Président du Tribunal correctionnel de l'arrondissement de Lausanne Pierre Henri Winzap, ainsi que Monsieur le Président du Tribunal d'arrondissement de Vevey Philippe Goermer) pour information ainsi évidemment qu'à Monsieur Ulrich.

En vous remerciant d'accueillir favorablement ma requête, je vous prie de croire, Monsieur le Président, à l'expression de ma haute considération.

Urs Saal, av.

Since there came no reaction from the part of the court of WINZAP, I submitted on October 18, 2006 the written request to have another defender appointed ex officio. In spite of reiterate recalls, WINZAP reacted with a denial of justice. Only after the beginning of the trial, he wanted to impose a new Lawyer, who I did not know, and with whom I had no confidential relationship. On top of that, I did not have had the opportunity to prepare with him the trial. This was a unbelievable violation of article 6 ECHR, granting explicitly the right to dispose of enough time to prepare a trial. Marc-Etienne BURDET and myself have therefore refused to participate at this phony trial, having reiterated in vain at the opening of the trial to have it postponed for granting an effective defense. A posteriori, Winzap deformed the facts. In his judgement, he pretended wrongly that I had terminated the mandate of my former lawyer, and that this act was to be assimilated with a abuse of law. The opposite is proven: SAAL gave up. Winzap has committed an abuse of law.

This ly of WINZAP was subsequently simply reproduced by copy/paste by the superior instances, notwithstanding reiterated objections from my side.

The judgement of the cantonal court PE01.027095-JAN/EMM/PWI of August 31st, 2007 preserved this forgery, according to which I had fired SAAL (= abuse of law) and overshadowed the fact that SAAL had himself requested to be relieved from his mandate.


In this trial, our strategy of defence was to administer the proof to have said the truth concerning two affairs. The one who has said the truth cannot be punished for infringement of the honour (article 173, part 2 of the Swiss Penal Code).

Let's start with the affaire of Danielle RUSSELL.

On October 29, 2006, we launched on the French version of our Home Page our last attack preceeding the show trial to come. We had choosen deliberately that case, which demonstrated very visibly the failure of the judiciary apparatus. Certain of our position of strength, we formulated the headline:

THE FIRST SHOW TRIAL AGAINST APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE IS PUT TO AN END...

...and the counter-attack is opened, by denouncing a trial fraud big as a house ... which is in addition well visible:



(The photo on the right side shows that a reconstructed house was exceeding 2 m the previous height, in contradiction with the judgement of March 3, 1997, prohibiting such an elevation. Photo to the left: situation before the reconstruction.)

This photomontage was concluding a double sheet DIN A4-Folder, addressed as open letter to the then acting President of the National Council, **Claude JANI**AK and copied to all Members of Parliament of the Confederation and of Vaud; this leaflet was distributed massively among the population in the region of La Côte. Extract (translation):

Mister **Claude JANI**AK
President of the National Council
Hauptstrasse 104
4102 Binningen

October 28, 2006

cc: Mister **Jean-Marc SURER**, President of the Parliament of Vaud

The trial fraud which went too far
www.swiss-justice.net/id/wyss

Dear Mister President of the National Council,

On October 12, 2006, our member of the committee Franz DUSS from St. Gallen has explained to you a case of judiciary arbitrary (which is proven visually) and we discussed the same day with a dozen of Members of the federal Parliaments in Flims GR. They have all encouraged us to continue our struggle. On page 4 you find another representation of a trial fraud from the canton of Vaud, in which 19 dishonest magistrates, including 3 federal Judges are involved (see list on page 3). For reconstructing a building, which is circumnavigating all determinations of a legally valid judgement of the administrative court of Vaud, the protagonists have produced several forged documents (submission of plans in another scale than indicated – 1 : 125 instead of 1 : 100 – and subsequently exchanging these plans after the public announcement of the reconstruction project: plans which are insinuating elevated dimensions of the neighbouring buildings, for suppressing the illegal elevation of the planned reconstruction etc. These offenses were covered up by the mayor Michel ROULET-CHAUVEY and among others the Judge Assessor Arnold CHAUVEY (Geometer, former President of the Parliament of the canton of Vaud and son in law of SCHNETZLER, a former President of the cantonal court of Vaud). In 1997 the affair could not be presented to the High Federal Court, because the lawyer of the cheated couple – a former trainee in the layers office of the guilty President of the administrative court **Jean-Albert WYSS** – had strictly refused to do it.

On December 21, 2002 the victims of this fraud had lodged a complaint for forged documents etc. The investigating «judge» **Nicolas CRUCHET** had investigated

seriously in appearance in the beginning, for burying subsequently the complaint finally on September 2nd, 2004 with cheap pretexts. The cantonal court, presided by the cantonal «Judge» **François DE MONTMOLLIN** had than this arbitrary decision confirmed on October 5, 2004, followed by an identical decision of the Federal Court 6S.12/2005/rod dated February 3rd, 2005 with the federal «Judge» **SCHNEIDER** as chairman:

www.worldcorruption.info/schneider.htm

The nonsense of convictions to long prison sentences without proofs/avowals is difficult to demonstrate. For illustrating the silliness of «inner conviction» of a Judge, resulting in such a penalty, one has to activate logical thinking. Only a minority of persons are able/ willing to make an intellectual effort to re-enact such injustices. In the present case the offense can be proven by geometry, and made visible. Everybody understands thus instantly the direct correlations....

This affair has triggered off the political trial against APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, which shall start on October 30, 2006 before the court of **Pierre-Henri WINZAP** in Lausanne. The case RUSSELL is unveiling very clearly the arbitrary of the judiciary apparatus, and demonstrates how the system has degenerated to become an organized gang of criminals, proliferating from the small mayor of the political party UDC at Etoy up to the UDC President of the federal cassation court. After 6 years of tough struggle, APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE will manage not only to be heard but to be as well understood by the public, by revealing this single evident abuse.

Only politics can clean out these Augean stables. As first citizen of Switzerland, you are in the obligation to care, and as well the President of the Parliament of Vaud, receiving a copy of this letter, has this duty. The guilty magistrates want to retract from the circulation those who do have the courage and the merit to denounce there misdeeds. It is indeed a perversity that the same multi recidivist Judges, who we know from many other judiciary crimes , dear to deal with court cases concerning members of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, for exploiting an opportunity for revenge and to cover up the truth. The Parliaments have exercised finally their constitutional duty which is obliging them to survey the courts, and to have the judiciary criminals pursued.

The scandal of the couple Russell is that trial fraud which went too far!

Respectfully

Gerhard ULRICH, President of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE

Danielle RUSSELL provided me on Tuesday evening, November 7, 2006 at 6.20 p.m. by secured e-mail with new information:

«This morning, Friday, November 3rd, 2006 Reto BARBLAN has been interrogated as witness in my absence. He made a strong impression on the court. WINZAP has asked him, if the term intentional deceit was not an exaggeration and Reto has denied. When one is committing an unintentional mistake of appreciation a first time, one will not persist a second time. He said that the scales had been falsified intentionally. The substitute of the Prosecutor has mentioned the law RPE, which is allowing a height of buildings of 12 m, and Reto has replied that that was correct, however that there was as well article 4 RPE, stipulating that buildings could only be reconstructed according to the existing measures. This article determined the issue in this case, since it concerned a reconstruction. In consequence, the concerned building had been elevated illegally by one floor, respectively 2 m, although the administrative court had prohibited earlier an elevation of 1.60 m.»

As I had predicted already on November 2nd, 2006 WINZAP had deceived Mrs. RUSSELL. Since he could interrogate the witness in her absence, she had no opportunity to request the declarations to be retained in the minutes of this determining witnessing. Indeed, in the judgement of WINZAP of November 24, 2006 (on page 28 out of a total of 289 pages) one is reading just the following empty verbalization:

«Reto BARBLAN, 1946, géomètre breveté. Il est exhorté à dire la vérité. Le Ministère public produit le Règlement sur le plan de zones et la police des constructions. L'audition de Reto BARBLAN étant terminée, il se retire.»

On October 25, 2006 Danielle RUSSELL had submitted for the trial records the detailed written report of the geometer BARBLAN, dated October 24, 2006, and Winzap has of course suppressed this evidence in his forthcoming judgement.

The other judiciary corruption case denounced by APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE concerned Birgit SAVIOZ, cheated in the sale of her real estate property at Sâles FR. See www.worldcorruption.info/savioz.htm

Birgit SAVIOZ had submitted to the court of the Tribunal WINZAP the notice of law of Professor Denis PIOTET, dated October 28, 2006, which had concluded as we had done that this sale of the property of Mrs. SAVIOZ had been illegal.

Of course, WINZAP ignored as well this legal advice of PIOTET.

The judgement of WINZAP is pretending on page 84, second last paragraph, «Toutes les accusations se sont relevées sans fondement». (all accusations – brought forward by APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE – have turned out to be unjustified). This is the nicely faked procedural truth, which could be obtained by suppressing the witnessing of the geometer Reto BARBLAN (see above) and the legal advice of the professor Denis PIOTET.

The affairs Birgit SAVIOZ and Danielle RUSSELL had been in the centre of the attention in this show trial, since

- a) 9 out of 15 plaintiffs were concerned by those denouncements.
- b) Birgit SAVIOZ and Danielle RUSSELL have been convicted in court as members of the committee of our civic action group.

On page 60 of his judgement, WINZAP had confirmed it himself: «Deux affaires ont eu un retentissement plus important que les autres, soit celle relative à Danielle RUSSELL d'une part et celle relative à Birgit SAVIOZ d'autre part.»

The court of WINZAP has been provided very well with the evidences, that APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE had denounced those cases rightfully.

Conclusion: We are in the presence of a monstrous judiciary fraud.

WINZAP did condemn us with exemplary sentences that is to say without any moderation. 6 activists of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE were condemned to suspended prison sentences going from 1 to 9 months. Marc-Etienne BURDET was knocked down with 18 months in prison firm and Gerhard ULRICH was gratified with firm 21 month imprisonment. In addition, WINZAP charged us with the judiciary costs and allocated to the abusive plaintiffs generous allowances for the so called moral damages. He ordered his judgment dispositive, i.e. his disinformation to be published in various daily newspapers of French speaking Switzerland. The objective has been achieved: the repression of the freedom of expression.

WINZAP did not limit himself to condemn us for infringements to honour (defamation, qualified slander). The public opinion would not have understood the heaviness of the sentences. For exhibiting us to be dangerous, he charged us

in addition with offenses of violence which we had not committed. In my case, he condemned me as well for attempted constraint and home invasion.

The penal investigation had been started by the cantonal investigating Judge **Françoise DESSAUX**. When the Lawyers from the canton of Fribourg started to accuse me of constraint, she countered by pointing out that the invitation in a flyer to a given Judge to abdicate because of his failures, is not a constraint. But when this file was taken over by her successor, the investigating Judge **Yves NICOLET**, this Magistrate eagerly picked up those fanciful complaints for constraint, and WINZAP hurried to condemn me for that law violation, although there existed no element on charge in the file.

Actually, 8 federal Judges have jointly lodged a complaint against me in August 2004, among others for alleged constraint. Let's be clear, that our actions at the residences of the federal Judges had been far more massive than those carried out at the homes of the Fribourg Lawyers. In spite of a one way instruction on charge and all the cheatings undertaken by the dark room of the nation (Federal Prosecutors' Office, Office of the federal investigating Judges), the Penal Federal Court was obliged to acquit me from the indictment of constraint on April 14, 2010. This is demonstrating that 8 federal Judges did not even know what constraint means on the penal level. See www.swiss1.net/info/aap/forni

The condemnation pronounced by WINZAP for attempt of constraint was thus definitely abusive.

I am of the opinion that there was neither home invasion. Here the event which did serve as a pretext to stick to me this offense:

On February 20, 2003, we entered as a group of five persons in the lobby of the Federal Court, just for the time span to deliver orally the following protestation message: «APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE. **SCHUBARTH** has gone. That is a good thing. He has produced too many victims. We did come together with the spouses S., victims of **SCHUBARTH** and condemned to long prison sentences without proofs. **SCHUBARTH** did not want to hear them face to face as they had requested. He defeated them by way of correspondence. – The successor of **SCHUBARTH** as a President of the cassation court is **WIPRÄCHTIGER**, the same who has intrigated beforehand against **SCHUBARTH**. But **WIPRÄCHTIGER** is dysfunctional according to the same pattern as

SCHUBARTH: He has rejected the demand of the couple S. to be heard face to face. The Federal Court is a retreat of lazy people and is presided by the perjury liar **AEMISEGGER**. We re-vindicate all Federal Judges to be fired!»

Thereafter, we accepted to be complemented outside of the building by the security agent Remo MEIER. This event did result in a complaint by the Federal Court, dated March 27, 2003 for alleged home invasion.

By filling up my judiciary records with law infringements of non-committed violent acts, WINZAP did close the judicial ambush over me, because the public opinion was that way misinformed: The Swiss consider the judiciary records to be truthful. The Mass Media, devote to the regime, did willingly amplify this slander ex officio by WINZAP.

WINZAP has been compensated for his cheating feat, since a few months later, he was promoted to become Vaudois cantonal «Judge» for having stifled two heavy judiciary corruption cases, one in Vaud, and the other one in Fribourg. This is a form of corruption which is commonly applied by the Vaudois

The same WINZAP has equally fraudulent in the corruption affairs at the costs of Naghi GASHTIKHAH and of **Michèle HERZOG**. See *The Album of Dishonour*.

Not the Members of APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE, condemned by WINZAP on November 24th, 2006 had infringed the honour of respectable persons. In the present case the professional slanderer ex officio was WINZAP.

Some victims of this Mafia Judge:

Danielle RUSSELL

Birgit SAVIOZ

Michèle HERZOG

Naghi GASHTIKHAH, judiciary crime + organized economic crime

Marc-Etienne BURDET

Gerhard ULRICH

François LÉGERET, *L'affaire Légeret – Un assassin imaginaire*, Jacques SECRETAN, Editor Mon Village 2016

Jakob GUTKNECHT, Freemason conspiracy

List of references (observations collected since 2000):

Number of negative references: 11

Number of positive references: 1

Consequently, the author is legitimated to classify WINZAP in the category of corrupt Mafia Judges.

Evaluation of Lawyers

14.11.16/GU