

DAVID FRISTEDT

1/13 [of the original version]

Monsieur le Procureur Général [Chief Prosecutor]

Jean-Pierre DRENO

Palais de Justice

5, Rue Colonel Bellando de Castro

MONACO

LR/AR [Registered letter with acknowledgment
of receipt]

First envoy (133 pages) for the attention of the fourth Chief Prosecutor of Monaco, in

The Staples, marker pen and *IT*-bug Affair

Mister Chief Prosecutor,

I ask you hereby to instruct the « Staples, marker pen and *IT*-bug Affair (1 and 2). Its protagonists have through three chief prosecutors in a row made all in their power to bury it. Indeed, the Criminal Code has prepared harsh sentences for the magistrates that commit crimes in order for them to hide their initial felonies, or those of others, in order to avoid any instruction from the prosecution. We are now faced with overwhelming criminal intentions / premeditations that can be followed through a thread of evident logic, since these lawyers know what they risk, whereas their desperation, leading them to commit even more blunders. Many a breach of the law intrinsic to the preparation of the present Affair and of its continuous and / or continuing character is punishable by 20 years in jail. For others, the

Monegasque Legislator has provided the hardest sentence of the law (Article 137 of the Criminal code). It is out of concern for future translation that I must start with an explanation at once, of some elements of the Monegasque Criminal code.

In order to make sure that You have got all documents pertaining to this Affair, and in view of Article 6 of the European Convention of Human Rights, You will be able to compare your file with mine. Indeed, I have reasons to believe that certain documents have vanished from Your Prosecution's Office, in light of the nature of the ongoing criminal complaints (3).

The Minister of State, Mr Michel Roger, acknowledged receipt of two letters (4 and 5) in which He was asked to make sure that a certain ordinance (a criminal ruling made by a hence incriminated judge) be officially nullified; demand that the said Minister of State affirms having caught all His attention (6), whereas He was to get another letter (11), from one of the victims of the criminal ruling, known as The Criminal Gambarini Ruling (7).

In fact, this ordinance saw the light of the day within its most flagrant illegality, and its content is even more illegal. However, the Monegasque authorities continue to base themselves upon it, since without it, many another knows what they risk, particularly since not having pulled into reverse in time. The blackmail that I am suffering would stop delivering its effects should the Prosecution's office once and for all take it to put an end to the disturbances of public order. The whole Affair would resolve itself, inexorably and logically. I shall do my best to try to convince you of the latter in the present envoy. Nevertheless, I affirm that You have what it takes to compare with what Your predecessor eventually will have left you, along with what has been written on and will be written on www.bimcam.com .

The major problem consists in that the responsible nr 1 is no one else but the Director of Judicial Services, and that such responsibility goes back to when he was President of the Court of First Instance. However, the Legislator has clearly anticipated such situation, and Your mission consists in enforcing the reprehension of crimes, not least and particularly if they have been committed by magistrates or by public ministerial officials. This is why I have given a right to inside information to the Cour de cassation (France's judicial Supreme Court) in this matter, so as to make sure that the Director of Judicial Services, Mr Narmino (herewith called Narmino), not be able to take over the dossier against himself (see my letter to the Chief Judge (Premier Président) of the Cour de Cassation, Mr Vincent Lamanda (24), sent the day before I undersigned were to learn the name of the successor of Mr Raybaud, herewith named as Raybaud

One of the victims, my mother, seized the Monegasque Supreme Court only in order to prove a denial of justice, which public evidence I now make use of, not least to show the criminal intentions of Raybaud, in terms of omitting information to the named Tribunal, information concerning himself, and attached to the present (12, 13 and 14).

Forgeries emanate from your prosecution's office, and from the Court of First Instance (7). These forgeries have been used to exert pressure on I undersigned, via the Swedish

Government, which will sooner than later be approached through a demand regarding the quandaries at stake. Please find enclosed my letter to the Swedish Prime Minister (9).

The criminal Gambarini Ruling

Mrs the [first] Vice-President of the Court of First Instance at the time Brigitte Gambarini (herewith Gambarini) took orders from someone whose malevolent intentions beforehand had been signaled to the Monegasque Police's headquarters. The demander would later on be convicted for breach of trust and for swindling, in another affair. The swindler made her illegal demand to Gambarini whilst committing the felony of usurpation / spoofing of the head stationary of lawyer Didier Escaut. Out of this non-contradictory "document" was borne the criminal ruling at stake. It was perpetrated in secret. At the time, the swindler was not in the possession of a Monegasque residence card, nor was she resident or domiciled in Monaco – albeit elsewhere, notably in Sweden, where she shared a joint bank account with I undersigned – not even through any a free contract of accommodation / lease. Since the ruling continues to produce harm through its effects, it is imperative that my lodged complaints / laid criminal charges against the said judge be dealt with according to law.

In order to try to even accept a legitimacy of the very criminal ruling, one must first of all check whether the crook had complied first hand with the requirements listed above. This not being the case, an "IT-bug" was invented.

In the case that You would not be in possession of the integrality of the laid criminal charges against Gambarini, I remain at Your disposal.

The « IT-bug » (7)

The illegal orders for me to pay money within forty-eight hours come supposedly come from Your Prosecution's Office, or at least, the latter has not denied it so far. They are based on the illegal ordinance. But, there is a document that states the Monegasque address of the swindler – a sine qua non condition for the Monegasque Justice to claim competence – and another one, which proves her French address, rendering hence incompetent the Monegasque authorities, from the beginning, including for the time of the criminal Gambarini ruling of the 21th of July 2004. When I let these facts become known, I was told that the address was an error, due to an IT-bug; that in fact, the crook was resident in France. But Monaco uses one side or the other of the forgeries, depending on the receiver of such or that lunacy (see my letter to His Excellency the Prime Minister of Sweden (9), as well as that sent to his Chief, His Majesty the King Carl XVI Gustaf (10)).

In the judgement in my favor of the 12th of May 2005, the Tribunal [of first instance], presided by Narmino, writes: "*Considering moreover, that the writ of the 26th of January 2005 (nr 305 of general role of 2004) [...] while soliciting the junction of the present procedure with that of the aforementioned writ of 18 November 204 [2004];*" However, one

cannot tell from this judgement, whether it refers to the writ of 18 November 2004 containing the false Monegasque address of the instigator, that which misled the Swedish Government (7D), or to the writ of 18 November 2004 in which a correct address is written as for the instigator, namely that she had previously been domiciled in Monaco (7I).

The staples (7)

Considering that I have been asked to sign orders to pay money, but that to these very orders were attached justifications and nonsense translations (25) of a different kind each time, I quickly understood, while seeing that from one of the envoys, someone had removed and put back the staples five times, and that somebody had retrieved and inserted documents with the intention for me to sign something which content I would be unaware of. In this regard, I have by letter of the 29th of April 2005 for the attention of the Chief Prosecutor Mr Daniel Serdet enlarged my laid criminal charges against Bailiff Marie-Thérèse Escaut-Marquet, defining her as responsible from the beginning of all crimes committed to that day. I ask you to act accordingly to the said complaint, immediately (2).

I ignore the itinerary of the letter of 2 February 2005 from late Mr Imperti, of the Foreign Relations Department, for the attention of the Consul of Monaco, Mr Olof Sjöström. But since the latter has confessed to having taken off and reputing the staples, albeit only one time (1), the other four times of taking off and reputing the staples seem to have taken place between the 2nd and the 17th of February 2005.

A former superior / chief of incriminated Narmino can testify to the fact that I have order within my papers. At the time, back in 1993, whilst I was practicing at the Monegasque Courthouse [Palais de Justice], it was a matter of files pertaining to the Tribunal. Indeed, I study ever since the Monegasque law and am even in the possession of a library consecrated to its ancient laws, in order for me to eventually resume my study on the evolution of Monegasque law since what will soon become twenty years.

The marker pen (7)

I hereby ask you to indicate to me the author of the colorings with a yellow marker pen such as those known by the brand “Stabilo Boss” on one of the envoys with order to pay money. Indeed, I think not that these have been made by the equivalent of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through late Mr Imperti, nor do I view it as something coming from the hand of Chief Prosecutor Daniel Serdet. More likely to any another is that these orders to pay money have been fabricated by the swindler herself, with the complicity (see stamps) of the incriminated bailiff, Me Escaut-Marquet, as with that of the latter’s husband, Me Didier Escaut, who is the one who first started the blackmail over 300.000,00 euros against my mother (8), a crime against which nothing has been done (see laid charges on www.bimcam.com under leaflet “Goodbye Mister Raybaud!”). On this plausibility, I again refer to the fact that [judge] Gambarini has acted on the orders of the swindler who used the head stationary of the

incriminated Me Didier Escaut, protected by the very Chief Prosecutor Jacques Raybaud, leaving us to objectively conclude that the protagonists of this affair do not and will not flinch in the face of anything.

The Raybaud case

On the website www.bimcam.com , and under the leaflet “Goodbye Mister Raybaud!”, it is written that the latter has contributed to the criminality in the Principality. This is a fact. Indeed, due to his inaction, in order to protect some of the protagonists of this affair, not least Narmino, there were to be some sixty victims swindled by Monte-Carlo Travel Market (12 and 22). Add to that what Raybaud omitted to give to the Supreme Court, in order to save himself (more biased than that exists not) (12, 13, 14 and 23) and You will understand the reason for my writing to the Chief Judge of France’s Supreme Court [Premier Président de la Cour de cassation, France] (24).

Raybaud, who were to take Narmino’s duties according to the incriminated Narmino himself through a unilateral kind of ordinance [arrêté] (15), in contrast to the separation of powers, was before the Supreme Court obviously incapable of summing up, objectively and impartially, concerning this petition to have his own refusals of access to the case files set aside, which were in this case likely to reveal the magnitude of the persistent failure to take action by the Prosecutor General's office and by the Prosecutor General himself, in the face of the continued and/or continuous breaches of Mrs. Fristedt's fundamental rights, in a legal case in which the Monegasque authorities have done everything in their might to make sure that I not be heard.

In this respect, I regret that Your predecessor on Your table has left you with this Affair (2, 4, 5, 16 and 23), but like it or not, he has omitted quite some information to the Supreme Court, not least regarding what is being known as *the Proust / Pastor-Bensa / Brugnetti – Affair* (I shall come back to it once You will have put an end to the disturbances of public order, or on www.bimcam.com , and only – for the sake of lessening any a trial burden – if I have to). Indeed, I don’t like it when my lawyer represents the Minister of State AND the swindler. I ask you hence to follow up (this constitutes a formal request) on the letters sent by the counsel of my mother, Me Ulf Öberg, considering that she has asked to become party as a victim even in this my affair (12, 13 and 14). Moreover, Raybaud still has not acted regarding my letter of 5 october 2004 to lawyer Didier Escaut, over the 300.000.00 euros claimed from my mother (8). I still await a reply. Please see to that I finally get it.

The Husson case (see www.bimcam.com under the Narmino leaflet) [and under The Medal’s backside]

On her, I invite you to take into consideration my last letter to Raybaud (23), copy of which has been sent to H.E. the Minister of State Mr Michel Roger (and consequently to His Majesty the King of Sweden and His Prime Minister, as to H.S.H. the Sovereign Prince

Albert II, albeit not confirmed by the mentioned Michel Roger), as well as my letters to the latter (4 and 5), complemented with his reply (6) in which he confirms that its content has gathered all His attention. But above all, I ask you to study my letter to the King (10), who is invited to the forthcoming princely wedding, a letter which deals with Husson, regarding her medal which reception I undersigned and many another find revolting.

Indeed, Husson – just as Narmino – was aware of everything right from the beginning, in 2004. Now, she can technically form part of the new High Council of Magistracy [Haut Conseil de la Magistrature] on the side of Narmino, in this very matter. Indeed, the components of this new institution are chosen by certain entities out of their own staff, but – strangely – not as far as the members of the Crown Council are concerned, something I immediately noted.

After having read my letter to the King, You will be able to notice that the instauration of the High Council of Magistracy took place on a certain Monday. The newspapers of the Kingdom of Sweden did not appreciate the King's visit to Monaco, and made it their cover story. Patricia Husson couldn't care less, medal in hand, albeit not in the way she previously had promoted it in the not free Monegasque press.

In my opinion, Patricia Husson, very different from her late father and consul, floats between the definitions of lese-majesty and high treason, but – in contrast with Narmino – *against two* chiefs of State

Your installment speech as Chief Prosecutor

Considering what incriminated Narmino and Muhlberger have publicly stated high and loud before Your arrival on the Rock, in that they were far from accepting any case law from the Court in Strasbourg, I take it upon myself to inform you that for the attention of Mr Thomas Hammarberg, notably, I have kept, copied and translated into various languages the declarations of Narmino and Muhlberger, which show that their visions are contrary to and incompatible with Monaco as a member of the Council of Europe.

The lodged criminal complaint against Narmino for false statement and the flagrant criminal intention that derives from said false statement

By fax of 23 August 2006 (17), in reply to that of my mother's (20), concerned about putting an end to crimes being committed in her name with the benevolence of Narmino, the latter falsely states to one of his victims, my mother, that I am not divorced. Proof of the contrary is to be found in my civil status. Indeed, this divorce was definite already on the 2 of June 2006. However, one would have to wait until mid September for it to be registered, with retroactive effect, hence, within the Town Hall's file, and this because of the refusal to accept that I was right from the beginning, just as I had told the Monegasque authorities in vain once upon a time: the divorce will take place in Sweden, automatically, within the competent court (18).

The house of cards would crumble, one would think. Nevertheless, during the supervision of Narmino and Husson, the swindler was to continue using a false name well after that. My mother filed a criminal complaint in this regard before the Chief Prosecutor of the Maritime Alps in Nice [Procureur de la République à Nice].

To understand: the 12th of May 2005, a judgement (albeit illegal, and for nothing) in my favor was rendered by the Tribunal, presided by Narmino. Only three years later did I get to know the existence of the said judgement, in spite of the correspondence in between with Narmino. In the ruling, it is stated, that none of the swindler's claims shall be granted, and that the said swindler is to pay all legal costs. The ruling is reputed to be contradictory, taking into consideration my letter to Court Clerk Mr Dalmaso of the 6th of April 2005 for such reputation (1), and leaning evidently on my letter of the 29th of April 2005 (2). Nevertheless, I had to wait three long years before getting to know about the mere existence of this judgement in my favor. Why? Because the court states that it is competent, when that was not the case (see the "bug", regarding the *ratione loci* aspect). And that even if this judgement in my favor had been communicated to me in time, I would have challenged the court's competence, particularly since it has been proven that it was the Court of Stockholm that was competent, just as I knew and had affirmed, but to the attention of complicit, deaf ears, knowing the why, and that did nothing but to aggravate the situation.

The fact for the Tribunal [Court of First Instance] to admit that it was incompetent suggests the illegality of the criminal Gambarini ruling. The court session of the 12th of May 2005 has been held in a clumsy way for the sole purpose of covering up for that same Tribunal's former misdemeanors.

Narmino's criminal intention is here flagrant, and would interest the Prosecutor of the Republic [Nice, France] Éric de Montgolfier (19), who at the time thought doing well, passing on – as I understand it – the complaint to Monaco, not being aware of any "IT-bug", not more than was the Swedish Government (7 and 9).

Of course I immediately replied to the false statement by a handwritten fax to the said Narmino, followed by another, typed this time (it states on the first page 22 August 2006-08-24 – it's a fax of the 24th of August 2006, as one can see at the end of the correspondence), after which – cornered - he finally ordered the Chief Prosecutor, Annie Brunet-Fuster, to eventually insert my divorce (21) in my civil status (18).

Moreover, while reading my letter to Court registrar Mr Dalmaso, of the 6th of April 2005, the day Prince Rainier III died (1), within its fourth page, I suggest to the swindler to accept – without costs for her - the offer from the Court in Stockholm. What did Narmino do? He protected the said swindler amidst the most vulgar of denials, retarding for nothing my divorce by a year, and making its insertion in the civil registry last even longer, and refused to act when the swindler continued to pursue her criminal career within Monte-Carlo Travel Market under the name of his main victim, my mother's.

Indeed, in Narmino's false statement he also states that he is unable to do anything about the name FRISTEDT being used on a website. However, and to the great dismay of many a

victim, it is precisely because of his desperate false statement and of his refusal to do as told that the swindler, who he saw himself forced to protect, was to be able to commit her breaches of trust and swindling at Monte-Carlo Travel Market under the name FRISTEDT. It is for this very reason that a chance has been given recently to the president of said company to constitute herself a victim of Narmino. I hereby attach for You an e-mail correspondence that took place between the aforementioned president and my mother, with my comments, and ask you to imagine the consequences if there were not soon put an end to the disturbances of public order. The correspondence also deals with current Police Chief Mr. André Muhlberger's responsibility. The president of Monte-Carlo Travel Market has failed to act since Mrs Monica Fristedt's e-mail of the 28th of March 2011, something that I take notice of in the matter of her "eventual good faith" (22).

The future princely wedding and Narmino officiating it – a disaster to avoid

Monaco will very soon become the focus of the world, during the princely wedding. The civil officer, i.e. the Mayor, has unfortunately been replaced by the omnipresent Narmino himself, who is subjected to a criminal charge of false statement precisely for having lied regarding the marital status of persons. Add to that article 137 of the Criminal Code [life in jail], and You will understand that a scandal, be it retroactive, and thus irreparable for the Prince's image and that of His Promised One has to be avoided at all costs. In my practice report, I devote a chapter on the civil service of the Prosecution's Office. Eighteen years later, it is of relevance.

In the articles of the Criminal Code enumerated under the Raybaud section on www.bimcam.com, the Legislator has provided for sentences for those who knowing about an infringement of the law fail to do everything in their power to prevent it. Since you are freshly installed, I objectively think that the Raybaud case, and thus that pertaining to Narmino deserve to be treated with priority. You will not have the material time to do so before the celebration of the wedding, whereas, in the public's interest, that of the Prince's and His future Half, of the credibility in Monaco and in its judicial institutions, Your mission consists in being able to guarantee to the world – after the wedding – that Narmino was entitled to officiate, and that he was above all suspicion. But certain sentences accessorially consist in the prohibition to perform a public duty. You have declared not having arrived to bury affairs.

In short, Narmino must not celebrate this wedding – in no way.

Moreover, it seems established, without my knowing it at the time,

- that on the 22nd of September 2005, H.S.H the Sovereign Prince Albert II of Monaco authorized the Director of Monaco's Intelligence Service (M.I.S.) (Chief of my wedding witness to which I allude to (1) in my letter to Court registrar Dalmaso on thy very day Prince Rainier III died, Baron Jean-Léonard Taubert-Natta de Massy, cousin and godson of Prince Albert II) to investigate Mr Philippe NARMINO, President of the Court of First Instance in Monaco;
- that on the 5th of January 2006, the said Director presented his report to H.S.H. the Sovereign Prince Albert II of Monaco, on the issue of corruption linked to the individual Philippe Narmino;
- that in spite of that, and in the same frame of time, said Narmino was to be promoted Director of Judicial Services and President of the State Council (<http://www.legimonaco.mc/Dataweb/jourmon.nsf/56ae81d1d4180496c12568ce002f290a/9970668d1977f8d5c125711100305e0c!OpenDocument>);
- that this implies that the mentioned Narmino would have been sworn in two days before H.S.H. the Sovereign Prince Albert II's reading of the report, after which the promotion nevertheless took place, on the [Friday] 13th of the same month;
- that to remedy to any doubt regarding this matter, the former Director of H.S.H. the Sovereign Prince Albert II's Intelligence Service will not hesitate to publish the full report, one You should read, regardless of the said Director's having terminated M.I.S. since.

It seems thus as if H.S.H the Sovereign Prince Albert II wanted to give Narmino a chance. With the present scandal, Narmino has clearly shown that he was unworthy of such trust.

H.S.H. the Sovereign Prince Albert II counts on You, just as I and many another who want the best for Monaco, to act according to Your mission, even and particularly if it suggests a criminal investigation linked to the person of Narmino. Recently, French headlines have shown that political figures may step down without the presumption of innocence being forgotten.

Monaco's image for ever must not rely on the personal interests of Narmino, criminally put into question notably for having lied to a victim in a case of – precisely – marital status of people. At least not through the help of the Prosecution's office.

Now it is Your duty to contact me should you have the slightest concern as to the different *modus operandi*, as well as if You were to need further information. In this respect, I want to know within no delays what will be Your next initiatives before the princely wedding. Monaco's interest is at stake, as well as that of the personalities invited to the wedding.

I remain at Your disposal, waiting to read you, whilst welcoming you to Monaco.

Yours sincerely,

Archipelago of Stockholm, the 6th of June 2011

[signed]

David Fristedt

[address and telephone number]

E-mail: info@bimcam.com

Cc Her Royal Highness the Hereditary Princess Victoria of Sweden;

His Majesty the King Carl XVI Gustaf of Sweden;

His Excellency Statsminister Fredrik Reinfeldt, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sweden;

The Commissioner for Human Rights, Mr Thomas Hammarberg, Council of Europe

Attached documents: see next page

11/13 [of the original version]

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS

in the Staples, marker pen and *IT-bug* Affair, within its first envoy (133 pages) to Monaco's fourth Chief Prosecutor in the Affair.

- 1) My fax on the day of Prince Rainier III's death, on the 6th of April 2005, in which I name the Affair for the first time (4 [four] pages) ;
- 2) My letter of 29 April 2005, a.k.a. "the Staples, Marker pen and *IT-bug* Affair". In the present envoy, page 13 [thirteen] has been added; it did not form part of encl. nr 47 of the Supreme Court, regarding the thieves; on page 12 [twelve] is described the reason for the burglars to search the archives, through ruse, breaking and entering (debts for "loss of her employer's cash assets", twice, regarding the same cash assets. To be added under the comments on (22) (13 [thirteen] pages);
- 3) My fax of 13 March 2006 for the attention of Mrs Annie Brunet-Fuster, Chief Prosecutor of Monaco ; the meeting between lawyer Donald Manasse and Deputy Public Prosecutor Stéphanie Wickström [or Vikström] took place; it is hereby requested that You act accordingly (1 [one] page);
- 4) My letter of 27 May 2010 to H.E. the Minister of State Michel Roger (3 [three] pages) ;
- 5) My follow-up letter of 1st of November 2010 to H.E. the Minister of State Michel Roger (2 [two] pages);
- 6) Letter from H.E. the Minister of State Michel Roger of 26 November 2010 (1 [one] page) ;
- 7) 7A : The ordinance of the First Vice-President of the Court of first instance of 21 July 2004 (1 [one] page) ; 7B : The Ordinance of the First Vice-President of the Court of first instance as encl. nr 17 of the Supreme Court (1 [one] page); 7C : Letter of 18 November 2004 from Bailiff Escaut-Marquet as read by the Swedish Government (1 [one] page) ; 7D : Receipt of a judiciary act transmitted by Monaco's Chief Prosecutor on 18 November 2004, not signed, in which is it falsely written that the applicant was domiciled in Monaco, a sine qua non condition for Monaco being competent This document was sent to

the Swedish Government (1 [one] page) ; 7E : Letter of 1st December 2004 from Monaco's Embassy to Sweden's Embassy in Paris (1 [one] page) ; 7F : Letter from Sweden's Embassy in Paris – seized by means of a false statement from the Monegasque authorities – to Sweden's Ministry of Justice on 8 December 2004, received by the latter on 16 December 2004 with BIRS mention of 3 January 2005 ; in Swedish (1 [one] page) ; 7G : Letter from the Swedish Government's Office – seized by means of a false statement from the Monegasque authorities – within its Swedish Ministry of Justice, and its section for crime related issues and international legal cooperation (BIRS) JuBIRS 2004/4006 of 3 January 2005 for the attention of the Swedish Embassy in Paris ; in Swedish (1 [one] page) ; 7H : Letter from Bailiff Escaut-Marquet of 18 November 2004 as sent via late Mr Rainier Imperti from Monaco's Department of External Affairs and Monaco's Consul Mr Olof Sjöström (1 [one] page) ; 7I : « Denunciation and divorce request », first page, head stationary of lawyer Didier Escaut with his wife Bailiff Escaut-Marquet's stamps, of 18 November 2004, in which it is correctly written that the applicant was *formerly* domiciled in Monaco, which makes Monaco incompetent *ratione loci* and BIRS, and that proves the false statement towards Sweden's Government This is the version sent to I undersigned via late Mr Imperti from the Monaco's Department of External Affairs and Monaco's Consul Mr Olof Sjöström (1 [one] page) ; 7J : Fax from Monaco's Consul Mr Olof Sjöström for the attention of I undersigned (erroneous first name) with demand that I sign the « Order to pay money » and the « Denunciation within short notice » despite the fact that the staples had been removed and put back five times ; document that states and proves that he had received them the same day, i.e. on 17 February 2005, even though the denunciation within short notice referred to a hearing of 10 February, a week earlier ; in Swedish ; encl nr 44 of the Supreme Court (1 [one] page) ; 7K : Letter from Monaco's Consul Mr Olof Sjöström to Mrs Monica Fristedt of 21 February 2005 with demand that I sign the documents which staples had been removed and put back five times ; in Swedish ; encl. nr 45 of the Supreme Court (1 [one] page) ; 7L : Letter from late Rainier Imperti from the Department of External Relations of 2 February 2005, received by Monaco's Consul Mr Olof Sjöström on 17 February 2005 (which he writes by hand on top of the letter) and sent by postal mail to my mother on the following 21 of February ; letter that asks, in vain, for my signature, as far as the denunciation within short notice is concerned (1 [one] page) ; 7M : Colour copy of the document « denunciation within short notice » as received via late Mr Rainier Imperti from Monaco's Department of External Relations and Monaco's Consul Mr Olof Sjöström, in which I point out the staple holes on the Chief Prosecutor's head stationary, as well as the use of the yellow marker pen ; non signed letter, and returned to Chief Prosecutor Mr Daniel Serdet within my criminal complaint of 29 April 2005 (attached document number 2) amidst thirty documents labeled « in colour » (1 [one] page) ; 7N : Letter by late Rainier Imperti from the Department of External Relations of 2 February 2005, received by Monaco's Consul Mr Olof Sjöström on 17 February (which he writes by hand on top of the letter) and sent to my mother on the following 21 of February ; letter that asks, in vain, for my signature, as far as the order to pay money is concerned ; encl nr 42 of the Supreme Court (1 [one] page) ; 7O : Colour copy of « Order to pay money » as received via late Mr Rainier Imperti from Monaco's Department of External Relations and Monaco's Consul Mr Olof Sjöström, in which I point out the staple holes on the Chief Prosecutor's head stationary, as well as the use of the yellow marker pen ; non signed letter, and returned to Chief Prosecutor Mr Daniel Serdet in my criminal complaint of 29 April 2005 (attached document number 2) amidst thirty documents labeled « in colour » (1 [one] page) ; 7P : « Order to pay money », head stationary Didier Escaut, of 26 January 2005, in which it is correctly written that the applicant was previously domiciled in Monaco ; letter containing threat to take all my goods if I did not pay 12.000,00 (twelve thousand) Euros within 48 (forty-eight) hours, but without mentioning any bank account number ; demand known to me as of 17 February 2005, through means of Monaco's Consul Olof Sjöström (2 [two] pages) ; 7Q : Letter from Bailiff Escaut-Marquet of 26 January 2005 referring to the next attached document, 7R (1 [one] page) ; 7R : « Order to pay money » as under attached document 7P, this time not signed (2 [two] pages) ;

- 8) My fax to lawyer Didier Escaut of 5 October 2004 with copy to Chief Prosecutor Mr Daniel Serdet, regarding the amount of 300.000,00 (three hundred thousand) Euros claimed by the said lawyer Escaut from my Mother and that in the absence of any reply within the time limits (Monaco vs. Council of Europe) resulted in a criminal complaint for blackmail (see laid charges on www.bimcam.com under

- the leaflet “Goodbye Mister Raybaud!”; questions to which it is hereby formally requested to reply (1 [one] page);
- 9) My translation from Swedish into French of my letter of 2 June 2010 to H.E Statsminister Fredrik Reinfeldt, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sweden ; translation of which certain parts have been removed from the original (2 [two] pages) ;
 - 10) My translation from Swedish into French of my letter of 28 May 2010 to His Majesty the King Carl XVI Gustaf of Sweden; translation of which certain parts have been removed from the original (2 [two] pages);
 - 11) Letter of 14 May 2011 from Mrs Monica Fristedt to H.E. The Minister of State of Monaco Mr Michel Roger ; unanswered letter (2 [two] pages) ;
 - 12) Letter into hands of 25 June 2008 from Barrister Ulf Öberg to Chief Prosecutor Jacques Raybaud (3 [three] pages) with letter of the month of January 2006 to Monte-Carlo Travel Market from Mrs Monica Fristedt (2 [two] pages) and letter from the latter to the Director of the Public Safety Department Mr André Muhlberger of 28 October 2006, a letter which he failed to answer (2 [two] pages); letter in which Mrs Monica Fristedt constitutes herself a victim in my laid criminal charges; letter to which Mr Jacques Raybaud has failed to answer, and which very existence he hid from the Supreme Court; letter that You are hereby requested to follow up (3+2+2, i.e. 7 [seven] pages);
 - 13) Letter into hands of 25 June 2008 from Barrister Ulf Öberg to Chief Prosecutor Jacques Raybaud containing detailed criticism by Mrs Fristedt against lawyer Didier Escaut and against lawyer Christophe Sosso, violation of the essential principles of the profession which in all circumstances guide the behaviour of the lawyer, lack of respect due to the Monegasque magistrates by lawyer Didier Escaut and lawyer Christophe Sosso (20 [twenty] pages), with letter from lawyer Didier Escaut to the Court of first instance of Stockholm of 29 June 2005, encl. nr 37 of the Supreme Court (1 [one] page) and letter “Information om förenklad delgivning” of Stockholm’s Court of first instance sent to the swindler’s French address on 12 July 2005 (Mål nr T 18613-O5 Rotel 607), in Swedish (1 [one] page). Letter to which Mr Jacques Raybaud has failed to answer, and which very existence he hid from the Supreme Court ; letter that You are hereby requested to follow up (20+1+1, i.e. 22 [twenty-two] pages) ;
 - 14) Letter of 14 October 2008 from Barrister Ulf Öberg to Chief Prosecutor Jacques Raybaud on the reiteration of Barrister Öbergs demands for access to the file and legal complaint against lawyer Joëlle Pastor-Bensa, defense lawyer, for violation of the Monegasque Bar’s deontological rules; Letter to which Mr Jacques Raybaud has failed to answer, and which very existence he hid from the Supreme Court, in which the Minister of State (late Mr Jean-Paul Proust) were indeed to be represented by the very Pastor-Bensa herself; letter that You are hereby requested to follow up (20+1+1, i.e. 22 [twenty-two] pages) ;
 - 15) « Ordinance » nr 2010-7 of 15 February 2010 showing that Chief Prosecutor Mr Jacques Raybaud has had access to everything since standing in for Mr Narmino, incriminated and signatory to the « ordinance », and that he hence responded directly to the Prince (1 [one] page);
 - 16) My letter of 5 July 2009 to Chief Prosecutor Mr Jacques Raybaud titled « Follow-up of all my criminal complaints” (1 [one] page);
 - 17) Narmino’s false statement of 23 August 2006 ; encl. nr 52 of the Supreme Court (1 [one] page);
 - 18) Proof of Narmino’s false statement, provided by Monaco’s Town Hall (1 [one] page) ;
 - 19) Tacit criminal complaint of 13 December 2006 by Mrs Monica Fristedt for the attention of Mr Chief Prosecutor of Nice, France (1 [one] page) ;
 - 20) Letter of 22 August 2006 from Mrs Monica Fristedt to Mr Narmino to which the latter replied through his false statement (1 [one] page) ;
 - 21) My fax of 24 August to Mr Narmino in reply to his false statement (17) (2 [two] pages) ;
 - 22) E-mail correspondence of 25 and 18 March 2011 between Mrs Elyse Danino of Monte-Carlo Travel Market and Mrs Monica Fristedt, with my comments dated the 26th of the same month, regarding the responsibilities of Monte-Carlo Travel Market, those of Mr Narmino, Director of Judicial Services and those of Mr André Muhlberger, Director of the Department of Public Safety, with demand that the said Danino constitute herself a victim of Narmino in my lodged criminal complaint for false statement against said Narmino; a request that has been disregarded (6 [six] pages);

- 23) My letter of 27 May 2010 to Chief Prosecutor Mr Jacques Raybaud containing criminal complaint against Mr Narmino, Councillor to the Monegasque Crown and Consul of the Kingdom of Sweden Mrs Patricia Husson's role or part, diplomatic incidents and umpteenth follow-up of the Staples, marker pen and IT-bug Affair; letter that You are hereby requested to follow up (5 [five] pages);
- 24) My letter of 30 March 2011 to Mr Vincent Lamanda, Chief Judge of the Supreme Court of France, granting a possibility for said Court to verify as an afterthought that Mr Narmino not be interfering in the legal cases brought against himself, and concerning Mr Jacques Raybaud; letter aimed at making Your job easier (3 [three] pages);
- 25) Example in bulk of the abject translations linked to the forgeries, taken out of a total of thirty pages, of which I quote parts in my letter of 29 April 2005 (2) (4 [four] pages).

The numbers (encl. nr) of the Supreme Court are pursuant to the file of said Court, seized by one of the victims. The Chief Prosecutor's Office is in the possession of a copy of it.

This letter contains thus 13 pages to which are added 120 pages of attached documents, i.e. a total of **133 (one hundred and thirty-three) pages**. Considering the scandal of the staples, each and every page of the present is numbered by hand on the backside, from 1 to 133. To the 133 pages is to be added the website www.bimcam.com, which contents complete the present information.

[End of letter]

[BACK TO WEBSITE](http://www.bimcam.com/dreno.html)
www.bimcam.com/dreno.html



Article 137 of the Monegasque Criminal Code, in French and in English

Article 137.- Hors les cas où la loi règle spécialement les peines encourues pour crimes ou délits commis par les fonctionnaires ou officiers publics, ceux d'entre eux qui auront participé à d'autres crimes ou délits qu'ils étaient chargés de prévenir, constater ou réprimer, seront condamnés comme il suit :

- s'il s'agit d'un délit : au maximum de la peine attachée au délit de l'espèce ;

- s'il s'agit d'un crime :

- à la réclusion de cinq ans à dix ans, lorsque le crime emporte contre tout autre coupable la peine du bannissement ou de la dégradation civique ;

- à la réclusion de dix à vingt ans, lorsque le crime emporte contre tout autre coupable la peine de la réclusion de cinq à dix ans ;

- à la réclusion à perpétuité lorsque le crime emporte contre tout autre coupable la peine de la réclusion de dix à vingt ans ou à perpétuité.

Article 137 - Apart from the cases in which the law specifically regulates the sentences provided for *aggravated crimes* or *crimes* (1) committed by employees of the State or its public officers, those, pertaining to these categories, who will have participated in other aggravated crimes or crimes that they were in charge to prevent, take legal notice of, ascertain or to see prosecuted, shall be sentenced as follow :

- In the case of a crime, to the maximum of the sentence attached to the crime at stake;

- In case of an aggravated crime :
 - to an imprisonment of five to ten years, when the aggravated crime suggests to any other guilty a person the sentence of banishment or that of the civic degradation ;

 - to an imprisonment of ten to twenty years, when the aggravated crime renders to any other guilty a person the sentence of five to ten years imprisonment;

 - to life imprisonment when the aggravated crime renders to any other guilty a person the sentence of ten to twenty years or life imprisonment.

(1) This is not an official translation, whereas the original is being reproduced too. “Délit(s)”, in French, means any crime that renders up to 10 years imprisonment; here translated as “crime(s)”. “Crime(s)”, in French, means any crime rendering from 10 years to life imprisonment; here translated as aggravated crimes.