

Monica Fristedt

**LR and via e-mail**

Mister Prosecutor General Jacques Dorémieux,

**Considering the numerous conflicts of interest, and in light of the Swedish Government's decision of rejection on the 17th of June 2015 of Philippe Narmino's complaint, see annex 8, You are being asked in the interest of public, international order, to see to that Philippe Narmino does not substitute himself for You upon reception of the present mail.**

**Please confirm by e-mail or by letter to the address that is written at the end of this mail, Your reception of it.**

I undersigned, Monica Fristedt, herewith file criminal complaints against

The honorary consul of Sweden Mrs Patricia HUSSON, for fabrication and forgery of various judicial acts, or for complicity and/or coercion in fabricating and falsifying judicial acts, with the intention to mislead the government and the citizens of a third State into thinking that they were presented with authentic, legal acts produced legally.

**On the 29th of January 2013**, a simulated court procedure took place in Monaco, after which a « judgement » (1st DRAFT [1<sup>ère</sup> GROSSE]) – totally fabricated from scratch – ought to have been passed on the 12th of February 2013. See the two first pages sent to Sweden. **Annex 01.**

It is not until this year of 2015 that, through the Swedish Government, I have had access to Patricia Husson's criminal complaint to the Monegasque police, and to its pertaining document, including the alterations done within the letter addressed by David Fristedt (herewith DF) to the **King of Sweden Carl XVI Gustaf**, discovering a case of forgery of judicial acts. The « official judgement » that the bailiff promised to be sent – as stated on the front page – has, for obvious reasons, never been sent to Sweden. I have thus never received said fabricated « judgement » : indeed, it is DF that saw to it being sent to my residence in London.

**PROOFS OF THE FORGERIES IN PUBLIC WRITING**

There are three different translations into Swedish of the contents of the letter to the **King of Sweden Carl XVI Gustaf**, regardless of the fact that the original, of course, was written in Swedish.

I have all documents scanned but, in terms of evidence and out of simplicity, showing but one page ought to suffice, despite some texts in French having been translated as to be unrecognizable (because of the forgeries ordered by Mrs Husson, the original Swedish text is now on official display on DF's website).

1. **The first translation** emanates from instruction judge L. MALBRANCKE's file **PG Nr 2011/001822** and has been undertaken by a Swedish translator, Anders Jönsson, whose stamp figures on each page, as it should. He has correctly translated the French contents of Mrs Husson's criminal complaint, save for a few errors, of which one pertains to Philippe Narmino's title of Director of judicial services (**Annex 1**).

2. **The second translation** which pertains to **« citation à prévenu et à parties civiles » en date du 13 décembre 2012 (« summons to accused and to civil parties » of the 13th of December 2012)**, has not been undertaken by Anders Jönsson, but by an unknown translator who hardly speaks Swedish and perhaps not even French (**Annex 2**).

It hence ensues that no stamp of the translator is to be found. The word **« kingdom » is being replaced by « USA »** and the text has been altered in most horrific a way. For instance, former, former prosecutor general Jacques Raybaud has been given the title of minister of Justice. It is evident that the new « translator » has not had access to the authentic translations undertaken by Anders Jönsson, but that this has been done illegally, just as lawyer Didier ESCAUT and his wife did in 2005 (<http://www.bimcam.com/theft-in-monaco-monte-carlo/c11/>).

3. **The third translation of the 12th of February 2013** is extracted from what is now commonly called « Albert's judgement » because of his name to be viewed on the front page. The translator's name seems to be written **Alidad Begherzadeh**, a resident of Cap Martin (his [ ? ] hard to decipher name and address figures in the lower part of the letter). No stamp here either. Here, the word **« kungadömet » (the kingdom) has been replaced with « furstendömet » (the principality)** (**Annex 3**).

**There is no doubt that the Swedish translation by Anders Jönsson, with its stamp on each page, has been paid for by the the State of Monaco. The two later translations have been undertaken privately by the forgerers themselves.**

## Summary

On the 26th of July 2011, Patricia files a criminal complaint before the Monegasque police against a Swedish citizen, DF, residing in Sweden since 2004. Contacted, the Swedish Police, confirms, as does the Monegasque police, that it is the Swedish consul in person who « threatens legal action ». One must at once underline that it is only last summer, via the Swedish Government, that I for the first time have had access to the criminal complaint filed by Patricia Husson and that I was able to see for myself that the latter chose to indicate to commissaire de police L. TOURNIER the address of her residence on Boulevard de Suisse, as well as her title of councillor to Prince Albert II. But when the Swedish Government is being

contacted, she choses to use her title of consul, as well as the address of the consulate. **Two variants, two countries.**

Le **15 novembre 2011**, Monaco reçoit un courrier du Ministère suédois de la Justice, rédigé en anglais, annonçant que « **the Ministry of Justice will close the file** » (le ministère de la Justice va clôturer le dossier).

On the **15th of November 2011**, Monaco receives a letter from the Swedish Ministry of Justice, written in English, stating that « **The Ministry of Justice will close the file** ».

On the **14th of February 2012**, in an official letter sent directly to Mr Malbrancke, I declare that these envoys are riddled with serious errors. That entire letter is to be viewed on DF's site <http://www.bimcam.com/theft-in-monaco-monte-carlo/the-medals-backside/> .

A several months long silence followed.

On the **29th of November 2012**, one can for the last time see Mr. Malbrancke's seal on a document sent to the Swedish government. This international document is titled « **Ordonnance de non-lieu partiel et de renvoi devant le tribunal correctionnel** » **Dossier Ji N° CAB 1/11/23Pgno2011/001822. (Ordninance of partial non-suit and of summons before the criminal court of first instance** » **File JI Nr CAB1/11/23 Pgno2011/001822.**

This surprising document, addressed to the prosecutor general, seems by all means to be an internal mail devoid of address, telephone number, etc.

As a response to it, the prosecutor general Jean-Pierre Dréno received a fax on the **17th of December 2012**, a fax in which I requested that he immediately « declare himself incompetent in the matter » (**Annex 4**).

**On the 13th of December 2012** (annex 2) the Swedish government received the act « ***citation à prévenu et à parties civiles*** », from Bailliff NOTARI, where it is stated that « ***Monsieur le procureur général auprès de la Cour d'appel*** » (***Mister prosecutor general before the Court of appeal***) has decided that the trial would take place on the 29th of January 2013. Notari is the only one to have affixed her seal on some pages and to have signed the acte without any reference whatsoever. DF who lives in Sweden is the only one to have received this invitation « *to be interrogated as an accused defendant* ». Claire NOTARI is also per very definition implicated in the forgeries.

As if this was not enough,

**Suddenly, on the 18th of December 2012, the Director of judicial services, Philippe NARMINO**, has such request - « ***citation à prévenu et à parties civiles*** » - sent to the Swedish government. It is being stated therein : « **Autorité requérante Direction des services judiciaires** » (**Requesting authority Direction of judicial services**).

The legal action that were to unfold before the Court was confidential to such extent that, according to the Swedish embassy in Paris, the latter as well as myself or my [female] friend who was holder of a power of attorney on my behalf to retrieve said judgement have been

denied access to any a judgement. Court clerk BARDY was thus to enter an impossible situation.

## **CRIMES OF ALL DEGREES AGAINST PUBLIC PEACE**

The forgeries of public documents constitute the most serious of crimes listed in Monaco's Criminal Code. Suffice to read said Criminal Code and particularly its articles 137 and 279 to understand that the legislator consider this kind of offences, i.e. the ones we are being confronted with, as very serious and that it is something that must never be tolerated in a legal society since it compromises the very concept of trust in the justice system. It is also interesting to read articles 90-130 of the Criminal Code.

Patricia Husson has, in extremely implacable a way, abused her position of trust as honorary consul to the Kingdom of Sweden, as well as through her honorific function of « Crown Councillor » to H.S.H. the Sovereign Prince Albert II.

Patricia Husson has intentionally had legal acts being forged just as she has altered the contents of a letter addressed to the King of Sweden and ordered the fabrication of a fake court act on which first page figures Prince Albert II's name, in order to fool the Swedish government into believing that the prince himself – in person – be the judge in favor of Patricia Husson in the affair initiated by herself. **Annex 01.**

**There is no doubt whatsoever that Patricia Husson is the one who has ordered the fabrication of the forgeries.**

This is why Patricia Husson is being considered highly responsible for all offences that have been committed in her affair. Article 137 clearly and explicitly states the legislator's point of view regarding what Patricia Husson and her implicated accomplices risk.

In 2004/2005, the same accomplices were implicated in a similar affair of forgeries and extortion/blackmail against DF and myself. The lack of help from the consul when an impostor, under a fallacious pretext and with the help, among others', of the Escaut-Marquet couple, has had acces to my residence and my belongings, is described in detail on DF's site.

By the end of this criminal complaint I have added a few documents in order to prove also their crimes committed in 2004/05, along with some comments, even if said documents speak for themselves.

It is only in this year of 2015 that I have become definitely convinced that the consul Mrs Husson has been implicated from 2004. It is the same people that currently commit forgeries of legal documents, as they have done before. Only a person in position of power and of trust can commit this kind of collective crimes.

New crimes have been committed in order to cover upp for the previous crimes and to mutually protect themselves. In this context, a quote from Transparency International is in

order : « *Corruption is abusing one's position in order to obtain undue advantage, for personal gain or for that of third parties.* »

At the time of the forgeries of 2004-2005 omnipresent bailiff Marie Thérèse Escaut-Marquet was suddenly to declare herself « civil party » to the trial, lawyer Escaut with her husband in this from scratch fabricated « judgement » of the 12th of February 2013. Se extract ([Annex 5](#)).

Some years ago, in 2004/2005, they were both being reported for forgeries and attempted extortion / blackmail. The charges – if they ever reached the prosecutor in charge of them – have never been dropped (annexes 6 & 7).

### **The Swedish Government's decision of the 17th of June 2015**

**The Swedish Government rejects DSJ Philippe Narmino's request for « mutual judicial assistance in criminal matters »** (as well as that of prosecutor general Dréno's) since, among several reasons, it infringes on Sweden's fundamental principles of law, as well as on Sweden's « fundamental law on freedom of speech » (Annex 8).

In a legal society, a prosecutor general [judicial power] must never use the headletter of his or her minister of justice [in this case a « Director of judicial services » - judicial, legislative and executive power], in obvious accordance with the prohibition for any a Swedish prosecutor to write on its government's letterhead. Herewith, a similar actuality is to be viewed : [:http://www.svd.se/falskt-svenskt-brev-i-rysk-tv-okand-avsandare](http://www.svd.se/falskt-svenskt-brev-i-rysk-tv-okand-avsandare) [Annex 9](#).

### **THE LINK BETWEEN HUSSON/NARMINO AND THEIR RESPECTIVE CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS**

Philippe Narmino's criminal complaint of august 2014 Ref: 1196/14 and 1197/14 having forged the basis of this too early born freak of « mutual judicial assistance », asked for by Jean-Pierre Dréno, is explicitly linked to **the « judgement » 1st draft [1<sup>ère</sup> Grosse]** of February 2013, produced by consul Husson. In said criminal complaint, the justiciables Narmino/Dréno simply refer to the « false judgement » of 2013.

Since Philippe Narmino refers to a forged legal act, he is being reported under article 137 for having intentionally fooled the Swedish government for writing that Mrs Husson's « judgement » were to have aquired force of res judicata, giving therewith the impression of an authenticity of the forged judgement. Master without doubts of these forgeries and to their inherent travesties of legal actions ; in particular since he has – many times – actively participated in the affair regarding Patricia Husson, consequently disturbing the Swedish Government with various notifications, all for nothing. As late as the 20th of March 2013, way after the bailiff having sent the same legal acts to DF and the Swedish Government, he asked said government to ensure him – himself – that DF had received the forged judgement.

This abundance of documents sent one after the other formed perhaps an uncouth attempt of intimidation in itself..

**Instead, it ensued that the forged documents were to become part of the public domain.**

**« Monaco's incompetence *ratione loci* is the common thread since these affairs' beginning »**

Patricia Husson and Philippe Narmino are both implicated in various affairs of forgey, from 2004 to this date.

They have by all means (i.e. illegal ones) and through thick and thin and at all costs wanted to present Monaco as the competent authority *ratione loci* in these affairs, which they so desperately wanted to handle in order to not being brought to trial themselves.

From similar criminal complaints filed by Mrs Husson and Mr Narmino during these last years it ensues that they both refer to [incriminate] eachother so as to kind of justify their respective criminal complaints against people living in other countries, wherein Monaco de facto is incompetent *ratione loci*.

These felonies, provided for by article 137 of the Criminal Code, are continuous and / or continued as long as there hasn't been put an end to the fiduciary blackmail and that the « fake judgement » of 2013 hasn't been officially nullified. Finally, an ordinance from 2004 must be nullified too for relying on erroneous information regarding precisely Monaco's incompetence *ratione loci* within a divorce case. This is the common thread which started on the 21st of July 2004 (**Annex 10**).

It is of utmost importance to prove that the people implicated in this affair are the same that have been manipulating the truth since ten years. It seems as though these people are the same as those who have systematically collaborated in order to produce legal actions in Monaco, despite said country never having been competent in any shape or form.

In order for Monaco to claim competence for judging a divorce affair in 2004/2005, a fake address in Monaco was provided within the document sent to the Swedish Justice.

At the same time, the correct address of the woman in Nice is shown within a similar document received by DF by ordinary mail. The two variants have the same date, the 18th of November 2004. **Once more, two variants, two recipients (**Annex 6**).**

On the 8th of May 2005, a secret trial took place in Monaco. It was presided by judge Philippe Narmino himself, and the [female] claimant's lawyer was Didier Escaut. In order to hide the address in Nice – which rendered Monaco incompetent – Mr Narmino deliberately chose to keep the undeniably false Monegasque address, in the judgement, if only to save face, including that of each accomplice. It was imperative that Monaco be considered

competent since failure to be competent would prove that they all had committed aggravated crimes of which we now do have the proofs. The common thread, yet again.

So judge Narmino has stated and lied that Monaco was competent in order for lawyer Escaut to not have to recognize having helped, with his bailiff wife, a forger to improve her lifestyle. Next, the Escaut couple tried to blackmail [even to this date] DF and did not flinch in the face of trying to deceive the Embassy and the Swedish Government. **Worth noting is that the bailiff Escaut-Marquet uses her her lawyer husband's (Escaut's) letterhead (Annex 7).**

The bailiff and the lawyer couldn't possibly have managed to pull off their fraudulent attempts as far via the Swedish Embassy in Paris had they not benefited from the help and protection of the new (since 2002) consul for Sweden in Monaco, Patricia Husson (See annexes 11, 12 & 13).

In the entirely fabricated « judgement » [of the 12th of February 2013], Didier Escaut, full of hubris, has asked that it be published - at my costs - in the [French !] daily *Le Figaro* with the mentioning of « victim Didier Escaut ». It is possible that *Le Figaro* knows about this, albeit not necessarily in the way wished by him.

To conclude, I demand that the entirely fabricated « judgement » of the 12th of February 2013 be immediately and ipso jure nullified, so that DF and myself be freed from all financial obligations toward the people involved and also demand, that the Ordinance of the 21th of July 2004 be nullified ipso jure too.

**Should Narmino suggest to You that he were to have been fooled by Husson, I would like to remind You for Narmino's benefit of article 279 of the Criminal Code.**

Yours sincerely,

London, the 16th of December 2015

[signed on LR]

Monica Fristedt

████████████████████, Kingdom of Sweden

E-mail : ████████████████████

**Annexes : 01 : Translator Jönsson, File extract PG Nr 2011/001822. 2 pages ; 2 : Unknown translator, 13th of december 2012. 1 page ; 3 : Translator Begherzadeh « 1<sup>ère</sup> Grosse » 12th of February 2013. 1 page ; 4 : Fax to PG Dréno 17th of December 2012. 4 pages ; 5 : Extract from « 1<sup>ère</sup> Grosse », 12th of February 2013. 1 page ; 6 : Bailiff E.M, 18th of November 2004. 2 pages ; 7 : Extorsion from the Escaut couple, 26th of January 2005, 2 pages ; 8 : The Swedish Government's decision , 17th of June 2015, 3 pages ; 9 : PG Dréno signs on DJS Narmino's letterhead : 1 page ; 10 : Ordinance of the 21st of July 2004, 1 page ; 11,12,13 : Correspondence between the Embassies 2005, 3 pages.**

Copies to: RÅ (The [supreme] Prosecutor General of Sweden) and BIMCAM

Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General  
Principality of Monaco

Sent recorded delivery with advice  
Of receipt to [2012monic@gmail.com](mailto:2012monic@gmail.com)

Monaco, 28 December 2015

Subject: Your letter received on 28 December 2015

Our Ref: 2011/001822

MG

Dear Madam,

I confirm safe receipt of your letter. I interpret it as trying to see the judgment of 12 February 2013 overturned, made in your absence by the Criminal Division of the High Court of the principality of Monaco. If you wish to have your case reviewed by the Criminal Division, you must satisfy the conditions set forth by Article 382 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. I myself cannot take any procedural action in relation to this judgment.

In order to do so, you will need to send me notification of your objection to this judgment for the civil parties – Ms. Patricia Husson, Mr Didier Escaut and Ms Marie-Therese Escaut-Marquet – within eight days of the date on which you were informed of this decision. Such notification can be made by letter sent recorded delivery with advice of receipt. **Indeed, upon examination of the correctional record, it seems that you were never personally notified of this judgment.** It seemed, however, that on 28 December 2015, the date on which your letter was received by the Office of the Attorney General, you had a detailed knowledge thereof as the line of argument that you developed shows.

Best regards,

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

(signature)

Jacques Doremieux

**Madame Monica Fristedt**



**Kingdom of Sweden**

Palais de Justice  
5, rue Colonel Bellando de Castro  
BP 513  
98015 MONACO CEDEX  
Tel: (+377) 98 98 88 11  
Fax: (+377) 93 50 05 68  
[parquetgeneral@justice.mc](mailto:parquetgeneral@justice.mc)