

28 January 2023. time PM 5.32

The Jyske Bank A/S group
Vestergade 8-18
8600 Silkeborg

The directors of Jyske Bank A/S
Anders Christian Dam.
Niels Erik Jakobsen.
Per Skovhus.
Peter Trier Schleidt.

Legal Department.
Director Martin Skovsted-Nielsen.
Lawyer Morten Ulrik Gade.

The representative office.
Lars Stensgaard Mørch.

Lars Stensgaard Mørch, who was responsible for the Danish Bank's money laundering, which has become known as the world's largest money laundering case, for a total of DKK 1,500,000,000,000

Danish Bank naturally fired Lars Mørch, when the money laundering became known to the public, which CEO Anders Dam immediately took advantage of, since Jyske Bank had to find a successor to Anders Dam, who is worthy of becoming a new mastermind for the criminal Jyske Bank.

I write in English as best I can, as emails must be used for the complaint about them Danish state.

And whether the Human Rights Court, will hear a complaint against the Danish state, when the Danish state has major financial interests with Jyske Bank of A/S, which is also committing fraud, I do not know.

But if the human rights court, will refuse to conduct an investigation of my claims and accusations against Jyske Bank, only because the Danish state itself decides who must comply with the legislation, and because of the state's financial interests in Jyske Bank which economic interests come first, before human rights.

Just as the bar association itself has covered up, that Jyske Bank, among other things, has bribed Lundgren's lawyer partner company, not to present a small client's fraud and false allegations against Jyske Bank A/S

Whereby both Jyske Bank A/S and Lundgren's lawyers have entered into a collaboration based on corruption.

Have I done anything to some of you, since None of you have wanted to communicate with me in the many emails I have sent, do you even think it is okay to ignore me, when this is so serious for the entire population of the country Denmark, if I do not fight for to draw attention to society's problems around legal certainty, and corruption among banks and lawyers, who should.



Rewatch my YouTube video from 27. september 2021. It is in Danish.

<https://youtu.be/y7Rx6Btflsw>



And this from 17 oktober 2021.

<https://youtu.be/Q3EVYdslwrQ>

The fact is that Jyske Bank can stop my complaint and rectify it.

Which Lundgren's lawyers together with Jyske Bank have shown no interest in.

That's why I still write.

Lundgren's lawyers have, after Jyske Bank bribed Lundgren's lawyers, been tasked with undermining the economy of the company, that first employed Lundgren's lawyers with partner Dan Terkildsen to present Jyske Bank's use of fraud, falsehood, bad faith, abuse of lapsed powers of attorney, abuse of Jyske Bank's access to the Land Registry and other users of deception, in order to mislead the customer, after Jyske Bank's employees started with Bank Advisor Nicolai Hansen together with Jeanett Kofoed-Hansen making power of attorney abuse so that Jyske Bank could deceive their customer.

Dear all of you who are CC
If you have any questions, call me on +4522227713.

You can also already here by this email answer my questions, to the Ministry of the State and the Ministry of Justice.

It is about legal certainty in Denmark has been lost, including the Government and the Parliament parliament since April 2019. to January 2023. have not wanted to answer even small elements questions concerning the corruption I am writing about, and which is now about to become a complaint against Denmark for violation of the convention on freedom of self-determination.

I have in no way had the provision in the case I hired Lundgren's lawyers to help me with, when I was faced with a powerful organization like Jyske Bank, which has a series of legal offences, which you all seemed to cover up.

This is where you all have the opportunity to prove me wrong.

Your actions, and whether you want to contribute to a society where the law is equal for all, you can show me that here.
If you answer and sign your answer, from the attached email at the bottom

Your silence

How do you think it went?

Shouldn't Anders Christian Dam be the first in Jyske Bank to be dismissed as CEO

And so that there is someone who might actually want to change Jyske Bank's business methods.

Just because I am the only one in Denmark who wants to put an end to corruption and abuse of power in Denmark, it is not certain that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice will agree that this is the future.

I offer to help Denmark be a watchdog, because it is clearly not quite what the Danish Financial Supervisory Authority wanted.



And to those of you who work for the state to be governed by cronyism, to cover up crime committed in Danish banks, who have also switched to using bribes, in the fight to be able to commit fraud with impunity, since no one in the the Bar Council wants to stop corruption i Denmark.

Your silence tells me I'm right, otherwise talk to me and help me understand why I, as a citizen of Denmark, have to fight against corrupt lawyers, and then you cover them up.



I have not shared this email with foreign authorities or journalists, this should be resolved in Denmark, if I have misunderstood or misunderstood anything, then as I have said and written, I want us to resolve this misunderstanding together.



In short, it is about Jyske Bank by several employees together in an association, with the help of, among others, Nicolai Hansen, Jeanett Kofoed-Hansen, Lars Aaquist, Søren Woergaard, Anette Kirkeby, Casper Dam Olsen, Birgit Buch Thuesen, Morten Ulrik Gade, and in the Court with the help of Philip Baruch.

Everyone in Jyske Bank had to hide from the customer, that the customer has never borrowed the DKK 4,328,000 on which Jyske Bank collects interest 5,32 %, Lars Aaquist has confirmed in court, that it is precisely the interest rate swap of DKK 4,328,000 that Jyske Bank uses to defraud the bank's customer with, and answer yes, this swap is made for the identical loan of DKK 4,328,000 that Nicolai Hansen together in association lies is both taken home and rescheduled.

When Nicolai Hansen and Casper Dam Olsen can lie and trick the customer into believing that the customer has borrowed the DKK 4,328,000 on which Jyske Bank claims interest.

Then it is a deliberate act to mislead the customer.

This is just one of Jyske Bank's working methods, because Jyske Bank deliberately and in bad faith exploits the fact that the owner and director have suffered a major brain haemorrhage and therefore cannot remember.

And was therefore an easy victim of Jyske Bank's cunning fraud

Jyske Bank's lawyers at Morten Ulrik Gade have in 2013 / 2014. lied to the customer in legal matters, that the customer has an underlying loan for the swap that Jyske Bank is deceiving the customer with.

Jyske Bank's lawyers Lund Elmer Sandager by board member Philip Baruch have in 2015 / 2016, like Morten Ulrik Gade, lied to the customer, and presented false information to the Court, which was to disappoint in legal matters, Philip Baruch lies that the customer has an underlying loan, to the swap which one Jyske Bank uses to deceive the customer with.

I am quite sure that Philip Baruch is involved in bribe of Lundgren's lawyers. When Jyske Bank chose to use bribes in 2018, which was hidden as a return commission, but also the Legal Department of Jyske Bank at Morten Ulrik Gade, may be the one, who in the Court's book have seen, that Lundgren's lawyers should take over the client's interests after Rødstenen's lawyers.

In February 2018, Lundgren's lawyers were hired to present the fraud and false case against Jyske Bank, which the customer since February 2016 to December 2017 had fought for their former Rødstenen lawyers at Thomas Schioldan Sørensen to present, which did not happen.

This is an abuse of power by lawyers, such as when a client seeks out lawyers who directly and deliberately is working against the client's interests, which Rødstenen and thereafter Lundgren's lawyers stood for.

What should a client like me do, when we meet lawyers like Rødstenen and Lundgren's lawyers, who have systematically used their power to not present their own client's fraud and false accusations against Jyske Bank, which also employs Lundgren's lawyers for a 3-figure sum million assignment, which Lundgren's lawyers hid from the client, and even on a direct question to Lundgren's lawyers, where the client asks Parter Dan Terkildsen directly.

Dan Terkildsen himself said at a previous meeting to the client that he did not know if there was anything in Lundgren's lawyers as work for Jyske Bank, and justified this by saying that Lundgren's was a large company.

This, as well as the fact that Lundgren's lawyers have still not handed the client a copy of the pleadings that Lundgren's lawyers themselves presented on 2 September 2019 in the client's case against Jyske Bank, which the client immediately requested on 5 September, Dan Terkildsen, to get a copy of.

Dan Terkildsen did not respond to the client's request of 5 September to obtain a copy of the client's own pleadings from 2 September in the case against Jyske Bank, and since the client does not know what Lundgren's lawyers have written in this pleading, or what Lundgren's lawyers are doing.

At Lundgren's lawyers, the client finds it natural to ask questions.

The client therefore sends 2 emails 20 September 2019. very early in the morning and here the client asks Lundgren's lawyers, with an inquiry directly to Partner Dan Terkildsen.

QUESTIONS.

Are there any from Lundgren's lawyers who work for Jyske Bank.

And then asks if there are any from Lundgren's lawyers who have worked for Lundgren's lawyers.

In the material that Lundgren's lawyers have presented and subpoenaed the client to get DKK 232,000 in fees, in the client's case against Jyske Bank, it appears that Lundgren's Emil Hald Vendelbo Winstrøm has invoiced an unknown amount to hold a meeting on September 20 about the client's emails.

Dan Terkildsen and perhaps even several of the Partners choose after this meeting 20 September 2019. with Emil Hald Vendelbo Winstrøm not to respond to the client.

21 September, the client finds evidence that Lundgren's lawyers, and subsequently that the client employed Lundgren's lawyers to present several fraud allegations against Jyske Bank, that Jyske Bank subsequently, in the spring of 2018, employed Lundgren's lawyers to advise Jyske Bank in a transaction with 6 the property for around DKK 600,000,000.

The client keeps his knowledge of Jysk Bank's cooperation with their Lundgren lawyers to himself, and thus gives Lundgren's lawyers and their partner Dan Terkildsen a few more days to give the client an answer, and for Dan Terkildsen himself to inform the client about this cooperation with Jyske Bank.

Lundgren's lawyer Dan Terkildsen refuses to answer the client.

Lundgren's lawyers was fired 24 September 2019. for being disloyal and corrupt.

Lundgren's lawyers and their partner Dan Terkildsen only have one comment, since Dan Terkildsen was fired after Lundgren's was taken for being corrupt.

Then writes that

THEY ARE CONSPIRACY THEORIES.

And continues to work together with Jyske Bank to undermine the client's financial opportunities to prosecute the criminal Jyske Bank.

After Jyske Bank's fraud, which was carried out systematically and in bad faith, which targeted the sick customer, Jyske bank has now started their next method of work.

Lund Elmer Sandager lawyers at Kristian Ambjørn Buus-Nielsen demand a statute of limitations.

Kristian Ambjørn believes that the company itself should have discovered Jyske Bank's fraud and that it should have been discovered within 3 years, and Kristian presented to judge Søren Ejdmum that the director and owner's illness Cerebral haemorrhage, which resulted in major memory problems, was of no importance to the company, who is just a number without in some ways can do nothing, without the director taking care of it.

Judge Søren Ejdmum helped Jyske Bank by manipulating witness statements, which when the judge removes that Lars Aaquist confirmed in court, that the Swap of DKK 4,328,000. which Jyske Bank started on 30 December 2008. was made for the identical loan of DKK 4,328,000.

Lars Aaquist pointed in court as a witness to the document that showed an offer of DKK 4,328,000 from 20 May 2008, valid until 20 November 2008, when the offer expires.

"However, I do not believe that Lars Aaquist, who is now employed at Danish Bank / Danske Bank, has any intention of contributing to his actions being used for deliberate fraud, therefore I will write to Lars Aaquist and give him the opportunity to sign it as Lars in court has confirmed.

That Jyske Bank's interest swap of 16-07-2008. of DKK 4,328,000 was made for the loan offer of DKK 4,328,000 with the date 20-05-2008 and expiry 20-11-2008.

If Lars confirms what he said in court, I will refrain from asking Lars Aaquist, if it was he who arranged for the interest rate swap on 30-12-2008. was initiated, without making sure that the loan, the underlying loan for which the swap was supposed to swap interest rates, had actually been taken home, or whether it had happened automatically, and that was why Nicolai Hansen first lied in February 2010 that the loan of DKK 4,328,000 had been taken home.

And that Nicolai Hansen this time together in the association with with Casper Dam Olsen again January 2012. lied that the customer has restructured the underlying loan for the swap."

Lars Aaquist confirmed directly in court, in front of Judge Søren Ejdam, that the DKK 4,328,000 swap that Jyske Bank started on 30 November 2008 was made for this identical loan. i.e. a loan offer.

A loan of DKK 4,328,000 which several of Jyske Bank's employees continuously lied about had been taken home, and which many more did know was not existed.

Even Jyske Bank's Management and Director CEO Anders Christian Dam. in May 2016. refused to answer the customer, on a direct request that Jyske Bank will document, that the customer borrowed the DKK 4,328,000 and then had to reschedule the loan, which Jyske Bank's employees Nicolai Hansen and Casper Dam Olsen jointly falsely wrote to the then ill customer.

Only afterwards does the customer himself 18 October 2016. get proof that the loan Jyske Bank used to deceive the customer with, has never existed.

After judge Søren Ejdam manipulated witness statements, which was to help Jyske Bank.

Then I write about corruption and abuse of power as well as cronyism, which I believe has infiltrated the Danish courts.

And therefore no one can trust the Danish courts to be impartial and independent, since in my view and assessment, it is that the state's financial interests outweigh the law, and the state's financial interests in Jyske Bank mean more to the courts, than the law, legal certainty and human rights.

The Supreme Court, Judge Kurt Rasmussen, has shown that no one can trust that the Bar Council is independent either.

The Bar Council, which is under the Ministry of Justice, and the fact that the board's decision cannot be appealed, gives the Bar Council full power and has become self-determining.

So when the board's members decide that in my complaint, that I, as a citizen of Denmark, do not have the right to decide for myself in my case against Jyske Bank, I also have no right to be handed over either pleadings or legal documents.

I also have no right to be informed that the law firm I have employed, has also been employed by the other party.

I believe these are highly offensive actions, and help to undermine the entire legal system, as no one can be sure that their lawyer is working for, and in the interests of the client, and those who might come to assume a corrupt law firm, as when I assumed the corrupt Lundgren lawyers, have become lawless at the same moment a citizen hires a lawyer.

On cronyism and corruption.

When the District Court judge Søren ejdum chose to remove the testimony, that went against Jyske Bank, which I Carsten Storbjerg Skaarup in 2020 got an honorable lawyer, to present prosual, such as the use of fraud, falsehood, bad faith and delusion which slows down the limitation period.

Judge Søren Ejdum has not mentioned this with a single word, and at the same time Søren Ejendum has manipulated witness statements.

Which leads me to conclude that the Danish authorities, and courts must be corrupt, or are governed by cronyism, in cases where the State's financial interests are in one of the parties to a case, and that the State's financial interests therefore are above the law.

In order to have this confirmed or denied, several authority figures and companies, as well as lawyers who are mentioned are requested to sign whether they agree or disagree with the Bar Council, as that case and decision has a prescriptive effect on all future cases.

If Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen together with Minister of Justice Peter Hummelgaard. refuses to answer and sign some of my questions.

Could the reason be that corruption and abuse of power in Denmark are above Danish legislation.

The question is whether the economic interests of the Danish state, which I say are above law and justice, also have an influence on the European Court of Human Rights, so that the Danish state itself decides who does not need to comply with the Danish legislation

New Danish judge at the European Court of Human Rights
26 January 2023

On 24 January 2023, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe elected Supreme Court judge Anne Louise Haahr Bormann as the new Danish judge at the European Court of Human Rights.

mdoe@jm.dk

I have pointed out that Supreme Court Justice Kurt Rasmussen, acts as if he is corrupt, which has happened in his office in the Bar Council, which as the supreme court is under the Ministry of Justice.

The question is simple, are the people who seek out a Danish lawyer disenfranchised and disenfranchised, in their own trial, in the moment they ask a lawyer from the Danish legal community for help.

When everyone has answered my questions, we know how deep corruption / cronyism and abuse of power runs in Danish society and authorities.

When it is not only Lundgren's lawyers that I reach out for, and also mention the Rödstenen, it is because after I find out in 2016 that Jyske Bank has perpetrated attachment manipulation, forgery and fraud and instructs Thomas Schioldan Sørensen to expand the case's claims, and Rödstenen then begins to work against the client's interests.

Why would The law firm Rödstenen I/S by Thomas Schioldan Sørensen not want to inform the client if the client's fraud and false accusations against Jyske Bank had been presented, as requested.

Fraud allegations, that the client in the period February 2016. has repeatedly requested their lawyer Rödstenen lawyers to present in their lawsuit against Jyske Bank A/S.

Rödstenen lawyers would not inform their client whether the client's allegations and expansion of the case against Jyske Bank had been presented to the courts, or not.

It was only after the client in Rödstenen lawyers December 2017 gave up getting their lawyer Thomas Schioldan Sørensen to answer, whether Rödstenen had presented the client's accusations against Jyske Bank, that the client requested another lawyer to ask the client's lawyer in the case against Jyske Bank, whether their claims against Jyske Bank had been presented.

This sounds really strange.

But it is true, and those i have mentioned, all have been presented with these accusations, and have also been invited to be invited, for the use of what I write about, like corruption in Denmark, whether the Ministry of Justice and the State Ministry are the ones who decide, who must work for corruption, I will know when they have answered, and or together with the Danish Financial Supervisory Authority have started an investigation into Jyske Bank's business methods, and whether Jyske Bank has an enrichment to run a financial business, and therefore to be able to be banking business in Denmark, and be a bank for the Danish state.

About the red stone lawyer who would not disclose their client, whether the client's fraud and false case against Jyske Bank had been presented to the court.

Rödstenen lawyers choose to respond to their client's, another lawyer, and Rödstenen informs that the client's fraud and false claims against Jyske Bank have not been presented in the Court.

This is where **Rödstenen lawyers then choose to lie to a lawyer and colleague**, as Rödstenen says that it has been agreed with me in a telephone meeting.

If the Rödstenen lawyer company did not lie to the lawyer I had to request to ask the Rödstenen lawyers if they have made my fraud and false claims against Jyske Bank.

Then they should again listen to the shared recorded conversation, between me and the 2 employees of Rödstenen lawyers, and then consider whether it is libel or whether Rödstenen lawyers perhaps, just like Lundgren's lawyers, had a hidden agenda together with Jyske Bank.

And let's meet because the thing may have happened some minor misunderstandings.

I have no desire to hang the Danish state out publicly in my books.

The same also applies to Jyske Bank.

Before I share all my emails, with the press and the foreign authorities, about this way in which the Danish state openly covers up Jyske Bank, I again invite us to meet, that is CEO Anders Christian Dam and me.

And if Jyske Bank does not find a solution, then this is a request to Jyske Bank that the bank give notice of this.

The Danish state, through the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, has a request to respond within 10 days to my questions of 26 January 2023.

Call me

Carsten Storbjerg Skaarup
+4522227713

If Jyske Bank wants to say that some mistakes have been made, and has a desire to correct them, then this is an excellent time to do so.

You can also choose to attack me and claim I'm lying, but let's not talk together, you know I don't stop except when "Jyske Bank" talks to me, and then asks me, if I want to stop my small campaigns.

Call me

Carsten Storbjerg Skaarup
+4522227713

There just 6 small questions
You can answer now before I ask you directly,

Kind regards

Carsten Storbjerg Skaarup
Soevej 5.
Hornbaek
Phone +4522227713

Mail.
banknyt@gmail.com
carsten.storbjerg@gmail.com



Forwarded message

Fra: **Carsten Storbjerg Skaarup** <andersdamjyskebank.dialog@gmail.com>

Date: fre. 27. jan. 2023 13.00

Subject: Is there a problem with the Danish State perhaps being complicit in Jyske Bank's fraud or are there misunderstandings

I want this to be solved together, as I do not want this discord, you just have to decide as a state and authorities, do you want to talk to me and Jyske Bank A /S then my approach is to enter into a conflict resolution, which requires Jyske Bank itself to want to participate.

To: Statsministeriet <stm@stm.dk>, Justitsministeriet <jm@jm.dk>

Cc: <fm@fm.dk>, Jura og Forretning <jur@domstolsstyrelsen.dk>, Kommunikation <kommunikation@nationalbanken.dk>, Folketingets Oplysning <folketinget@ft.dk>, <reu@ft.dk>, <redaktionen@altinget.dk>, <finanstilsynet@ftnet.dk>, <SAK@ankl.dk>, <saoek@ankl.dk>, <em@em.dk>

27 January 2023. time 13.00

Please share this letter with all 179 members of parliament, with links to all enclosed attachments.

Please remember to answer questions posted within the 9 days, and call me on +4522227713 if you have any questions or anything else, maybe corrections, or maybe what I want is a solution that stops my fight. the mosquito against a herd of elephants

**The Prime Minister's Office.
office.**

**The Danish Parliament and the Government
Prins Jørgens Gård 1.
1218 Copenhagen.
Denmark.**

**Prime minister Mette Frederiksen.
Hummelgaard**

The Ministry of Justice

**Ministry of Justice Denmark
Slotsholmsgade 10
1216 Copenhagen.
Denmark.**

Minister of Justice Peter



To be allowed to call yourself a lawyer, you must have a lawyer's education, and you must be subject to the strict legal ethical guidelines, which, among other things, means

That you always only serve the interests of the client.

[The lawyer's duty and privileges. FINANS.](#)

Remember that if none of what I write, it is libel and in the worst case it can result in up to 2 years in prison.

So when they say that Jyske Bank is behind economic crime, which is carried out in association, and I have also reported myself to the police to have the case investigated, which the police did not want, their answer was that I myself had to be responsible for quality assurance.

Now we are at the point where we have to investigate who is behind and for the Danish State covering up Jyske Bank's criminal actions.

There is therefore that authority to respond to the few.

YES - NO - DON'T KNOW. questions are important both for my book, but also for the eventual complaint against the state for violation of human rights.



Now it is the bar association that I am going after, as I believe I can prove, based on the actions of the members, the actions of these mentioned members have abused their power to cover up the corrupt law firms as Lundgren's lawyers.

At this point, I would like to claim that the Danish Financial Supervisory Authority has helped to cover up Jyske Bank, and even if the Danish Financial Supervisory Authority knows that Jyske Bank also uses bribes in connection with fraud in the bank's pursuit of money for shareholders such as ATP Pension, who also don't care, as long as there is the money, then ATP does not ask any questions about Jyske Bank's fraud either.



Of course, these people in the Danish Financial Supervisory Authority must have the opportunity to respond personally, when I want to contact each one of them to get an answer, it is about Jyske Bank's request to have permission to conduct banking business in Denmark.

As well as why the Norwegian Financial Supervisory Authority has passively covered up Jyske Bank's many violations of the law.

But first the Prime Minister of Denmark and the Minister of Justice must reply to my email.

You are clearly welcome to answer why no authorities have wanted to answer a single one of my many inquiries since April. 2019.

I have previously applied for a free trial in connection with the fraud case against Jyske Bank.

The Civil Services Agency writes that a free trial can be granted in special cases, even if the financial conditions are not met.

This applies if the case is of a principled nature or of general public interest, or has significant significance for the applicant's social or professional situation.

The Civil Administration did not think, that this case is in the public interest, and there is no free trial in cases involving criminal acts, as the police must investigate that, The police will not investigate banks like Jyske Bank for fraud, which I am informed is a political decision, and was also informed that then I could not do anything.

Now this is an email to draw attention to the Bar Council.

As I believe it is corruption / cronyism that controls who gets justice in Denmark.



That it is a problem that the bar council has the full power to settle a complaint, without the opportunity to appeal the board's decision.

In this way can the Bar Council choose to cover up corrupt law firms, as happened in my case.

And then refuse to sign on the matters which the members of the bar council say are not some violation.

I want however, that the board signs to make sure that the rules are the same for everyone, and that the board does not distinguish between who is involved in the complaints and the board receives

Therefore I have asked the legal community, that when none of these rules from my complaint are violations of good legal practice, then the bar council will come to the same rulings in similar cases, with at least these conditions.

Please reply. this email with the attached document within 10 days, is sendt 26-01-2023.



I give these 3 answer options, and therefore ask the Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen and the Minister of Justice Peter Hummelgaard to each answer with one.

I totally agree

I completely disagree.

I do not know.

And that for every question.

1.

It is not a violation of good legal practice when.

A lawyer hides and withholds own pleadings from the lawyer's own client.**I totally agree.**

_____ . / _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I completely disagree.

_____ . _____

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I do not know.

_____ . _____

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

2.

It is not a violation of good legal practice when.

A lawyer also does not, on request, provide the client with a copy of the lawyer's own pleadings.**I totally agree.**

_____ . / _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I completely disagree.

_____ . _____

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I do not know.

_____ . _____

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

3.

It is not a violation of good legal practice when.

A lawyer hides and withholds the other party's pleadings from the lawyer's own client.**I totally agree.**

_____ . / _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I completely disagree.

_____ . _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I do not know.

_____ . _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

4.

It is not a violation of good legal practice when.

When a lawyer withholds parts of the court record from the lawyer's own client.**I totally agree.**

_____ . / _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I completely disagree.

_____ . _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I do not know.

_____ . _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

5.

It is not a violation of good legal practice when.

When a lawyer does not present the client's claims in the client's case, and at the same time does not respond to the client's inquiries, what the client says is important and must be presented in court.**I totally agree.**

_____ . / _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I completely disagree.

_____ . _____

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I do not know.

_____ . _____

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

6.

It is not a violation of good legal practice when.

When a law firm works for both the plaintiff and defendant at the same time, as long as it does not happen in the same case.**Why a law firm A. that has been tasked with presenting a fraudulent and false case against the defendant B. and Subsequently at the same time, the same law firm A. may well give B. counseling in a transaction of around DKK 600,000,000. without it is being a breach of good legal practice.****I totally agree.**

_____ . / _____

•

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhauge Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I completely disagree.

_____ . _____

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhaug Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.

I do not know.

Write your name in legible writing. / And sign here if you agree with, Jens Steen Jensen, Birgitte Frølund, Kurt Rasmussen, Rikke Skadhaug Seerup Krogsgård and Henrik Hyltoft.



Jens Steen Jensen from Kromann Reumert lawyers, Birgitte Frølund from Horten lawyers, Kurt Rasmussen from the Supreme Court, Rikke Skadhaug Seerup Krogsgård from the consumer complaints board and Henrik Hyltoft from the Organization Dansk Erhverv, a decision that Martin Lavesen from DLA Piper lawyers agree with, that.

- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: that it is the lawyers alone who decide what a client may be presented with in terms of allegations and pleas.**
- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: that it is the lawyers alone who decide which evidence a client may have presented for the client's claims and pleas.**
- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: for the lawyer to change the client's claim, if a client claims something that is untrue, false or invalid, then the lawyer is free to change the client's claim to the opposite.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers do not respond to the client's inquiries.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers do not share the plaintiff's pleadings with the client.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers do not share the defendant's pleadings with the client.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers do not share all court records with the client.**
- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: that lawyers do not give the client a copy of all court records, even if the client requests the lawyer to do so.**
- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: that lawyers do not give the client a copy of all court records, even if the client requests both the lawyer and the court to do so. "Which happened by requesting the court for access to documents in his case against Jyske Bank A/S as Lundgren's lawyers would not hand over to the client a copy of all court records and pleadings."**
- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: that even if lawyers have confirmed orally, "or on the record" to their clients, that these lawyers do not present anything to the court without the client's complete agreement with the lawyer, lawyers may subsequently present allegations, which is not comparable to the client's claims.**
- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: For lawyers to change the client's pleadings, even if the client has written to the lawyer, you must not present anything to the court without my "client" having approved it.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers change the client's pleadings, even without informing the client. In other words, lawyers do not have to share anything that the lawyer presents.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers call witnesses other than those the client has said, even without informing the client about it.**

- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: for lawyers to remove the client's witnesses, even without informing the client.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers make a mess of spelling when presenting annexes.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers mislead the client.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: For lawyers to write services on a client, such as taxi bills on a client, even if it does not concern the client.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers do not answer the client's questions concerning questions about whether other lawyers from the same law office may have worked for the same company against which the client's lawyer is employed to present a fraudulent and false case.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: that lawyers do not answer their clients' questions, and that the lawyer then takes a fee / payment for not answering what their clients ask.**
- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: For lawyers to hide from their clients that the court has written to the lawyer, the court will disregard the client's own written testimony, with the client's claims and annexes that support the client's explanation, which the client himself sent to the court , after the lawyer himself forgot to present the client's claims.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: It is a criminal offense for a lawyer to encourage a client to continue to carry out actions that the opposing party's lawyer in a case has written to the client's lawyer.**
- **It is not a violation of good legal practice: For a lawyer to withhold letters from the client in which the client is accused of committing a criminal offense, since lawyers do not need to inform the client that the client is accused of violating the criminal law.**
- **It is not a breach of good legal practice: breaking confidentiality in legal matters, not hiding email addresses that have been sent to the BBC. and which the client wants hidden.**

ATT Danish.

- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At det alene er advokaterne, som bestemmer hvad en klient må få fremlagt af påstande og anbringinger.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At det alene er advokaterne, som bestemmer, hvilket beviser en klient må få fremlagt til klientens påstande og anbringinger.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokaten ændrer i klientens påstand, hvis en klient påstår noget er usandt, falsk, eller ugyldig, så må advokaten gerne ændre klientens påstand til det modsatte.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ikke svarer på klientens henvendelser.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ikke deler sagsøgers processkrifter med klienten.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ikke dele sagsøgte processkrifter med klienten.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ikke deler alle retsbøger med klienten.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ikke udleverer klienten kopi af alle retsbøger, selv om klienten anmoder advokaten om det.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ikke udleverer klienten kopi af alle retsbøger, selv om klienten anmoder både advokaten, men også domstolen om det. "Hvilket skete ved at anmode domstolen om aktindsigt i sin sag mod Jyske Bank A/S da Lundgrens advokater ikke ville udlevere klienten kopi af alle retsbøger og processkrifter."**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At selv om advokater har bekræftet mundtligt, "eller med optagelse" for deres klienter, at disse advokater ikke fremlægger noget for retten, uden klienten er helt enig med advokaten, advokater må gerne efterfølgende fremlægge påstande, som ikke er sammenligneligt med klientens påstande.**

- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ændrer i klientens anbringender, selv om klienten har skrevet til advokaten, du må intet fremlægge for domstolen, uden at "klienten" har godkendt det.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ændrer klientens anbringender, også uden at oplyse klienten noget om det. Altså advokater behøver ikke at dele noget af det som advokaten fremlægger.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater indkalder andre vidner end dem, klienten har sagt, også uden at oplyse klienten noget om det.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater fjerner klientens vidner, også uden at oplyse klienten noget om det.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater laver litrerings rod, ved fremlæggelse af bilag.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater vildleder klienten.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater skriver ydelser på en klient, så som taxaregninger på en klient, selv om det ikke vedrører klienten.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ikke svare klienten på spørgsmål der omhandler spørgsmål, hvorvidt andre advokater fra samme advokatkontoret, måtte have arbejder for den samme virksomhed, som klientens advokaten er ansat til at fremlægge en svig og falsk sag imod.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater ikke svare deres klienter på spørgsmål, og som advokaten bagefter tager honorar / betaling for ikke at svare på det, deres klienter spørger om.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At advokater skjuler overfor deres klienter, at retten har skrevet til advokaten, retten vil se bort fra klientens egne fremlagte skriftlige vidneforklaringer, med klientens påstande og bilag som understøtter klientens forklaring, hvilket klienten selv sendte til retten, efter advokaten selv glemte at fremlægge klientens påstande.**

- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At en advokat opfordrer en klient til at fortsætte med at udføre handlinger, som modpartens advokat i en sag, har skrevet til klientens advokat er strafbar handling.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At en advokat tilbageholder breve for klienten, hvori klienten beskyldes for at begå strafbar handling, eftersom advokater ikke behøver oplyse klienten om at klienten, beskyldes for at for at overtræde straffeloven.**
- **Det er ikke en overtrædelse af god advokatskik: At bryde tavshedspligten ved i retsforhold, ikke at skjule mailadresser som er sendt BBC. og som klienten ønsker skjult.**

The Bar Association has previously rejected a complaint against a lawyer who did not apply for a free trial in a timely manner, despite an agreement to this effect. A further complaint was made that the lawyer Hans Mogensen from Homann lawyers had informed the client that if free trial was granted, the lawyer Hans Mogensen would charge and invoice the client for an additional DKK 27,625. which the client himself had to pay, in addition to free process.

Which is to undermine the principle of free process.

The board of lawyers assessed that this was not a violation of good legal practice, and the board acquitted lawyer Homann lawyers in both complaints, I must state for information that Hans Mogensen has done an excellent and nice job, and at the same time looked after the client's interests.

I am referring to this case, which can be documented, as it shows what power the Bar Council has, to be able to acquit lawyers who have clearly made mistakes, and committed a breach of good legal practice, so that the Bar Council can subsequently hide their decision, which cannot be appealed elsewhere.

When the Bar Council has the power to decide who must comply with the rules of good legal practice and no one can control the members of the Bar Council, how do you get rid of the corruption that several lawyers are part of.

I also encourage here that the Minister of State, Mette Frederiksen, will realize that there is a problem that goes beyond the legal certainty of the population.



I have a major investigative work that needs to be completed in connection with a complaint against the Danish State, for which I am a banker, may be involved in Jyske Bank's fraud, which is what we need to clarify, among other things by you responding to my inquiries, and if you do not answer, it may have a damaging effect on Denmark's credibility in matters concerning legal certainty and human rights in Denmark.

Attached is a copy of recent emails, letters.

And I request help to conduct an investigation, because in the event that I have made a mistake, I must immediately correct it.

Now I say again, dialogue is what is needed if I am not going to sue the Danish State, which since April 2019 has refused, which can only be due to abuse of the state's power.

Excuse the strong words, but is it true that you work against legal certainty for the victims when Danish banks expose a customer to fraud.

I refer to my many inquiries, and expect to come into contact and dialogue with the Prime Minister's office at Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen.

If there has been a mistake or there are misunderstandings that can be corrected, then that is preferable to me having to complain about the Danish State.

I request that the Prime Minister contact Jyske Bank's management at CEO Anders Christian Dam, who, as the most responsible person of the Danish State, should know that I, as a citizen of Denmark, want dialogue.

As I wrote yesterday, Jyske Bank has probably cheated and deceived in the region of 5-6,000,000 dkk which has cost me probably 4-5,000 tilmer's work and costs in the region of 1.5-2,000,000 dkk which no small person can survive , but what the hell :-) this is a good story.

You can answer that you want to fuck me a bit, because you have the power to do so, and that regardless of the fact that I am right.

But the Danish State should not do that, now investigate whether you think I am writing the truth and then deal with it.

Call me on +4522227713

If you wish to receive my offer of dialogue, to investigate whether an error has occurred and whether a solution can be found.

I will be in Copenhagen a little later today, and would like to come for a short meeting, if you want to meet, you can call and invite me.



I want this to be solved together, as I do not want this discord, you just have to decide as a state and authorities, do you want to talk to me and Jyske Bank A /S then my approach is to enter into a conflict resolution, which requires Jyske Bank itself to want to participate.

This is a problem, and it is your own fault and that of Jyske Bank A/S.

My right is that I can write about it, but you can choose to request me to meet and talk about it, also the book if there are some who want to give an interview or some who would like to be anonymous.

Will you help me to get Jyske Bank to answer whether they want a solution or for Jyske Bank A/S to answer if they don't care about what I write.

I'm just a human being so at least answer me

I wish you all a really nice weekend, and now remember that you may all the few and simple questions, whether it is not a violation of good legal practice, and whether you think it applies to all lawyers, or only those who is exposed to crime and who has hired one of the corrupt lawyers in the legal community.

Kind regards

Carsten Storbjerg Skaarup
Soevej 5.
Hornbaek
Phone +4522227713

Mail.

banknyt@gmail.com

carsten.storbjerg@gmail.com

Copy of the complaint against the corrupt Lundgren's lawyer partner company.

I am thinking of translating the entire complaint into English, and inserting links to appendices, the complaint, responses and requests as well as the decision, by the same judge who is set in the left High Court.

The reason I write in English, or try to, is solely because I expect to have to sue the Danish State for violation of human rights, which answers to my questions must reveal.

How much corruption exists in Denmark, and when it reaches the Ministry of State and the Ministry of Justice, that is what we are investigating together, and answering or not answering will support my further investigation into cronyism and bribery in Denmark, which I write happened between Jyske Bank and Lundgren's lawyers.



30 vedhæftede filer • Scannet af Gmail

Forsmag på YouTube-video Pandoras æske er lukket op Danmark står overfor en skandale af uset omfang er fremlagt myndighederne



Forsmag på YouTube-video Jyske Bank Anders Dam, Philip Baruch, Dan Terkildsen, Morten Ulrik Gade vi ses i retten 16 november

