

IV. GENERAL COMMENT AS TO REMEDIES PURSUED BEFORE AUTHORITY, 16.2

HIGH COURT ON REMAND IN CUSTODY (ØSTER LANDSRET, COPENHAGEN)

1980

1. March 3, Appeal by the Special Prosecution as to a press release by the defence, the Court decided in favour of the Prosecution and did not permit the press release. (Court 1.)
2. March 3, Appeal by the defence as to the permission for the accused to receive a visit of his wife and sons. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution and did not permit MH to see his wife and children in prison. (1)
3. March 11, Appeal by the defence as to forwarding two letters from MH to his civil defence in Denmark and his Swiss legal advisor. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution.
4. March 17, Appeal by the defence as to the solitary confinement, the remand in custody and holding the court hearing for closed doors. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution.
5. April 12, Appeal by the defence as to the solitary confinement and incarceration. The Court decided in favour of the Special Prosecution.
6. July 25, Appeal by the defence as to the defence and MH making a public comment to a newspaper article and making a letter as to the solitary confinement and the application to the Commission of Human Rights available to the public. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution.
7. Sept. 5, Appeal by the defence as to re and in custody, restriction on visits and correspondence. This was a so-called oral hearing. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution (Court 12)
8. Dec. 9, Appeal by the defence as to remand in custody, restriction on visits and correspondence. This was an oral hearing. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 11)

1981

9. March 19, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody, restriction and the refusal to let the accused see the Prosecutions reports as to the indictment. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 11)
10. April 30, Appeal by the defence as to the requirement of two appointed defence counsellors Mr Folmer Reindel and Mr John Korsø-Jensen. The Court decided in favour of the defence, after the Danish Law Society had assisted the defence's petition/notice of appeal. (Court 11)
11. June 25, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution.
12. July 7, Appeal by the defence as to the raid and seizure at various addresses. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution.
13. July 14, Appeal by the defence as to the solitary confinement of MH. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution (Court 9.)
14. Aug. 14, Appeal by the defence as to the defence's expenses in connection with travel to Switzerland to investigate. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution and refused the payment for such trip. (Court 1)
15. Oct. 30, Appeal by the defence as to the Special Prosecution making an injunction on funds located in USA. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)
16. Nov. 9, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution and did not either permit oral hearing.
17. Dec. 8, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution.

1982

18. Jan. 26, Appeal by the defence as to the re and in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. It was the first oral hearing for 14 month. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)

19. April 16, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)
20. May 18, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1)
21. June 3, Appeal by the defence as to the remand and in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)
22. June 25, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)
23. July 23, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)
24. Aug. 19, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)
25. Oct. 26, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody and restriction imposed on the accused. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)
26. Nov. 5, Appeal by the defence as to the remand in custody with a number of restriction imposed on the accused, during the appeal to the High Court. This was an oral hearing. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. (Court 1.)
27. Dec 15, Appeal by the defence as to disagreement on fees for the defence. The Court followed the lower Court's decision.
28. Dec 20, Decision as to keeping the accused incarcerated for another 4 weeks with the various restrictions imposed.

1983

- 29. Jan. 12, Decision as to keeping the accused incarcerated for another 4 weeks with the various restrictions imposed.
- 30. Feb. 9, Decision as to keeping the accused incarcerated for another 4 weeks with the various restrictions imposed.
- 31. March 9, Decisions as to keeping the accused incarcerated during the appeal, for another 4 weeks.
- 32. April 6, Decisions as to keeping the accused incarcerated during the appeal, for another 4 weeks.
- 33. April 6, Decision as to the payment of fees to Mr Folmer Reindel the defence. The Court decided against the requested fees and in effect reducing the fee with more than 90%.
- 34. May 4, Decisions as to keeping the accused incarcerated during the appeal, for a period until the 1st of June 1983.

IV. 16.3 SUPREME COURT DECISIONS (HØJESTERET)

1980

- 1. May 14, Appeal by firstly the accused personally, after the appointment of legal advisor who also appealed the Commercial Court's decision as to MH personal bankruptcy and the compulsory liquidation of SCE A/S under incorporation (according to a decision dated the 4th of March 1980). Both Court decisions were confirmed and the Supreme Court decided in favour of the Commercial Court's decision. All the facts related to these decisions were incorrect and considerable documentation and auditors reports appear to have been unavailable to the Supreme Court.

1983

- 2. Jan. 26, Appeal by the defence as to the incarceration with restrictions during the time of appeal, with reference to the normal parole and weekend visit conditions if the accused had not appeal the lower Court's decision. The Court decided in favour of the Prosecution. The hearing was oral.