Judit Szima as a trade union leader has been sentenced at first instance ……………,

because the Ready to Act Hungarian Police Union (TMRSZ) could not have been smashed up to this day.

As you have certainly been informed, the chamber headed by dr. István Tuba of the District Court of Szekszárd declared her guilty at first instance in 4 counts of indictment out of 6, and so she was given a custodial sentence to be served in prison for 3 years as the main penalty and restriction from participating in public affairs for 4 years and confiscation of property in the amount of HUF 22 million.

Both the defence and the Secretary General submitted an appeal against the sentence.

The defenders of the accused's accomplices also lodged an appeal against the facts of the case and the decision made.

Having received the sentence given at first instance, we will publish it on our website following a modification of initials of the names.

We will also publish the appeal in order to inform you after it has been prepared and submitted.

We are shocked and do not understand the decision made as no crime happened, which was proved in the procedure, but the court of first instance did not see it in this way. Before passing a harsh judgement on people condemned now in view of the decision given by the court of first instance and the standpoint of the prosecutor’s office, we would like to inform the public under which circumstances and based on which facts and information this sentence was passed; the sentence which missed impartiality, objectivity and consideration of facts.

Judit Szima or her colleagues condemned now are not criminals. The regime declared her to be a criminal not finally and at first instance, under circumstances in which she could not entirely tell her speech of almost 400 pages (that will be published here in parts) as her last plea as "the prosecutor spoke 9 hours, whilst Judit Szima has already spoken more than 10 hours so far, so the limitation of, i.e. deprivation from my right to tell the speech as my last plea is justified".

I would only like to add that the prosecutor has also made statements in 91 pages, which are contrary to the records of the case, and if the defence receives permission to speak in the proportion of 1:5 in order to refute the statements of the prosecutor that are contrary to any such records of the case, this is not disproportionate or excessive at all. It is not excessive to refute a lie contained in one sentence of the prosecution by 5 sentences and most of all this is not a manner suitable for prolonging the procedure.

Furthermore, you have to know that she told a speech in approx. 800-1000 pages and presented her evidence besides the 400-page defence argument as her last plea.

On the opposing side, there are documents, experts' reports, witness statements and other files that are collectively the records of the case in 30 thousand pages, which were collected by the prosecutor’s office (i.e. not seized in the manner provided under the Criminal Proceedings Act, but "obtained").

You have to know that the court granted the motions of the prosecution in around more than 99%, i.e. the prosecution could explain its own position in the procedure.

In addition, you should also know and this is also a fact of the procedure that the prosecutor communicated to the defence on 8 December 2014 for the first time what he/she considered as evidence against the accused out of almost 30 thousand pages of records of the case. So the prosecutor communicated on 8 December 2014 for the first time which are the almost 3 thousand pages of documents that are considered as evidence to support his/her action as of 3 June 2011. Till that time the prosecutor did not fully indicate his/her evidence specifically.

Subsequently, the accused sitting on the dock presented her motions to prove her innocence and guiltlessness before the prosecutor.

It is a fact of case that the motion of the accused was not granted by the court at first instance, to which dr. István Szikinger and dr. Ernő Ónodi attorneys-at-law defending Judit Szima as secretary general raised objection.

Where is the principle of equality of parties’ arms before court if – according to the fact of the case - the prosecutor indicated his/her evidence - mostly documents - after more than 3 years, and the defence did not have possibility to get to know them before?

Following this, almost all motions of the defence/accused were rejected by the court.

While almost all and entire motions of the prosecutor were granted, the motions of the defence were almost entirely refused!

Defence regarded this as good omen, thinking that the court did not consider the standpoint of the prosecutor well-grounded since what else could have been the reason for rejecting consequently and subsequently all motions of the defence, and not to give the defence possibility to prove guiltlessness of the accused.

We thought that the prosecutor could not prove guiltiness, so based on the presumption of innocence the only reason for rejecting all motions of the defence was that they were unnecessary as the court did not consider it necessary to grant the motions of the accused.

However, today it turned out that there is no equality of parties’ arms. The court did not want to deal in reality with anything that the accused wanted to present or prove. Enikő T. is a reliable witness according to the court, her word documents printed – like some slips of paper – are deemed to be credible and authentic evidence, which are sufficient to declare people criminals by the chamber of the District Court of Szekszárd acting as court of first instance.

The words of a dismissed employee of troubled psyche – as crown witness – constituted the basis of a decision which removes the secretary general from the lead of a trade union, and declared confiscation of property of a person to the extent that essentially means to become homeless.

The chamber headed by dr. István Tuba of the District Cour of Szekszárd as Hungarian court accepted and substantially incorporated the concept of the Prosecutor’s Investigation Office of Kaposvár into the sentence and delivered a “show” sentence which is not supported by any objective facts. Enikő T. „said” . More than probable secret service provocation, covert information-gathering and series of provocations did not result in any evidence for the state power – this is part of the records of the case – so only Enikő T. and her slips of paper remained.

Today in the summer of 2015 the country reached back by this sentence given at first instance to the point from which this country wanted to depart in 1956. There is a prosecutor, there is a "crown witness" who speaks about word documents and waves slips of paper instead of ground squirrel leather. And there is at least one court, the court chamber headed by dr. István Tuba which, like in that era, can consider all these as sufficient evidence to declare trade union officers, who work with integrity and unpleasant efficiency, to be criminals, using the power vested in it. Because after a 25-year long democratic transformation the state power, from which the judicial powers should be independent theoretically – but as our example shows they are not – has the interest to return back to the same position from which we wanted to depart in 1956. The country and justice get nowhere. To say the least – at first instance. We are waiting for continuation but nobody can stretch truth too far.

Before you read the speech in her last plea, we will publish our data request letter that should be deemed as our criminal report against E.M. who may be considered as the agent provocateur of Hungarian secret services, with the information that since 13 February 2015 there is only unbroken silence in the case. We did not receive any notice of any decision denying, refusing or ordering investigation in reply to our data request, which is also a criminal report, although the applicable Criminal Procedures Act defines it as the obligation of acting authority.

Nobody had any reaction at the decision-making level to the complaint or criminal report, though we attached photo-portfolios thereto, and according to our knowledge, neither the National Security Commission of Parliament has made any actions in the merits in the case until today.

We recommend you to read the writing titled the WELL as additional information, clicking on the link http://www.tmrsz.hu/2015/03/17/a-kut/, which generally grounds our criminal report sent to the head of the Counter Terrorism Centre (TEK) as well as the information and events to be presented subsequently, which represent a sequence of provocation made by secret services against the trade union.