



Separated Unjustly Guarded Under Dictates

Advocacy for Family Justice & Human Rights

" You are not alone "

URGENT ACTION REQUEST

**WHEN THE COST OF SEEKING
JUSTICE REACHES THE FAMILY HOME**

Address:

Unit 1A Heatherview Business
Park, Athlone Road #8147,
Longford, Co Longford,
N39KD82, Ireland

www.sugud.org

contact@sugud.org

Date: 08.09.2026

Reference: Germany/09.2026/00673

Submitted to :

- United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
- UN Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers
- UN Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders
- UN Committee on the Rights of the Child

***Judicial Costs, Family-Justice Proceedings, Economic Exhaustion,
Compulsory Enforcement and the Risk of Coercive Financial Pressure Against
a Human Rights Defender and His Children***

Country: Federal Republic of Germany

Date: 8 September 2026

Classification: URGENT – Preventive Human Rights Action Requested

Immediate Trigger: Registration of a compulsory security mortgage against the family property

Registered Amount: EUR 3,527.91

Property Record: Grundbuch Wiesweiler, Blatt 965

Registration Authority: Amtsgericht Kusel – Grundbuchamt

Creditor: Land Rheinland-Pfalz, represented by Landesjustizkasse Mainz

Registration Notice: 3 September 2026

Landesjustizkasse Application: 18 August 2026

I. EXECUTIVE URGENT WARNING

SUGUD submits Human Rights Monitoring Report No. 73 because the documented consequences of the proceedings examined in previous reports have now crossed a materially different threshold.

They have reached the family property.

On **3 September 2026**, the **Amtsgericht Kusel - Grundbuchamt** formally notified Ahmed Homos that a **Zwangssicherungshypothek - compulsory security**

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability.

mortgage - in the amount of EUR 3,527.91 had been entered against his property recorded in **Grundbuch Wiesweiler, Blatt 965**.

The underlying application was submitted by **Land Rheinland-Pfalz, represented by Landesjustizkasse Mainz**, on **18 August 2026**.

The State's own documents identify the claim as enforceable and request registration of the compulsory mortgage by way of enforcement.

This report does **not** claim that the existence of a compulsory mortgage is, by itself, unlawful.

German law expressly recognizes the registration of a *Sicherungshypothek* as a form of enforcement against immovable property. Sections 866 and 867 ZPO regulate such enforcement, and §867 provides that the mortgage arises upon registration. ([Gesetze im Internet](#))

Nor does SUGUD claim that a compulsory auction of the home has already been ordered.

The available evidence does not establish that.

The urgent issue is different.

The documented sequence has now become:

FAMILY-JUSTICE PROCEEDINGS

→ **JUDICIAL COSTS**

→ **CONTESTED COST CLAIMS**

→ **ENFORCEMENT**

→ **LAND REGISTER**

→ **COMPULSORY SECURITY MORTGAGE AGAINST THE FAMILY PROPERTY**

The central question is therefore no longer merely whether individual judicial decisions were procedurally correct.

It is now:

Can the cumulative financial consequences generated through contested judicial processes become so severe that continuing to insist upon legal and human-rights remedies carries the practical

price of progressive economic exhaustion and exposure of the family home to enforcement?

SUGUD requests urgent preventive examination **before that question is answered through an irreversible consequence.**

II. THE NEW FACT IS NOT AN ALLEGATION

The evidentiary starting point of Report No. 73 is exceptionally clear.

The notification issued by **Amtsgericht Kusel - Grundbuchamt**, dated **3 September 2026**, reference **WI-965-5**, states that the entry shown in the annex had been made in the land register.

The annex identifies:

Property: Wiesweiler Blatt 965

Registered owner: Ahmed Homos

Amount: EUR 3,527.91

Measure: Zwangssicherungshypothek

Creditor: Land Rheinland-Pfalz, represented by Landesjustizkasse Mainz.

The Landesjustizkasse request dated **18 August 2026** states that judicial costs totaling EUR 3,527.91 are owed and that the claim is enforceable.

The attached *Forderungsaufstellung* identifies multiple judicial accounting references underlying the aggregate amount.

These facts do not originate from SUGUD.

They originate from the German State's own records.

III. THE ORIGIN OF THE FINANCIAL CLAIMS

The attached State accounting record is particularly significant because the EUR 3,527.91 is not presented as one isolated private commercial debt.

The *Forderungsaufstellung* identifies claims associated with judicial institutions including:

**Amtsgericht Kusel; Pfälzisches Oberlandesgericht Zweibrücken; and
Amtsgericht Kaiserslautern.**

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability.**

According to the underlying case history, the claims arising from **Amtsgericht Kusel and Pfälzisches Oberlandesgericht Zweibrücken** concern family-law proceedings involving Homos and his family.

The Kaiserslautern component is associated with insolvency proceedings.

This distinction is essential.

SUGUD does not merge legally different proceedings merely because their financial consequences have ultimately entered the same enforcement chain.

Instead, it asks that the genealogy of **every component of the EUR 3,527.91** be independently reconstructed:

Which proceeding generated it?
Which decision generated it?
Which court imposed it?
On what date?
Under which legal basis?
What remedy existed?
Was that remedy effectively accessible?
Was it exercised?
What was the outcome?

Once a cumulative judicial debt is used to encumber a family property, such transparency is not peripheral.

It is fundamental.

IV. THE FAMILY-JUSTICE ORIGIN OF THE KUSEL AND ZWEIBRÜCKEN CLAIMS

The family-law character of the relevant proceedings is independently visible in the documentary record.

For example, earlier Pfälzisches Oberlandesgericht Zweibrücken proceedings expressly concern parental responsibility for the five Homos children and identify Ahmed Homos, Hend Selim, Jugendamt Kusel and the procedural representative within the family-law proceedings.

More recently, the two proceedings:

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

2 UF 40/26 and 2 UF 41/26

before the **Pfälzisches Oberlandesgericht Zweibrücken** concerned *Umgangsregelung* contact arrangements between **Ahmed Homos and Hend Selim**.

Accordingly, their subject matter was not commercial.

It concerned the family.

V. THE COSTS IN 2 UF 40/26 AND 2 UF 41/26 WERE EXPRESSLY CONTESTED

On **4 July 2026**, Homos submitted an *Erinnerung* against the final court-cost invoices relating to:

2 UF 40/26 and 2 UF 41/26.

The communication expressly disputed both:

the legal basis of the costs and the obligation to pay them.

It further connected the objections to the events underlying the proceedings, particularly the hearing held on **4 March 2026 before Amtsgericht Kusel**, and referred to documented objections concerning procedural defects, the accuracy of the hearing record, the right to be heard and procedural fairness.

This fact is critical.

It does not establish that the costs are legally invalid.

But it establishes something narrower and undeniable:

The costs were not passively accepted. Their underlying legal and procedural basis was expressly contested.

VI. THE RESPONSE OF THE PFÄLZISCHES OBERLANDESGERICHT

On **27 July 2026**, the Pfälzisches Oberlandesgericht Zweibrücken responded separately in both proceedings.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

The Court stated that the *Erinnerung* transmitted by ordinary email was inadmissible because legal remedies and applications had to comply with the legally prescribed form and required a document bearing the original handwritten signature.

The Court further stated that the requirement had already been identified in its order of 19 May 2026 and invited Homos to submit a personally signed document by post if he wished the objection to be treated as a formal *Erinnerung*.

SUGUD Report No. 71 subsequently examined the broader distinction between:

actual institutional knowledge and formal procedural validity.

Report No. 73 does not reopen that analysis merely to repeat it.

It asks what happens **after disputed procedural access and disputed judicial costs become part of an enforcement chain reaching the family property.**

VII. THE 4 MARCH 2026 KUSEL PROCEEDINGS CANNOT BE ERASED FROM THE CONTEXT

The financial claims cannot responsibly be analyzed as accounting figures detached from their procedural origins.

The hearing of **4 March 2026 before Amtsgericht Kusel** has been the subject of extensive previous SUGUD documentation.

Serious allegations have been raised concerning the accuracy and completeness of the procedural record and the treatment of material information allegedly known within a multi-actor institutional environment.

Those allegations have involved, in different capacities, persons connected with:

**Amtsgericht Kusel;
Jugendamt Kusel;
Jugendamt Idar-Oberstein;
the procedural representative;
a court-appointed expert;**

and legal representatives involved in the proceedings.

SUGUD does not convert those previous documented allegations into final judicial findings merely by repeating them.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability.**

Nor does Report No. 73 claim that every participant intentionally falsified a record.
That would require proof specific to each person and act.

The narrower point is decisive:

The underlying family proceedings remain subject to serious, specifically documented challenges concerning their factual and procedural integrity.

Yet financial consequences generated through the same broader family-justice history have now progressed into enforcement against property.

That temporal relationship requires examination.

VIII. THE KAISERSLAUTERN INSOLVENCY COMPONENT

The Kaiserslautern component requires separate treatment.

Homos states that the insolvency proceedings followed the closure of his business during an earlier phase of the family crisis.

According to his account, while caring for his four older children, he was confronted with a practical message that adequate personal care and availability had to be ensured and that failure to secure the children's care could result in child-protection intervention, including the possibility of removal.

Homos states that he therefore chose his children, ceased his business activity and subsequently entered insolvency.

SUGUD does **not** presently present that entire causal chain as independently established solely because Homos states it.

There is, however, a concrete and identifiable evidentiary pathway for testing it.

IX. DOMINIQUE KOHR - AN IDENTIFIED CONTEMPORANEOUS WITNESS

The relevant witness is not hypothetical.

The documentary record independently establishes the involvement of **Dominique Kohr**, identified as a qualified social worker/social pedagogue, in the *Sozialpädagogische Familienhilfe* provided to the Homos family under **§31 SGB VIII**.

The same documentation identifies **Jugendamt Kusel / Frau Phillipp** as the competent Jugendamt contact.

The professional documentation further records that Homos lived with the four children in his own home; that the home was found orderly and clean even during occasional unannounced visits; that sufficient food was available; that he cooked for the children; that he engaged with their schooling, development and activities; and that he regularly cooperated with the family-support service.

Another professional record reports that Kohr knew the children, maintained intensive contact with Homos concerning family matters and described a close bond and positive household circumstances.

Homos identifies **Mr. Kohr as the family-support professional who personally transmitted to him the Jugendamt-related message concerning the need to prioritize the care of his four children and the potential consequences if adequate care could not be ensured.**

The currently reviewed written Kohr documentation does not itself reproduce that specific alleged statement.

SUGUD therefore classifies this element as:

**FIRST-PERSON TESTIMONY SUPPORTED BY THE IDENTIFICATION
OF A SPECIFIC CONTEMPORANEOUS PROFESSIONAL WITNESS
CAPABLE OF INDEPENDENT CORROBORATION.**

That is not a weakness.

It provides an investigative route.

An independent examiner can ask Mr. Kohr:

What precisely was communicated?

When?

By whom?

Was he transmitting the position of Jugendamt Kusel?

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

What consequence was communicated if adequate childcare could not be ensured?

Was Homos's employment or business activity discussed?

Did Homos subsequently cease his business activity?

These questions are capable of factual determination.

X. THE CAUSAL CHAIN REQUIRING VERIFICATION

The resulting evidentiary hypothesis is therefore:

FAMILY-CARE REQUIREMENTS

↓

COMMUNICATION THROUGH AN IDENTIFIED FAMILY-SUPPORT PROFESSIONAL

↓

DECISION TO PRIORITIZE THE FOUR CHILDREN

↓

CESSATION OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY

↓

INSOLVENCY

↓

INSOLVENCY-RELATED JUDICIAL COSTS

↓

AGGREGATION WITH OTHER JUDICIAL COSTS

↓

ENFORCEMENT

↓

COMPULSORY SECURITY MORTGAGE AGAINST THE PROPERTY

SUGUD requests that this chain be **verified, not presumed**.

The appropriate evidence includes:

the Jugendamt file;

IDIF/family-support records;

testimony from Dominique Kohr;

business closure and tax records;

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability.

the insolvency file before Amtsgericht Kaiserslautern;

and the Landesjustizkasse accounting record.

If the chain is corroborated, its human-rights significance would be substantial.

XI. FROM FAMILY JUSTICE TO THE FAMILY HOME

The broader documented architecture can now be stated with considerably greater precision:

Family proceedings concerning Homos and his children



judicial decisions and appellate proceedings



court-cost liabilities



express objections to at least some of those liabilities



continued enforcement architecture



aggregate judicial debt



compulsory security mortgage



family property entered into the enforcement chain

That is the escalation requiring urgent attention.

XII. FINANCIAL PRESSURE: THE LEGALLY CORRECT QUESTION

SUGUD deliberately does **not** characterize the mortgage as criminal extortion or blackmail.

The presently available evidence does not establish the elements necessary for such a finding.

The legally serious question is instead whether the **cumulative operation of judicial costs and enforcement measures has acquired a coercive, chilling or**

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

economically exhausting effect upon the continued exercise of legal and human-rights remedies.

That distinction is fundamental.

A lawful cost does not become unlawful merely because it is burdensome.

A lawful enforcement mechanism does not become retaliation merely because its subject is a human-rights defender.

But equally:

The formal legality of each isolated step cannot automatically answer the human-rights question created by their cumulative operation.

XIII. THE HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDER DIMENSION

Ahmed Homos is the founder of SUGUD and has engaged in sustained documentation, reporting and international communication concerning alleged violations within family-justice proceedings.

The United Nations framework on human-rights defenders recognizes the importance of protecting persons engaged peacefully in the promotion and protection of human rights from retaliation and reprisals. OHCHR materials expressly recognize that human-rights defenders may face harassment, judicial pressure and other forms of retaliation.

Report No. 73 does not claim that the mortgage proves retaliation.

It asks whether retaliation or an impermissible chilling effect can be excluded after the complete chronology is independently examined.

The distinction matters:

Human-rights-defender status creates no immunity from lawful debts.

But:

A lawful debt mechanism cannot be treated as analytically immune from scrutiny where its timing, origin, cumulative impact or implementation raises a credible question of pressure upon protected human-rights activity.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability.

XIV. THIS REPORT DOES NOT ASK FOR IMMUNITY

SUGUD expressly rejects any interpretation of this submission as a demand that Ahmed Homos be placed above German law.

He is not.

Nor is any human-rights defender.

If a judicial debt is lawful, correctly assessed, procedurally final and fairly enforceable, human-rights activity does not extinguish it.

But the converse is equally fundamental:

Human-rights activity cannot deprive a person of the right to challenge whether a debt is lawful, correctly assessed, procedurally final and fairly enforced.

That is the distinction upon which this report rests.

XV. THE FAMILY AND CHILDREN CANNOT BE TREATED AS AN ABSTRACT SIDE EFFECT

The property affected by the compulsory mortgage is connected to the family household.

Earlier professional family-support documentation records Homos living in his own house with the four older children and positively describes the children's care and household circumstances.

Accordingly, the economic consequences cannot be evaluated only as a bilateral accounting relationship between creditor and debtor.

Children are potentially affected by the stability of the household against which enforcement measures are progressing.

This does not create automatic immunity from enforcement.

It creates an obligation to take the consequences seriously.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

XVI. THE STRONGEST EXPLANATION IN FAVOUR OF THE STATE

A credible monitoring organization must test the explanation most favorable to the institutions it examines.

The strongest State explanation would be:

The judicial decisions remain legally effective.

The costs were lawfully imposed.

Available remedies existed.

Some objections did not comply with procedural form.

Landesjustizkasse Mainz is merely enforcing valid and enforceable claims.

The Grundbuchamt did not reconsider the underlying family proceedings because that was not its function.

The compulsory security mortgage is an ordinary instrument authorized by German enforcement law.

There is no retaliation.

There is no coercive campaign.

There is no coordination between institutions.

There is no attempt to force Homos to abandon his rights.

SUGUD acknowledges that this explanation is legally possible.

Indeed, §§866 and 867 ZPO expressly recognize a security mortgage as one of the forms of enforcement against immovable property and regulate its registration.

(Gesetze im Internet)

But that explanation must itself survive evidence.

It does not answer:

What is the exact origin of every amount?

Which amounts arise from family proceedings?

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

Which were challenged?

What happened to those challenges?

Were procedural remedies practically effective?

What was the economic origin of the insolvency component?

What was communicated through the family-support system before the business closed?

What cumulative impact has the resulting enforcement produced?

Could continued enforcement materially impair the ability to pursue domestic and international remedies?

Those questions remain.

XVII. REPORTS 71, 72 AND 73 NOW FORM A SINGLE ESCALATION CHAIN

Report No. 73 should not be read in isolation.

The three latest monitoring reports identify three distinct stages.

Report No. 71 - ACCESS

When Form Replaces Justice

The question was whether procedural formalism could prevent substantive examination despite actual institutional knowledge and attempts at corrective compliance.

Report No. 72 - INFORMATION

The Institutional Gatekeeper

The question became what safeguards exist when information acknowledged as received by a judicial institution is not forwarded to the competent person and is announced for deletion.

Report No. 73 - CONSEQUENCE

When the Cost of Seeking Justice Reaches the Family Home

The question is now what happens when disputed judicial processes and accumulated judicial costs progress into enforcement against property.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

The sequence is therefore:

ACCESS



INFORMATION



COST



ENFORCEMENT



PROPERTY

This progression requires independent scrutiny.

It does not, by itself, prove a coordinated institutional plan.

But it makes continued treatment of each development as an entirely isolated event increasingly inadequate for human-rights monitoring purposes.

XVIII. FROM “INDIVIDUAL INCIDENT” TO INSTITUTIONAL-RISK ANALYSIS

SUGUD has repeatedly avoided declaring coordination where coordination has not been independently established.

Report No. 73 maintains that standard.

The evidence presently does **not** establish:

a centralized instruction against Ahmed Homos;

coordination between every court involved;

an agreement to financially punish him;

or a deliberate plan to seize his home.

But human-rights monitoring does not require waiting for proof of conspiracy before examining institutional risk.

Where different stages of one person's interaction with a justice system repeatedly generate concerns concerning:

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability.

procedural access;
information integrity;
record integrity;
family-justice decision-making;
cost accumulation;
and finally property enforcement,
the appropriate question becomes systemic:

Are the safeguards between these stages sufficient to prevent individually lawful mechanisms from producing a cumulatively unjust result?

XIX. THE PROPERTY THRESHOLD

There is a qualitative difference between:

**a judicial cost invoice;
a payment reminder;
an enforcement warning;
and
an encumbrance entered in the land register.**

On **3 September 2026**, that threshold was crossed.

The German State's own document establishes the registration.

German procedural law further establishes that enforcement against immovable property can take the form of a security mortgage, compulsory auction or compulsory administration; §867 provides that the mortgage arises upon registration and addresses satisfaction from the property through compulsory auction on the basis of the enforceable title bearing the registration. ([Gesetze im Internet](#))

Again:

No compulsory auction is established by the present evidence.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

But the legal architecture demonstrates why waiting for a later stage before examining the problem would undermine the preventive purpose of this submission.

XX. ACCESS TO JUSTICE CANNOT BE MERELY THEORETICAL

Article 6 §1 ECHR protects access to a court within the scope of the Convention guarantee.

European Court of Human Rights jurisprudence has repeatedly examined whether procedural restrictions impair practical access to judicial determination. In **Zubac v. Croatia**, the Court addressed excessive formalism in access to a higher court and found an Article 6 §1 violation in the circumstances examined there. ([HUDOC](#))

Report No. 73 does not assert that Zubac automatically determines these German proceedings.

It supplies the governing analytical question:

Was judicial protection practically and effectively accessible, or did the cumulative interaction between procedural requirements, contested costs and enforcement make access increasingly theoretical?

XXI. THE RIGHT TO FAMILY LIFE AND THE CHILDREN

Article 8 ECHR protects private and family life and the home.

The present report does not argue that Article 8 prohibits lawful enforcement against residential property.

It asks whether the cumulative circumstances - particularly where the enforcement chain is materially connected to family proceedings and affects a household with dependent children - require a proportionate assessment of consequences.

The children are not parties to SUGUD's institutional conflict.

Their stability must not become the unexamined collateral consequence of it.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

XXII. PROPERTY RIGHTS

Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the ECHR protects peaceful enjoyment of possessions while permitting lawful control and deprivation of property subject to the conditions established by law and the general principles of international law.

Accordingly, the relevant question is not whether the State can ever enforce against property.

It can.

The question is whether interference with property in the circumstances is:

lawful;

pursuing a legitimate aim;

and

proportionate.

That assessment becomes particularly important when the liabilities originate substantially from contested judicial proceedings concerning the family.

XXIII. INTERNATIONAL FAIR-TRIAL GUARANTEES

Article 14(1) ICCPR guarantees equality before courts and tribunals and a fair hearing before a competent, independent and impartial tribunal.

The principle of judicial independence is indispensable.

But judicial independence does not mean that judicial systems are exempt from human-rights monitoring.

The two principles are complementary:

No judge should be subjected to improper pressure because of a decision.

And:

No litigant or human-rights defender should be subjected to improper pressure because he challenges a decision through lawful means.

The present report asks whether that equilibrium has been maintained.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

XXIV. EVIDENTIARY CLASSIFICATION

A. DOCUMENTED

The following matters are established by the available documentary record:

1. On 3 September 2026, Amtsgericht Kusel – Grundbuchamt issued the registration notification concerning Wiesweiler Blatt 965.
2. A compulsory security mortgage of **EUR 3,527.91** was registered.
3. The creditor is **Land Rheinland-Pfalz**, represented by Landesjustizkasse Mainz.
4. The underlying application is dated **18 August 2026**.
5. The attached accounting statement identifies multiple judicial cost references.
6. Proceedings **2 UF 40/26** and **2 UF 41/26** before the Pfälzisches Oberlandesgericht Zweibrücken concerned family contact arrangements between Ahmed Homos and Hend Selim.
7. On 4 July 2026, Homos expressly challenged the final cost invoices in those two proceedings.
8. On 27 July 2026, the OLG held the emailed objections formally inadmissible and invited personally signed postal submissions.
9. Dominique Kohr was professionally involved in the Homos family's Sozialpädagogische Familienhilfe under §31 SGB VIII.
10. The relevant professional documentation identifies Jugendamt Kusel/Frau Phillipp as the competent Jugendamt contact.
11. Professional documentation records Homos living with and caring for the four older children in his home and positively documents significant aspects of their household and care circumstances.

XXV. CAPABLE OF INDEPENDENT CORROBORATION

The following matters require further evidence but have identifiable means of verification:

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

1. Homos's account that Dominique Kohr communicated the Jugendamt-related warning concerning childcare and potential removal consequences.
2. The precise content and source of that communication.
3. The causal connection between that communication, Homos's cessation of business activity and subsequent insolvency.
4. The complete relationship between the Kaiserslautern insolvency component and the present EUR 3,527.91 enforcement total.
5. The exact procedural status of every objection to the costs now forming part of the enforcement architecture.

These matters can be tested through identifiable witnesses and institutional records.

XXVI. NOT ESTABLISHED

SUGUD expressly states that the presently available evidence does **not** establish:

1. that the compulsory security mortgage itself is unlawful;
2. that compulsory auction of the property has been ordered;
3. that every euro of the EUR 3,527.91 originates in family proceedings;
4. that Dominique Kohr's written reports themselves contain the alleged warning concerning removal of the children;
5. that every participant in the 4 March 2026 proceedings intentionally falsified information;
6. that German judicial institutions coordinated an economic campaign against Homos;
7. that the financial enforcement was intentionally designed to punish SUGUD;
8. that a criminal offence of extortion, coercion or evidence destruction has been established.

These limitations are not concessions.

They define precisely what the evidence can and cannot presently prove.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

XXVII. THE URGENT QUESTIONS THAT GERMANY CAN ANSWER

Report No. 73 therefore presents the competent German authorities with questions capable of objective answer:

1. What is the exact originating case, decision and statutory basis for each component of the EUR 3,527.91?
2. Which components originate from family proceedings before Amtsgericht Kusel?
3. Which components originate from family proceedings before Pfälzisches Oberlandesgericht Zweibrücken?
4. What is the precise origin of the Amtsgericht Kaiserslautern component?
5. What procedural effect was ultimately given to the objections concerning 2 UF 40/26 and 2 UF 41/26?
6. Were all available objections and corrective submissions resolved before the relevant costs progressed into enforcement?
7. What records exist concerning the family-support communication identified by Homos and attributed to Dominique Kohr as the transmitting professional?
8. What Jugendamt documentation exists concerning Homos's employment, business activity and capacity to care personally for his four children at the relevant time?
9. What safeguards were applied before cumulative judicial liabilities were secured against property associated with a household containing dependent children?
10. What domestic mechanism remains capable of preventing irreversible consequences while disputed procedural and human-rights issues are still under examination?

None of these questions requires speculation.

All can be answered from records and witnesses.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

XXVIII. URGENT REQUEST TO THE HIGH COMMISSIONER

SUGUD respectfully requests the **United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights** to record the registration of the compulsory security mortgage as a material escalation within the existing international documentation.

SUGUD further requests consideration of communication with the competent German authorities seeking clarification concerning:

the complete origin of the EUR 3,527.91;

the relationship between the cost claims and the documented family proceedings;

the procedural status of outstanding objections;

the consequences for the family household;

and the safeguards available against irreversible enforcement while the underlying issues remain disputed.

XXIX. URGENT REQUEST TO THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR ON HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS

SUGUD respectfully requests the **Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders** to examine whether the cumulative economic consequences documented in this case may constitute, or risk developing into:

financial pressure;

a chilling effect;

economic exhaustion;

or

retaliatory consequences

connected to the continued pursuit of human-rights documentation and international remedies.

SUGUD does not request a presumption of retaliation.

It requests examination before further escalation makes the question academic.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

XXX. URGENT REQUEST TO THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR ON THE INDEPENDENCE OF JUDGES AND LAWYERS

SUGUD respectfully requests the **Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers** to examine the institutional dimension of the case.

The issue is not whether an international mechanism should interfere with the merits of an independent judicial decision.

It should not.

The issue is whether the overall procedural architecture provides sufficient safeguards so that:

judicial independence does not become insulation from accountability;

procedural requirements do not eliminate practical access to review;

and

financial enforcement does not outrun effective examination of serious procedural objections.

XXXI. SPECIFIC URGENT MEASURES REQUESTED

Within their respective mandates, SUGUD respectfully requests:

1. Preservation of records.

That all relevant judicial, Jugendamt, family-support, electronic, postal, accounting, insolvency, enforcement and land-register records be preserved.

2. Complete financial mapping.

That the competent German authorities identify the origin, legal basis and procedural status of every component of the EUR 3,527.91.

3. Family-proceedings mapping.

That all amounts originating in Amtsgericht Kusel and Pfälzisches Oberlandesgericht Zweibrücken family proceedings be separately identified.

4. Examination of the Kaiserslautern component.

That the insolvency file and its relationship to the preceding family-care circumstances be examined.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

5. Witness preservation and verification.

That the relevant contemporaneous records concerning Dominique Kohr's involvement be preserved and that his evidence concerning the disputed family-care communication be capable of independent examination.

6. Review of outstanding cost objections.

That the procedural status and substantive availability of review concerning the contested cost claims be clarified.

7. Preventive protection against irreversible consequences.

That competent German authorities consider, in accordance with applicable domestic law, whether enforcement capable of creating irreversible consequences should be suspended, limited or otherwise safeguarded pending effective examination of outstanding objections.

8. Protection of the children.

That the practical consequences of further property enforcement for the dependent children and stability of the household be assessed.

9. Human-rights-defender safeguards.

That assurances be sought that lawful complaints, publications, communications with United Nations mechanisms and other peaceful human-rights activities will not result in retaliatory or improperly coercive measures.

10. Independent examination.

That the cumulative chronology be assessed as a whole rather than solely as isolated administrative and judicial events.

XXXII. THE PREVENTIVE PRINCIPLE

This report does not ask the United Nations to wait until the home is sold.

It does not ask it to presume that the home will be sold.

It asks it to recognize that **the property has already entered the enforcement architecture.**

That fact is documented.

Preventive protection has meaning only before irreversible harm.

Once the irreversible consequence has occurred, prevention has failed by definition.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability.**

XXXIII. THE CENTRAL HUMAN-RIGHTS FINDING

On the evidence presently available, SUGUD does **not** make a final finding of coordinated institutional retaliation.

It makes a different finding:

The cumulative documented developments have reached a level at which an independent examination of coercive financial effect, effective access to justice, family impact and potential human-rights-defender retaliation is objectively warranted and urgently required.

The registration of the compulsory security mortgage transforms the risk from theoretical to concrete.

That is the finding supported by the present evidence.

XXXIV. THE QUESTION THAT CAN NO LONGER BE POSTPONED

Germany unquestionably possesses the right to enforce lawful judicial debts.

That proposition is not disputed.

The issue is what happens when the person against whom enforcement proceeds says:

the costs originate substantially in family proceedings whose factual and procedural integrity he has repeatedly challenged;

some of the costs were expressly contested;

the mechanisms for obtaining substantive review have themselves become subjects of documented procedural controversy;

the wider family history allegedly contributed to the destruction of his previous economic capacity;

and the accumulated financial consequences have now reached his property.

At that point, the correct question is no longer:

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

“Does German law contain an enforcement mechanism?”

It plainly does.

The correct question becomes:

“Were the safeguards preceding the use of that mechanism sufficiently effective to ensure that enforcement is the final consequence of justice - rather than the mechanism through which the practical ability to continue seeking justice is exhausted?”

XXXV. CONCLUSION

A person enters a family-justice system seeking protection, adjudication or resolution.

That person should not automatically emerge vindicated.

Courts must remain free to reject claims that are legally unfounded.

Nor should litigation be cost-free merely because the litigant considers his cause just.

But the rule of law requires something equally fundamental:

The cost of challenging alleged injustice must not become the mechanism that makes further challenge practically impossible before the allegations themselves receive effective examination.

In this case, the progression is now documented beyond correspondence.

A compulsory security mortgage of **EUR 3,527.91** has been registered against the property.

Family proceedings before Kusel and Zweibrücken form part of the underlying judicial history.

Proceedings **2 UF 40/26** and **2 UF 41/26** demonstrably concerned family contact arrangements, and their cost assessments were expressly challenged.

The earlier family-support record independently establishes Dominique Kohr's professional involvement with the family and documents the father caring for the four older children in the home.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.

A specific witness has now been identified who can confirm or refute a central element of the alleged causal chain leading from family-care pressure to business closure and insolvency.

The evidence therefore no longer presents an untestable narrative.

It presents:

documents;
dates;
case numbers;
institutions;
financial amounts;
an identified witness;
a registered property encumbrance;
and
questions capable of independent verification.

SUGUD does not ask the international community to accept its conclusions on faith.

It asks the international community to **test the evidence before the consequences become irreversible.**

And that is why Report No. 73 is submitted as an:

URGENT ACTION REQUEST

The request is not for immunity.

It is not for privilege.

It is not for interference with judicial independence.

It is for something considerably more fundamental:

effective scrutiny before irreversible enforcement.

Because if effective review arrives only after economic exhaustion, it is not fully effective.

If protection arrives only after the family home is lost, it is no longer preventive.

All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability.**

And if the practical price of continuing to insist upon rights becomes the progressive destruction of the economic capacity required to exercise those rights, then the question facing a rule-of-law system is no longer merely what each individual procedure permitted.

It is:

what the system, taken as a whole, ultimately did.

For that reason, SUGUD respectfully requests **urgent attention, preservation of evidence, clarification from the competent German authorities, examination of the identified witness and documentary chain, assessment of the impact upon the children, and consideration of preventive safeguards against further irreversible enforcement while the outstanding procedural and human-rights issues remain unresolved.**

SUGUD remains available to cooperate with any competent independent review mechanism by providing additional documentation, methodological clarification, or relevant case materials, where appropriate and consistent with applicable legal requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

Ahmed Homos

Fachjournalist | GEMA Member
Member of the ver.di Trade Union
Member of BVF & AWU
Founder of SUGUD

Reference: **OHCHR 3ygz24a** - Reference: **UR/CRC/25/DEU/8** - ECHR:
5769/25 German Constitutional Court: **1 BvR 1377/25** - Bundestag Petition: **Pet**
4-21-07-99999-003005



All materials issued by **SUGUD Organization** are independent human rights documentation formally submitted to **UN mechanisms** and the **European Court of Human Rights**.

All rights reserved. Use is permitted only for purposes of **human rights investigation, reporting, and accountability**.