

**Translation of the official letter in French to the Juge d'Instruction in Monaco Mr Loïc  
Malbrancke of 14 February 2012 from Mrs Monica Fristedt.**

Monsieur le Juge,

During January 2012, You have sent me three summons, of which two were written and signed the very same day, and which contained a perfectly identical content, to my Monegasque address, knowing perfectly well, through means of a Monegasque lawyer that I was not in Monaco. The clerk signed for You the same content twice. You have chosen not to inform me of the purpose – i.e. object - of your notice to meeting, contenting Yourself with referring me to a number that tells me zilch.

Mister David Fristedt (herewith David) has noted the absence of any reference number on the documents that the Swedish police were to have received by Your very self. Nevertheless, Your summons for my attention seem to have quite something to do with these “THREATS OF INDICTMENT” as entitled in the document that the Swedish police gave him, as well as with those eventually pertaining to David’s website, as far as what has been reported to me unofficially.

Be it said hereby and once and for all, that in no way shall I accept further disturbances due to the actions or inactions of Mrs the Monegasque Crown Councillor and Consul to Sweden in Monaco Patricia HUSSON (herewith Husson). She will be held responsible for whatever she has launched.

I can of course not give You any further information during the Swedish affair, taking into account the fact that the Prosecutor General Mister Jean-Pierre DRENO (herewith Dreno) as well as the Swedish judicial authorities have received, in due form, everything in order for both parties to put an end to the public disorders, including herewith Your very own thought process.

The matter has already been judged by the Administrative Court of Appeals of Stockholm, and is far from being over, whereas both You, as I and everyone, ought to simply face the fact, which consists in waiting for its issue. Indeed, it is You, Husson, and / or eventually Dreno who wanted to export the affair to Sweden.

I am not in the position of telling you who has sent what to Sweden, since the police of Monaco as well as that of Sweden have produced differing information, and – be it said – on crucial points.

I am David’s main witness in all cases, regarding Husson’s formal « THREATS » in Sweden, just as regarding crimes and aggravated crimes, such as those complained for since ages against high authorities in Monaco, crimes that the succeeding heads of the Monegasque prosecution have been forbidden to prosecute. This deals among other things with matters as serious as **forgeries in public writing committed by public ministerial officials.**

I shall in no way accept any pressure from Your part, nor during the Swedish inquiry, nor during the Monegasque one.

Needles to say that I shall not accept any other threats from Husson or by anyone else. Your three summons finally got to me in the United Kingdom. These have unfortunately been viewed, by I undersigned as well as by many another lawyer as constituting no less than *attempt of pressure on witness in ongoing matters within which I am a civil party to the ongoing process*, and this reverberates ever so badly.

It so happened, that the Monegasque police called me on my Monegasque number, last summer, and told me that Husson were to have filed a criminal complaint against David for some sentences on his website. Such complaint occurred thus after the reception by Dreno of the criminal charges laid by David on the 6th of June 2011, concerning justly so the people who would now stand behind the official "Threats" (attached document nr 23, non published, and on Dreno's desk). The Swedish Embassy in Paris has confirmed in writing that Husson has acted without its knowledge.

The police in Monaco told me that Dreno were to have given order to call David's « mommy » - at least this is what I grasped – in spite of Dreno possessing David's very number in Sweden, and **despite David's really wanting to get into contact with him**. But as in year 2004, it is I, the mom, that some prefer to disturb / intimidate again (!) and again.

I feel this as being a cowardly act as well as disgraceful one.

In Swedish there is an insult called "*modersförolämpning*". This consists in hurting someone's mother in order to harm the person more efficiently.

I have since 2004 been thinking about the reasons of such practices, and it seems that this very harassment against my person with slanders and other gravely damaging false statements, first from the swindler herself (Charlotte SHAHZADA), but later on in ever so more serious a manner through her counsel lawyer Didier ESCAUT, bailiff Marie-Thérèse ESCAUT-MARQUET's husband, who through his envoys (via the Swedish consulate?) via the embassies in late 2004 and in the beginning of 2005 accused me of serious breaches of the law, affirming – even worse so – that I would have committed acts of violence in Monaco, monstrosities received by the office of the Swedish Government in envoys meant for David! I am still waiting, since the 29th of April 2005, for official denials

Many another have persisted in the swindler's premeditated path. These circumstances now constitute a real threat against my person. I am notably and with reason worried about the possibility for some to break into my Monegasque apartment again, with the help of a bailiff, for example. It is only a matter of fabricating a new ordinance.

My feeling is that Your three summons constitute a direct follow-up of this stalking that started in 2004 and one which seems to have been fueled anew by Husson within the ignition of her power apparatus.

Regarding Husson, I can inform you that I and my son during these last years have not had the same perception of her role in our affairs.

I had never suspected her of having something to do with the sending of forgeries in 2004 and 2005 for which David filed a criminal complaint on the 29th of April 2005, emphasizing therein the bailiff's responsibility. On the contrary, I addressed myself to her in order to find a mediator in view of bringing this unbearable affair to an end.

I sometimes think about late Mr Rainier IMPERTI who – as far as I believe – was being used, the day after his nomination, for serving the criminal purposes of this « ménage à trois », the swindler and the couple ESCAUT/ESCAUT-MARQUET.

During the meeting in 2010 with Husson, I were however to experience a strong sensation of her pretending to not know about the majority of the things that had happened to me, and this in spite of her having received substantial information to say the least, from my lawyer and from myself.

When on top of that she started to defend the bailiff, the atmosphere thus became downright unpleasant.

Husson told me drily that she was no diplomat. With hindsight, and considering what she henceforth has launched in Sweden, this seems unfortunately confirmed.

It has been brought to my knowledge that in her filed complaint against David, she is to have reacted very strongly on his having affirmed that the bailiff's envoys of 2004 and 2005 contained forgeries etc. In doing so, she endorses the content of said envoys, admitting to know their contents, and their route (the staples affair). Whereof record for The Swedish Government who received them, and considering that as a consul, she is ranked below the office of said Government. She is consequently being suspected by myself of being in possession of information that are susceptible of facilitating the investigations while going back in time.

I hereby join for You with the present a copy (PJ 1) of David Fristedt's criminal complaint of last 7th of December to Dreno as a direct consequence of this particularly thoughtless "threat" of prosecution made upon demand by Husson.

When the Supreme Court, within its judgement of 2009 refused to give me access to the ordinary tribunals, impeaching thus to put an end to this horrifying affair, and considering the Prosecution's Office's persistent silence towards David, the latter decided to take control over the website that I had started years ago in the sole aim of announcing on the internet and not least in Nice-Matin pictures of my stolen jewellery.

He has since let the site develop itself according to what he has found to be the most appropriate way, in order to be able to demonstrate with his total meticulousness and in detail, unfailing, the authors', co-authors' and accomplices' modus operandi, where the ordinance of 21 July 2004 was the start of this tradition of lies and fraudulent manoeuvres that were to be undertaken at the highest level in order to conceal the scandal.

It is faced with this situation that he tries, through his website, to bring some light onto this affair, in order to be able to finally close it. Indeed, said website were to become his new tool since seeing that the ordinary and judicial way was to be him denied. For his courage, my son enjoys my most total support.

One of late Prince Rainier III's last wishes for Monaco was that for Monaco to become a member of the European Council. This constituted a strong signal of His wish for openness and transparency of the country's judicial system. This is exactly to what some people in

Monaco openly object. The website as such constitutes an apparently necessary warranty of transparency.

His Serene Highness the Sovereign Prince Albert II of Monaco proclaimed notably the following :

*« We are all, regardless of our level of responsibility, the craftsmen of Monaco's prosperity which, evidently, cannot be gained without effort, no more today than yesterday.*

*This prosperity relies for much of it on the people's climate of security and that of their belongings. I intend for this to remain one of our essential assets. »*

I wish to quote what David writes on the home page of the site [www.bimcam.com](http://www.bimcam.com) :

*“It means that the perfect crime exists in Monaco when the authorities follow the orders of a swindler. In a civilized country this should not happen. As long as the authorities refuse to compensate the victims, we will continue to publish information about this remarkable story.”*

I would like to stress that in no way do I have the possibility to decide on David's website. I have, however, given him permission to publish some of the letters that I have written whereas as he has seen it fit to do so. I have full confidence in his not writing anything that he could not prove.

Now it is his turn to tell what nobody has wanted to hear. He does it for the best of Monaco.

It goes without saying it is my desire for David's website that of it not having to exist.

It is not the website that is to be blamed, but the people who divert and hide the truth who hold the huge responsibility for having let the present take on such proportions. Monaco's Codes and Laws reflect with clarity the severity with which the Legislator deals with the breaches of the law committed by such persons. This is why we count, with certain assurance, on being compensated one day.

I have in no way lost faith therein.

In the world of today, it has been proven on a daily basis that it is to no avail that of trying to coax or silence critical voices through tools of repression or terror. It is an outmoded method.

Many people in Monaco know that I am trying, since a while (save for my failed attempt with Husson), to find a negotiator, or a mediator, and I can only hope that an intelligent person finally may admit that it is through dialogue that one obtains results – not through threats. Last spring, I tried for the last time to obtain the annulment of the dangerous, illegal ordinance of 21 July 2004, addressing myself to H.E. the Ministre of State Mr Michel ROGER (ex judge before the Supreme Court in my case, in 2009).

It seems however and unfortunately that some – in disregard of the laws – have wanted to preserve it indeed, only in order to not having to judge those responsible for this grave error. By doing so, the swindler automatically enjoys impunity despite the knowledge of the reality of things.

As well Mr Philippe NARMINO as ex Ministre of State late Mr Jean-Paul PROUST have wanted to make people believe that the swindler had not fooled then Vice-President of the Court of First Instance Mrs Brigitte GAMBARINI, which means that her actions, those of the bailiff Marie-Thérèse ESCAUT-MARQUET and the lawyer Didier ESCAUT ought to be seen as legally undertaken when they gave away my apartment and the goods therein to the swindler, through this ordinance which does not carry my name, with its known result.

One has consequently granted impunity to the swindler, the bailiff and the lawyer.

**Regrettably, even the Minister of State H.E. Mr Michel ROGER has taken stand, whereas the Monegasque authorities grant themselves the right to commit in Monaco against anyone the same kind of crimes in the future, and in total impunity, according to this “Lex Gambarini”.**

Fearing since for my security in Monaco, I do not dare to set my foot there any longer.

**Minister of State Michel ROGER’s recent letter became bearer of so grave consequences that because of it, despite having resided in Monaco since 1977, I no longer do.**

Cordially,

London, on the 14th of February 2012

[signed]

Monica Fristedt

Adresse e-mail: [...]

PJ : (attached documents)

1) Criminal complaint of 7 December [2011] by Mr David Fristedt for the attention of Mr Prosecutor General of Monaco Jean-Pierre DRENO, awaiting for the future recommended letter with acknowledgement of receipt to be finished and sent, considering Your initiatives.

2) Extracts in bulk by Mrs Monica Fristedt for the attention of Mr Loïc MALBRANCKE, instruction judge, of the ongoing criminal complaint by Mr David Fristedt of the 6th of June 2011 of which Monaco’s General Prosecutor Mr Jean-Pierre DRENO has acknowledged receipt.

Cc : Mr David Fristedt

Printed pages in all : 16 [sixteen pages of the original version].

Translation by David Fristedt