

Section 2

The correct case process

Government's response to the ACCC in the case C / 81 is thoroughly misleading. The government wants to or can not keep apart the division of the matter made by the County Administrative Board by inadmiss some complainants and then reject the other appellants.

Both the Court in Nacka and the Svea Court of Appeal uses the same division but can not keep them apart.

Avvisa – inadmiss

Avslå - rejekt

Here is the case process

3.11.2011 municipality gives planning permission.

26.12.2011 Our appeal Bernd Stümer Kerstin Stümer mailed to the municipality.
See Section 1 Annex 5

County Administrative Board (LN)

LN inadmiss

Annex 1

15.12.2011 LN inadmiss me and other 403-4710-2010 m fl
Bernd Stümer (Helgesta 1:2), 26 other complainants

Annex 2

31.12.2011 to LN I'm concerned partie, and according power of attorney agent for
Johan Andersson

Annex 3

3.9.2012 appeals LN decision 403-4710-2010 m fl from 15.12.2011 inadmissible
complaint locus standi Bernd and Kerstin

LN Rejekt

Annex 4

4.1.2012 LN rejects raw neighbors' complaints locus standi the right 403-4718-2010
I'm not raw neighbor In this case, I have no part in this case.

23.3.2012 LN rejects Thornefors(2) och Karlsson This decision does not concern
me. The decision is only sent to the Tornefors etc.

Nacka judgments

Annex 5

15.5.2014 Judgment Nacka admits my, No. 30, locus standi and others total 33 people Case P129-12

Annex 6

15.5.2014 Judgment Nacka in Case C 635-12, P 1924-12 inadmiss Bernd and Kerstin's appeal in Case P 635-12

NOTE

In this ruling case P 635-12, P 1924-12 is stated on page 1 that Bernd Stümer and Kerstin Stümer was a party to P 635-12, but not in P1924-12 (Thornefors etc.)

Under Grounds is stated for locus standi

Bernd Stümer and Kerstin Stümer was not a party to the contested decision. The decision therefore can not be considered to have gone against them. Their appeals will be inadmissible.

(What decision they were not party to?)

Svea Hovrätt, Svea Court of Appeal

Annex 7

29.6.2014 Appeal to the Land and Environmental Court Svea Court of Appeal Supplementary Appeal Case No. P 5592-14.

My appeal applies to the Land and Environment Court judgment P 129-12 and was submitted via email 5.6.2014.

Annex 8

Evidence for my appeal Diary Svea HR P 5593-14. Actors (sic) Stümer Bernd, agent: Stümer Bernd, Stümer Kerstin, agent Stümer Bernd

Annex 9

9.3.2015 SH final judgment inadmissible lokus standi

Note

LN decisions rejecting 4.1.2012

Is not of my concerne but Jösso, Johansson, Asplund, Zetterlund, Arvidsson, L och J Andersson och Thorneforss (2) och Kerstin Karlsson

LN ruling 23.3. 2012 LN rejekting

Is not of my concerne but Thorneforss (2) och K.Karlsson

These two decisions have nothing to do with my case on locus standi.

Note these two LN decisions does not concern me but LN decision 15.12.2011 LN admits me and others 403-4710-2010. This decision is of my concern.

Throughout the legal process it is stated that I am complainant
My documents are signed concerned party and Bernd Stümer and agent

Despite the government's total confusion or misleading attempts, I note that the fact is that in the case of wind turbines on Helgarö / Strängnäs, the Swedish legal process refused me and all the 32 other complainant locus standi, which clearly contravenes the provisions of Aarhus Convention.

It should be noted that the Swedish legal process has refused to comply with the complainant's claim for a legal process, where all the laws and regulations regarding machine windmills are applicable, including the Law Machinery Directive, have been applied.