

Nga Thi Tuyet Tran

Name of Witness

Berg 206/4

Address:

9771 Berg im Drautal

### Statement of Facts

On July 1, 2025 Ms. Nga Thi Tuyet Tran (mother of Akua and Aurora Kraus-Tran) and her witness, went to the BH Spittal, Bereich Soziales, Jugend und Familie/Jugendamt, Tiroler Straße 13, 9800 Spittal an der Drau, Austria.

When I arrived, Mathiesl had the case in front of him on the desk and stated that I would not get access because the alleged father now had sole custody.

I asked whether I understood correctly that he had let me come to this place, confirming the appointment, although he knew that he could not give me access. Mathiesl replied that he did not know this back then.

Mathiesl mentioned that access could be given only if the alleged father confirmed it. He also said that the alleged father was obligated to give me all information about the children, but only if I requested it directly from him.

I pointed out that the children had been released from the crisis intervention center the week before and asked if he meant that the children would be released without court confirmation. Mathiesl responded that they could do that, they could do ~~that~~ and did not need any confirmation.

I reminded him that the crisis intervention center had told me the court order was released earlier. Mathiesl replied that he was not sitting all the time at his workspace watching my case. When I said that he had an electronic system where he could access it, he did not respond with a solution.

My witness informed Mathiesl about natural and human rights law, clarifying that no one could take away the children and that the government did not own them. The witness educated him about natural law.

Mathiesl, as head of the department, mentioned the invoices and the cease and desist order. He wanted me to explain the invoices and everything I was doing. I answered that I was there for the case itself and that everything was explained in the invoice.

Mathiesl looked at me and asked if I really thought someone would pay my invoices. I replied that it did not matter. Mathiesl then said that he could also create an invoice and send it to me. I asked what unlawful things I had done.

Mathiesl stated that with my letters I could do that with him because he had no problem with it, that he could handle it, that he had 200 proclamations in his trunk, and that many fathers and mothers were complaining to him. He added that he was fine with that, but others would not be okay with it. These remarks were already insinuations.

I told Mathiesl to give me access, because I had the right to receive everything in regard to my children. When I asked if he was giving me access now, Mathiesl denied with 'No'.

I then said that he should give me access since the children were taken until the time when he claimed that I did not have custody, because during that time I had custody. Mathiesl again said that he could not do that because he had to protect the father and the children.

Mathiesl also stated that I was making everything public, putting this "shit" live, and that a lot of people were watching it. I replied that it was good that many people were watching it.

I asked why he had confirmed the appointment when I came to his place and he was denying me access. Mathiesl said that he wanted to have a reasonable conversation with me. I pointed out that he had confirmed the appointment and the permission to do a file inspection only for a reasonable conversation. Mathiesl confirmed this but added that it was not possible to have a reasonable conversation with me, that he pitied the children for having such a mother, and that I was not „normal“. He used the phrase "poor children."

I told him that he did not know my children. Mathiesl replied that he had seen them three times the week before. I answered that he still did not know my children and that the only solution was to give the children back. Mathiesl said that this would never happen.

Mathiesl also urged me to get a lawyer, saying that the time for appeal was soon over.

I then said that if he wanted me to get a lawyer and support this case, then he should give me access to the case, because I needed this for further evidence. Mathiesl again denied.

Mathiesl then asked me what I actually wanted from the case. I said that I wanted all the medical reports, including what treatments and measures had been taken on the children during the time they were removed. Mathiesl replied that he did not have anything like that in the case, that such information would be at the corresponding places like KIZ.

I said: What, you don't have anything about that? You have taken the blood of Aurora and Akua without my and their consent. So where is the doctor report? Mathiesl replied that he did not have one. I reminded him that every doctor had to create a doctor report and asked if he was telling me there was no such report in the case. Mathiesl confirmed this with "Yes."

I asked how he got the information. Mathiesl replied that he had a phone call and was told that the doctor said the children were „ok“.

I reminded him about the law called Sorgfaltspflicht (duty of care) and that they must create documentation and protocols by law. Mathiesl became agitated and said that I did not have to tell him how he had to do his work.

Finally, I asked him one last time if he was giving me access. Mathiesl again denied with "No."

After that the witness and I left.

**I make this statement to confirm what I personally witnessed, and I affirm that the above account is true to the best of my knowledge and recollection.**

Nga Thi Tuyet Tran

Date: September 12, 2025

