

Katalin Baranyi
665, rue de Neudorf
L-2220 Luxembourg
Luxembourg

Phone : +352 43 12 65
Fax : +352 26 43 12 11

POLICE GRAND-DUCALE
Centre Aldingen
B.P. 1612
L-1016 Luxembourg

Luxembourg August 30 2010

Att : To whom it may concern
Re : Criminal complaint
Case # : Invasion of privacy – Covert surveillance
Your reference :
Our reference :
Posting by : Fax and mail
Your fax # : 24 422 299
Numbers of pages : 4
Attachment :
Copy :

Dear Sir/Ms.

On Friday August 27 at approximately 20 minutes past four in the afternoon, I spotted a car that was passing suspiciously slowly in the direction of the airport. Just up the road the car turned and drove towards the city only to stop just outside our driveway. For about a minute the driver, which was alone in the car, took pictures or filmed me. The lens of the camera was focused right on me and it was quite visible as well, so I suppose the driver was professionally equipped. I was standing in our room on the first floor on the southeast corner of the house. After I had logged his plate-number (PB 4238), I tried to get the drivers attention by miming “photo-clicking” with my fingers. As soon as he spotted me, he took off.

I have a son attending to the local school in Neudorf, and by this new incident I honestly fear that these people will hurt me, or my son. This incident scared me off, as this isn't the first time “someone” has been taking pictures/filmed our house. One of these incidents occurred on April 10 2009 (Good Friday) approximately at four a clock in the afternoon. The perpetrator downloaded a movie on Youtube with pictures of our house taken that day, together with a complete description were I live, my full name, and some text with a smearing content. There have also been other incidents where I have seen a person filming our house from the passenger seat of a black car standing just outside our premises, taking off as soon as they are being spotted.

Immediately after the incident on Friday I called the local police at Cent and explained what had happened. The officer on duty told me that the car that was used is owned by a constructing company in Luxembourg, and that he would, right away, call the company and take a statement, and then return to me with whatever he got.

He returned with the following information: The name of the company is Cardoso & Fils. The officer had been talking to the owner/boss, Mr. Cardoso. Mr. Cardoso admitted that it was one of his technicians that had been at our house. He furthermore declared that he had taken pictures of our house. According to Mr. Cardoso the purpose of this “visit” was that the roof of this house was to be “rebuilt”. Hence the technician had been here to take some pictures of the roof. For your information; there are no plans for our roof.

Let me also remind you that it was an awful rainy weather at the moment the technician was taking these pictures. He was sitting inside the car, obstructing the traffic on the lane down to Neudorf, parked only some 10 meters from the wall of our house. From his position (inside the car) he wouldn't be able to even see the roof. At least he should have positioned himself outside the car on the other side of the road, that is if he really wanted to see and take pictures of the roof.

As far as I understood the officer, Mr. Cardoso had made him believe that it was a roof of an apartment that was to be reconstructed, and that I thus was living in an apartment. I informed the officer that I live in a semi-attached house, and besides a house down the road consisting of studios, I don't know about any apartments in the vicinity of our house. Consequently Mr. Cardoso's statement falls to the ground.

Mr. Cardoso also declared to the officer that this wasn't the first time he had been here taking pictures of the house. According to the statement given to the officer, “Cardoso” had been here a few months ago as well, picturing the house. This information rules out the question whether Cardoso this time had picked the wrong object to picture, as he obviously must have found the correct building a few months ago. Last Friday he returned to the very same object, our house.

The next problem with Cardoso's “visit” on last Friday was that he was not taking pictures of the roof. The quite visible camera lens was pointing right at me, some 5-8 meters (or two floors) below the roof. Cardoso's man was obviously not picturing the roof, he was picturing me, and as far as I understand; he was thoroughly doing what someone had told him to do, and that was to take pictures of the house in general, people inside included. Most likely this guy was taking pictures (1/2 hour after normal working hours) to put together a “picture” of our house, inhabitants, neighbours, and the nearby surroundings and hence providing his principal – whoever that might be – with enough information to make a profile of us and the surroundings, for later use, thus being accomplice to illegal covert surveillance.

Reviewing the piece of information given and putting the facts together in the right order, we get this picture: For some unknown reason Mr. Cardoso instructed his technician/employee to go over to our house and take pictures of the house and its residents. When the employee of Mr. Cardoso was caught in the action taking pictures of the house and me, he took off. I immediately called the police and gave the officer on duty my explanation on what had happened, as well as the plate number of the car. The officer checked the number and found that it corresponded with a registration number associated with a car owned by Mr. Cardoso. The officer decided to call Mr. Cardoso and ask for his statement on the matter. Mr. Cardoso

declared that his employee had been out on a mission for the purpose of taking picture of a roof, and that he actually had been taking pictures.

The fact is that it was raining heavy around the time the photographer was taking these pictures, and that he never left his car during his mission. The photographer stopped his car some 10 meters from the wall of the southeast corner of our house, making it impossible to take any decent pictures of the roof, as the angle from where he was positioned and up to the roof was too steep to even get a glimpse of **his alleged object**. In addition to this, the photographer's lens was aiming at me on the first floor, proving that he was not taking pictures of the roof. From an academic point of view I find it hard to believe that a renowned constructing company – or any constructing company – finds it more practical or rational to take pictures (on a dim and rainy afternoon, after working hours) of a house of which they are to reconstruct the roof, instead of assessing the architect drawings and take it from there.

Mr. Cardoso's statements are not trustworthy and give strong reason to doubt. The question now is why he didn't tell the truth? Mr. Cardoso claims that he's employee was to take pictures of the **roof** of this house, that it concerned a **roof** on top of an apartment, that this **roof** was to be restored, that he had been here before taking pictures and that there was nothing suspicious about this.

If this was true, then you have to assume that the employee by mistake had picked the wrong house. But is this a reasonable explanation? **Did he really pick the wrong house?** No. Firstly Mr. Cardoso has declared that he or one of his employees has been here before, a few months ago, **hence ruling out** the possibility that he had picked the wrong house on this second or third visit.

But even if he had picked the wrong house by mistake both this time as well as a few months ago, his explanation doesn't add up at all. If the driver of the car was to take pictures of the roof then you would expect him to leave the car and position himself in such a way that he would get our roof in sight. Notice that he was aiming his lens at me, on the first floor, from a position where he would never be able to see the roof even if he had bent his lens straight up to the sky. Make also notice that if he was here to take picture of the roof, he most likely would have picked a time when it was not raining and at least he would have stayed for more than the one minute he spent on taking pictures of me.

Another thing that I noticed during my conversation with the police officer was that Mr. Cardoso had told the officer that there was **"nothing suspicious"** about this. If this was just a mistake, why on earth would Mr. Cardoso try to persuade the officer to believe that there was nothing suspicious about this photo-session? Mr. Cardoso told the officer a story which he knew would hold no water if anyone started poring water into his "facts", consequently he did his best to get the officer from poring water, i.e. checking the facts and hold them against Mr. Cardoso's statements.

Taking into consideration that Mr. Cardoso admits that he has been here before, taking pictures, and the mere fact **that pictures of my house** have been placed **on Youtube**, illegally, there is a possibility that Mr. Cardoso is the one providing a third-party with these pictures.

I would like to have Mr. Cardoso interrogated on this issue, and I would also like to get access to all pictures of our house that are in his possession. Most likely Mr. Cardoso has been hired

to take these pictures and by this committing illegal covert surveillance on behalf of a third party, hence it is of great importance to uncover who is behind, and their purposes.

This incident is at best an invasion of and thus a violation of my privacy (which is a crime in itself), but I fear it could be much worse. By this criminal complaint I ask you to investigate the above mentioned actions and prosecute the offender/-s. In this regard I also petition the prosecuting authority to appoint a counsel (lawyer) for me to take care of my rights in regards to this complaint.

Finally I ask you kindly to keep me posted on this matter.

Yours sincerely



Katalin Baranyi

Luxembourg August 30 2010