

Kalamata  
Billington Lane  
Derrington  
Stafford  
ST18 9LR  
Phone: +44 1785 248865  
Email: [mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com](mailto:mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com)  
27 July 2015

Dear Frau Elke König,

The first thing to say is that I am sorry for not addressing you in German, languages were never my strong point, and I only understand English.

I believe that you were director of BaFin from January 2012 to December 2014. You were then in a position to follow BaFin's probe into Deutsche Bank for gold price manipulation, that Reuters reported to have started mid-2013. During that probe Reuters on the 19 June 2014 reported that Deutsche Bank were auditing themselves on the same matter. Deutsche Bank never denied the Reuters report, nor do I see in any web search results that show any indication that the audit was undertaken before that date, nor do I see any web search results that show the audit has completed. This has caused me much trouble, because in private correspondence to me, Deutsche Bank claimed in July 2014, that it had looked into my allegations of precious metal price manipulation (which took it 5 months) and found those allegations baseless. So it claims to have made two overlapping audits, one finds that there is no basis for such allegations, the other is undecided. I know that the recipients of my accusations would know of the two audits, since the recipients were all the major directors of the board, and so a simple confusion cannot be a plausible explanation. The most likely answer is that Reuters were informed of an audit by Deutsche Bank's press office, and the audit has no substance beyond that press release – in other words it was a fake audit, and faked to mislead BaFin into thinking it was serious about responding to the the allegations of market manipulation. A fake audit implies guilt of market manipulation.

I have recently taken Deutsche Bank, Anshu Jain and six other banks to court for market manipulation, with these conflicts of correspondence as the key evidence. In that claim Anshu Jain, Emma Slatter (A senior lawyer for Deutsche Bank and Anshu Jain's witness) and Deutsche Bank together issued a bare denial, an unlawful response. They would neither admit nor deny that the audits were fake, and they provided absolutely no evidence that the audit publicized by Reuters was anything other than a press release. Anshu Jain and his witness refused to turn up to court for cross-examination. Now you may think that with a bare denial, and an evasive position in their application to strike-out the claim (against the key allegations), and a defendant and witness who refused to be cross-examined (and it was they who had applied for the strike-out hearing), along with Deutsche Bank's history of lying to regulators,

just recently exposed, that the defendants would have no chance of winning. What happened was that I was declared 'vexatious' – which means a plaintiff who brings court cases repeatedly for fanciful and meritless reasons. This prevents me from suing banks for market manipulation.

Faced with such an absurd court verdict, I write to you to ask if you have personally seen any evidence that Deutsche Bank's audit was anything more than a press release, and what that evidence was. Was it Anshu Jain or Juergen Fitschen who was responsible for the audit?

I have recently read the BaFin report on Anshu Jain - a report that accused him of deliberately misleading the Bundesbank with fake Libor statistics. This seems fairly obvious, as Libor rigging was solvency misrepresentation, and Deutsche Bank needed to underestimate its borrowing costs, following the liquidity crises of 2008, along with all the other banks that had played the subprime game.

I wish to thank you for your time and effort in responding to this letter – it is greatly appreciated, and I think your opinion could be instrumental in seeing justice done.

Kind regards  
Mark Anthony Taylor