

From: valab <email address redacted>
To: Aarhus Compliance
Cc: mauri, madeleine kura, advokatfirman <email addresses redacted>
Date: 14/08/2015 21:23
Subject: SV: ACCC/C/2013/81 (Sweden) - letter to the parties

14.8.2015
Till
ACCC
Ms marshall

In respect of your Letter ACCC / C / 2013/81 (Sweden) - Letter to the parties
13.08.2015

I hereby ask for explanation why the Committee again put so much emphasis on whether I alone have submitted my application C / 81.

The certificate from FLIS clarifies that FLIS has supported me in my application.
The Committee writes:

The Committee decided to consider Mr. Bernd Stümer the sole communicant in the case, since the original communication was submitted only in his name, while the organisation FLIS, which Mr Stümer subsequently stated that he represented, might act as an observer in the case if it wished to do so.

For what reason and on what basis, the Committee concludes that FLIS might act as an observer and not as a participant in the case if it wished to do so?

Requests the Committee again certification and specification of the manner in which FLIS participated in the notification?

What has this request to do with the issue of that the Swedish government has violated the provisions of the Convention when those provisions clearly are related to people, public, and not associations.

The Committee continues:

To clarify whether he appealed the building permit in his own name or only as a representative of another individual.

Not once has this matter been raised.

Why now?

My appeal has demonstrably always been drawn up by me as an interested party and agent for other interested parties.

Yours sincerely,

Bernd Stümer