

VERHO

THE USB FILE

HOW A PRIVATELY CURATED EVIDENCE PACKAGE BECAME THE FRAMEWORK OF AN INVESTIGATION

Evidence-forensic analysis of case file 8 St 101/24k

Request - waiting - receipt - LKA analysis - evidential use

Hallein complex | Fischbach is outside the scope of this analysis

**USB REQUESTED. USB CHASED.
USB ANALYSED.**

THE FILE'S STRONGEST FORMULA

Not zero investigation, but predominantly secondary processing of a private selection

1 What this case file is about

The core of the case in one sentence

The new proceedings concern later publications - principally videos, blogs and media outputs - but part of their evidential content comes from an older case file and predates an acquittal. The central question is therefore not merely when a new video was published, but whether its evidential core is genuinely new or has simply been repackaged and relabelled in law.

This analysis concerns the new criminal case file 8 St 101/24k and is limited to the Hallein complex. Fischbach is expressly excluded. The material under examination consists mainly of publicly accessible videos, blog posts, audiovisual recordings and statements assessed by the authorities, in particular in relation to section 120(2) of the Austrian Criminal Code.

The chronology matters. The new publications appeared after the earlier court decision, yet they may contain photographs, measurements, recordings, assertions and other material that was already known and evaluated in the original proceedings. A new publication date does not automatically create new evidence. The analysis must separate the new act of publication, the old evidential material and any genuinely new factual or legal information.

Four questions addressed by this report

- Who selected the material that became the core of the new case file?
- What did the police and prosecution secure independently, and what did they merely receive, locate or compare?
- Which items are genuinely new, and which are old evidence embedded in a new video or annex?
- Was the acquittal and the original procedural context incorporated into the review promptly and on an equal footing?

An important legal boundary

This report does not claim that a later publication can never constitute a separate act. It does submit that, when assessing identity of the matter, evidential novelty and the prohibition of repeated prosecution, a new carrier or publication date cannot simply be equated with a new evidential core. That must be tested object by object.

The reviewed corpus comprises a 474-page original validation file and 903 technically accessible pages from the new file - 1,377 pages in total. The new PDF parts contain technical gaps; every conclusion concerning the absence of an investigative act is therefore confined to the accessible material and the exact passages cited.

2 What VERHO is

VERHO is neither a court nor an investigative authority

VERHO is the working name of an independent analytical framework for evidence verification and case-file genealogy. It does not determine guilt or innocence, replace legal representation or issue binding legal findings. Its role is to make a complex file reproducible: who alleged what, where an item came from, what had already been adjudicated, what is genuinely new, and what the authorities verified independently.

VERHO does not examine content alone. It also records origin, selection, carrier, date, context, processor and subsequent copies. The same video sequence may appear repeatedly - on a USB device, in a screenshot, in a blog and in a police annex - without becoming four independent pieces of evidence.

The core VERHO matrix

Field	Control question	Output
Allegation	What exactly is alleged, and to which act does it relate?	A precise sentence without rhetoric.
Carrier	Video, USB, blog, photograph, testimony or official record?	Separation of content from container.
Provenance	Who created, selected, copied and delivered the item?	Evidence genealogy.
Earlier assessment	Was the same content already in the original file or judgment?	Identity, overlap and difference.
New verification	What did the authorities verify independently of the private package?	Primary vs. secondary acts.
Delta	What is genuinely new, and what is only newly labelled or published?	Actual increase in evidential value.

Three levels of analytical statement

Level	Meaning
DOCUMENTED FACT	Follows directly from a document, report or procedural act.
STRONG SIGNAL	Several facts support the same explanation, but no final legal conclusion is drawn.
OPEN QUESTION	The accessible file is insufficient; further evidence or technical verification is required.

Purpose of this analysis

The objective is not to manufacture a dramatic accusation. It is to distinguish a received allegation from an independently established fact, a single original item from its many copies, and a new act of publication from an old evidential core.

3 Executive finding

3	1	2
prosecution records: request, chase-up, receipt	privately curated USB data carrier	LKA reports with express limitations

The documented core

The prosecution first requested a USB device from the Holz knecht/Fronthaler circle, stated that an LKA seizure would be unnecessary if Holz knecht could provide all media, then chased delivery and, after receipt, forwarded the USB and further Holz knecht material to the LKA. The LKA subsequently searched for and compared precisely that material.

The accessible file therefore documents a submission-driven evidential architecture. State bodies performed their own acts, but a material part of their work was secondary: receipt, classification, online location, comparison and legal framing of a privately selected corpus. The first LKA report also records that the officer did not know the charges or outcomes of earlier proceedings, did not contact the authorities named in the material, and searched only within the suspicion points defined by the prosecution.

What the file does and does not support

Supported by the file	Not supported by the file
The selection of evidence was privately pre-structured in key blocks; the state then conducted predominantly secondary review and comparison.	The file does not prove manipulation of the USB, unlawful collusion, personal bias or the complete absence of every police or prosecutorial act.

Publication-ready precision

The state's own activity was predominantly secondary: receiving, classifying, comparing and legally framing a privately curated evidence package; an equivalent, independently documented primary investigation is not visible in the accessible file.

4 Evidence genealogy: who supplied, who waited, who analysed?



Date / ON	Documented event	Forensic significance
26.02.2024 ON 2	Starting point: a report after Benjamin Zauner supplied an email.	Private source material initiates the proceedings.
31.10.2024 ON 9.4	LKA reviews the website, blogs and videos, but records limited context and no external enquiries.	Independent activity, but a narrow and incomplete frame.
04.03.2025 ON 1.10	The prosecution views the website/videos and discusses securing them with LKA.	A documented prosecution act, not an independent full corpus.
14./21.03.2025 ON 16 / 1.12	Following RA Wimmer's notice, the prosecution requests videos and media by USB.	The private party becomes the key supplier.
ON 1.13	The prosecution asks whether and when the USB will arrive.	A literal, documented waiting loop.
ON 1.14	The received USB and further Holzknacht material are sent to LKA.	Private provenance of the examined core is file-established.
15.07.2025 ON 18.1	LKA reports on viewing, online searching and comparison of the USB.	Secondary state analysis of a privately supplied selection.
25.08.2025 ON 19.1	Holzknacht sends a further evaluative submission to the prosecution.	Continuing private narrative input into the same file.

The significance is not chronological alone. The private side first influences the selection of files, extracts, folder names and accompanying text. Only then does that selection become the object of official review. This selection stage determines what enters the investigative field of vision at all.

5 The key note: USB first, interview afterwards

„Zu Ihrer Mitteilung vom 14.3.2025 (...) wird zunächst um Übermittlung der Videos und sonstigen medialen Werke mittels USB-Sticks ersucht. In weiterer Folge ist die Einvernahme des Herbert HOLZKNECHT beabsichtigt, die zielführend erst nach einer vollständigen Sichtung durch die Staatsanwaltschaft erfolgen kann.“

English translation: With reference to your communication of 14 March 2025, transmission of the videos and other media works by USB is initially requested. Herbert Holzknicht is to be interviewed thereafter; the interview can only be useful once the prosecution has completed a full review.

File citation: 1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 33, ON 1.12, StA Eisenstadt.

What this signals: The sequence is express: first the privately compiled data package, then the interview of its supplier. This creates a risk that the private selection frames the later interview and the investigative subject in advance.

1. Note an RA Mag. WIMMER (ON 16) mit Textbaustein:

"Zu Ihrer Mitteilung vom 14.3.2025 (Ihr Aktenzeichen FronAn2/PribPa) wird zunächst um Übermittlung der Videos und sonstigen medialen Werke mittels USB-Sticks ersucht. In weiterer Folge ist die Einvernahme des Herbert HOLZKNECHT beabsichtigt, die zielführend erst nach einer vollständigen Sichtung durch die Staatsanwaltschaft erfolgen kann. Anlässlich dieser besteht die Möglichkeit die übergebenen Daten gemeinsam zu erörtern.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen"

2. Note an LKA Oberwart + ON 16 mit Textbaustein:

"Zu PAD/24/01892637/003/KRIM wird die Mitteilung des Herbert HOLZKNECHT zur Kenntnis übermittelt. Für den Fall, dass dieser sämtliche Videos und sonstigen medialen Werke zur Verfügung stellen kann, ist eine Sicherung durch das LKA nicht erforderlich."

2. Kal 2 Wo (USB-Stick? Info auch an LKA)

Facsimile, ON 1.12: the USB request and the message to LKA appear in the same procedural note.

„Für den Fall, dass dieser sämtliche Videos und sonstigen medialen Werke zur Verfügung stellen kann, ist eine Sicherung durch das LKA nicht erforderlich.“

English translation: If he is able to provide all videos and other media works, securing them through the LKA is not required.

File citation: 1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 33, ON 1.12, message to LKA Oberwart.

What this signals: The state's own securing of the evidence is made dependent on the private supplier's asserted completeness. This is the strongest documented indication that primary evidence acquisition was outsourced.

What this does not establish

- The note does not, by itself, prove manipulation of the files.
- It does not prove unlawful cooperation between an authority and a private person.
- It does establish a concrete need to audit completeness, selection neutrality, metadata, original sources and an uninterrupted chain of provenance.

6 The prosecution literally waits for the USB

„Zu Ihrer Mitteilung vom 14.3.2025 (...) und der ha. Note vom 21.3.2025 wird um Bekanntgabe ersucht, ob und gegebenenfalls wann der genannte USB-Stick an die Staatsanwaltschaft übermittelt werden wird.“

English translation: With reference to your communication of 14 March 2025 and this office's note of 21 March 2025, please advise whether, and if so when, the USB device will be transmitted to the public prosecutor's office.

File citation: 1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 35, ON 1.13, StA Eisenstadt.

What this signals: This is not an inference. The file contains an express chase-up asking whether and when the private data carrier will be delivered. At this stage, investigative progress visibly depends on private supply.

308 008 ST 101/24 k

AB-Bogen

ON 1.13, 1

STA Eisenstadt 008 ST 101/24 k

Note

TA:

1. Note an RA Mag. WIMMER (ON 16) mit Textbaustein:

"Zu Ihrer Mitteilung vom 14.3.2025 (Ihr Aktenzeichen FronAn2/PribPa) und der ha. Note vom 21.3.2025 wird um Bekanntgabe ersucht, ob und gegebenenfalls wann der genannte USB-Stick an die Staatsanwaltschaft übermittelt werden wird.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen"

Facsimile, ON 1.13: a two-week deadline is also entered with the note 'USB-Stick?'.

„Zu PAD/24/01892637/003/KRIM wird (...) der nunmehr eingelangte USB-Stick sowie die weiteren zur Verfügung gestellten Unterlagen des Herbert HOLZKNECHT zur weiteren Veranlassung übermittelt.“

English translation: In relation to PAD/... the USB device, which has now been received, and the further documents supplied by Herbert Holzknacht are transmitted for further action.

File citation: 1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 37, ON 1.14, StA Eisenstadt to LKA Oberwart.

What this signals: Request, chase-up and receipt form a closed provenance chain. According to the wording of the file itself, the core corpus delivered to the LKA originated in Holzknacht's sphere.

308 008 ST 101/24 k

AB-Bogen

ON 1.14, 1

STA Eisenstadt 008 ST 101/24 k

Vfg

TA:

1. Note an LKA Oberwart + ON 17 und USB-Stick:

"Zu PAD/24/01892637/003/KRIM wird - wie bereits im Vorfeld telefonisch besprochen - der nunmehr eingelangte USB-Stick sowie die weiteren zur Verfügung gestellten Unterlagen des Herbert HOLZKNECHT zur weiteren Veranlassung übermittelt."

2. Kal 1 Mo (Bericht über ausgewertete Videos)

Facsimile, ON 1.14: the USB and further Holzknacht material are forwarded to LKA.

7 First LKA report: review without knowledge of the earlier outcome

„Die Sichtung der Blogs und Videos gestaltete sich als schwierig, da in den Videos immer wieder auf Gerichtsverfahren hingewiesen wurde, von welcher Gefertigter hinsichtlich der Anklagepunkte bzw. des Ausganges der Verfahren keine Kenntnis hat.“

English translation: Reviewing the blogs and videos proved difficult because they repeatedly referred to court proceedings, while the reporting officer had no knowledge of the charges or the outcome of those proceedings.

File citation: 1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 184, ON 9.4, p. 2, LKA interim report of 31 October 2024.

What this signals: The officer evaluated material while expressly lacking its decisive procedural context. Where later publications rely on earlier evidence, this is a major contextual deficit.

„Mit den angeführten Behörden und Polizeidienststellen wurde kein Kontakt aufgenommen.“

English translation: No contact was made with the authorities and police units referred to.

File citation: Ibid.


What this signals: The assertions in the submitted material were not cross-checked with the named public bodies at this stage. The exercise remained focused on media representations, not independent verification of the underlying events.

„Seitens Gefertigten wurde nur - auf die in der Note der Staatsanwaltschaft Eisenstadt angeführten Verdachtspunkte (...) - gezielt bzw. erhoben und in den Punkt Beweismittel implementiert.“

English translation: The reporting officer searched and made findings only in relation to the suspicion points listed in the Eisenstadt public prosecutor's note, and incorporated them under evidence.

File citation: Ibid.

What this signals: The report itself describes a hypothesis-bound search. The acquittal, the earlier evidence and alternative explanations did not necessarily receive equal treatment within the assignment.



Facsimile, ON 9.4, p. 2: lack of knowledge of the outcome, no authority contacts and a restricted assignment.

8 What the LKA actually did with the USB

„Der übermittelte USB Stick samt den Unterlagen wurden auftragsgemäß hinsichtlich des ‚Vorfindens bzw. Nachverfolgung der auf dem Stick gespeicherten Videos‘ und der übergebenen Unterlagen im Internet sowie nach strafbaren Handlungen im Sinne des § 120/2 StGB gesichtet.“

English translation: In accordance with the assignment, the transmitted USB and documents were reviewed to locate or trace online the videos stored on the device and the materials supplied, and for acts potentially falling within section 120(2) StGB.

File citation: 1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 367, ON 18.1, p. 1, LKA interim report of 15 July 2025.

What this signals: The assignment was targeted secondary analysis: locate the private files online, compare them, and examine them through a predefined offence framework.

308 008 ST 101/24 k

ON 18.1, 1

Landespolizeidirektion
Burgenland

GZ: PAD/24/01892637/003/KRIM

Oberwart, am 15.07.2025

Retouren an: LPD Burgenland LKAASST Oberwart
Prinz-Eugen-Straße 10, 7400 Oberwart

Bearbeiterin: 891491
Burgenland Landeskriminalamt (LKA)
Burgenland LKAASST Oberwart
Prinz-Eugen-Straße 10
7400 Oberwart
UP-Code: UP00011
Tel: +43 59133 1248
LPD-B-LKAASST-Oberwart@polizei.gv.at
Sicherheitsbehörde: Burgenland LPD

An die
Staatsanwaltschaft Eisenstadt
Wiener Straße 9
7000 Eisenstadt

Eingel. am: 16. JULI 2025

fach, mit: Boag, Akten

Zwischen – Bericht

Betreff: POVALOVA Michaela;
PRIBELA Pavol;
Verdacht auf: Versuchte Nötigung
Verdacht auf: Fortdauernde Belästigung im Wege einer Telekommunikation oder eines Computersystems
Verdacht auf: Verleumdung
Verdacht auf: Missbrauch von Tonaufnahme- und Abhörgeräten (OZ 010)

Darstellung der Tat:

Bezugnehmend zum Auftrag vom 18.04.2025 und der Note vom 26.06.2025 wird folgendes berichtet:

Der übermittelte USB Stick samt den Unterlagen wurden auftragsgemäß

Facsimile, ON 18.1, p. 1: the report expressly identifies the transmitted USB as the object of review.

The fair counterpoint

The LKA was not wholly passive. It compared files with www.antimafia.at and YouTube and located several items online. It would therefore be inaccurate to say that 'nothing was investigated'. The precise finding is that this activity started from the privately supplied selection and is not documented as an independent, comprehensive collection of all original media and underlying events.

Two different types of work

Primary investigation: independent securing, original exports, metadata, hashes, counter-sources, witnesses and verification of events.

Documented here: principally location, comparison, screenshot documentation and legal-content analysis of a supplied package.

9 The limitations are written into the police report

„Seitens Gefertigten kann somit keine Anzahl bzw. eine detaillierte Aufstellung angegeben werden, wo und wie oft diese Videosequenzen noch in anderen Videos implementiert sind.“

English translation: The reporting officer is therefore unable to state the number, or provide a detailed list, of where and how often these video sequences were incorporated into other videos.

File citation: 1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 368, ON 18.1, p. 2.


What this signals: The scale and repeated use of individual sequences remained unquantified. Without an object matrix, the same information risks being counted repeatedly as apparently separate evidence.

„Bezüglich der weiteren Unterlagen zu ON 17.11 bis ON 17.29 wird berichtet, dass es sich um Auszüge von Videosequenzen bzw. Aussagen bzw. erneut um ‚kopierte Blogeinträge‘ handelt.“

English translation: As regards the further documents at ON 17.11 to ON 17.29, the report states that they consist of extracts from video sequences or statements, or again of 'copied blog entries'.

File citation: Ibid.

What this signals: The report itself characterises part of the material as extracts and copies. Context, duplication and original-source integrity therefore require specific control.



Facsimile, ON 18.1, p. 2: comparison, limitations, copied blogs and USB folder structure.

Folder names as a trace of selection

USB folder	Forensic signal
01_Print_Unterlagen_zu_Pribela	A person-focused dossier structure, not a neutral event chronology.
02_VIDEOS_YouTube_Pribela_Original	A private 'Original' label; technical originality requires separate verification.
03_YouTube_VIDEOS_kurz_Alt	Short and older versions increase context-loss and double-counting risks.
04_Google_SUCHE_Alt	A search result proves location, not automatically truth or authorship.

10 Provenance is visible: 'Holzknecht Herbert aus Web kopiert'

Literal provenance label

Several annexes carry the heading 'Blog am 25.03.2024 Holzknecht Herbert aus Web kopiert' - 'Blog, 25 March 2024, Herbert Holzknecht, copied from the web'. This is not a VERHO inference; it is part of the file's own labelling.

308 008 ST 101/24 k

ON 18.66, 1

www.antimafia.at

Blog am 25.03.2024 Holzknecht Herbert aus Web kopiert

03) Was bringt uns das neue Jahr 2022 v o 02.01.2022

IHR - unsere mutigen Mitkämpfer!

In erster Linie bedanken wir uns te bedanken wir sueni sigen Monaten in uns setzt. Unser Kampf hat schon längst begonnen. Uns wird immer mehr einsetzen. Da geht's nicht nur um die Säuberung eines Uramgaaan dem Guten gehört. Es ist nicht mehr zulässig Welt durch ihr Handeln und Vorgehen zerstören.

Wir haben et was Verrücktes erlebt. D

Facsimile: 2 akt.pdf, PDF p. 29, ON 18.66. The private copying act is identified in the annex heading.

Principal source blocks

Block	Source / function	Finding
ON 2 / ON 9.5	Zauner and related legal submissions	Initial and subsequent private incriminating narrative.
ON 9.2	Submission connected with Fronthaler	Private allegation block with media annexes.
ON 16	RA Mag. Wimmer	Notice followed by the prosecution's USB request.
ON 17	'OP Holzknecht Unterlagen'	Criminal complaint, lists, videos and blogs from Holzknecht's package.
ON 18	LKA report and annexes	State secondary processing of USB and web material.
ON 19.1	Holzknecht, 25.08.2025	Further evaluative allegations sent directly to the prosecution.
ON 21	Pribela/Povalová	Counter-submissions and exculpatory material enter later.

The decisive distinction is this: present in the file does not mean independently established, and located online does not mean substantively verified. One original item may be multiplied through a USB file, extract, screenshot, police annex and new blog without producing several independent sources.

11 What was examined - and what remains open

Area	Documented state act	Not documented to equivalent standard	Status
Online availability	Website and YouTube searches; comparison with USB files.	Complete, time-stamped primary securing of every original.	PARTIAL
File provenance	Private delivery route and folder names are visible.	Hashes, original exports, forensic image and complete transfer chain.	OPEN
Content	Selected passages were transcribed, illustrated and legally assessed.	Systematic full context, exculpatory passages and counter-evidence.	SELECTIVE
Earlier proceedings	The judgment was later added to the new file as ON 15.	The first LKA report expressly lacked knowledge of charges and outcomes.	DEFICIT
External verification	ON 9.4 records no equivalent confirmation of the events.	Contact with the named authorities and police units.	NOT DONE
Earlier evidence	Some old measurements, photographs and the judgment are in the new file.	Object-level comparison of the earlier assessment with every new video.	OPEN

Audit standard: section 3 StPO

The criminal police, public prosecution service and courts must investigate the truth and clarify all facts relevant to assessing the offence and the accused. This report does not make a final finding of a statutory breach; it identifies points at which the documented depth of investigation should be tested against that standard. [RIS - section 3 StPO](#)

In what sense the file 'stands or falls' with private submissions

Not every individual allegation must be false. But the overall investigative architecture depends on the completeness, authenticity, selection neutrality and context of the private USB. If those assumptions fail, the online existence of some videos may remain proven, while their arrangement, attribution and alleged systemic meaning lose a material part of their evidential foundation.

12 The strongest procedural signals

ID	Signal	File basis	Weight
USB-01	Securing delegated to an adverse witness	ON 1.12: no LKA securing if Holzknecht provides everything.	STRONG
USB-02	Progress waits on private delivery	ON 1.13 asks whether and when the USB will arrive.	FACT
USB-03	Supplier defines the examined corpus	ON 1.14 and 18.1: Holzknecht material becomes the LKA object.	FACT
USB-04	Analysis without the earlier case outcome	ON 9.4: no knowledge of charges or outcome.	CARDINAL
USB-05	No enquiries to the named authorities	ON 9.4 expressly records no contact.	CARDINAL
USB-06	Closed hypothesis-driven search	ON 9.4: only the predefined suspicion points.	STRONG
USB-07	Copies, extracts and repeated sequences	ON 18.1: copied blogs; no complete count of re-use possible.	STRONG
USB-08	Technical authenticity not shown in cited acts	No stated hash/forensic chain in the reviewed notes.	OPEN
USB-09	Old evidence receives a new incriminating frame	New videos contain old evidence; the judgment is not integrated on equal terms at the outset.	OUTCOME-RELEVANT

The most serious combined pattern

A privately selected corpus becomes the official object of review; the first analysis does not know the outcome of the earlier proceedings, does not check the allegations with the named authorities and searches only within predefined suspicions. The same original corpus is then multiplied through screenshots, extracts and rediscovery online. This signals a risk of confirmation through a closed source loop.

Not proof of manipulation, but a compelling audit trigger

The accessible material does not justify alleging that the USB was manipulated. It does justify a technical and substantive reproduction audit because the selection, naming and compilation came from the sphere of an adverse complainant and the state's analysis was built upon that selection.

13 Questions the case file must answer

No.	Audit question	Required evidence
1	Who technically created the USB, and when?	Creator, device, export date and transfer record.
2	Is the examined copy bit-identical to the received carrier?	Hashes, forensic image, write protection and every transfer.
3	Which files are originals, downloads, edits or screen recordings?	File list with metadata, URL, acquisition time and edit history.
4	Who determined the selection of videos, extracts and blogs?	Selection criteria and the complete source corpus, not only adverse items.
5	What was secured independently of the USB?	Official original downloads with timestamps and authenticity controls.
6	Which exculpatory passages and counter-evidence were examined?	Object matrix containing both adverse and exculpatory material.
7	When was the acquittal substantively incorporated?	Analysis connecting earlier facts, evaluation and the mental element.
8	Why were the named authorities and police units not contacted?	Further investigative plan or reasoned justification.
9	How was repeated use of the same sequence controlled?	Unique content ID, timecode and source video.
10	What new evidence displaces the earlier factual and knowledge position?	Delta matrix: original 2021 file vs. new 2024-2026 file.

Minimum matrix for every new media object

Publication date → exact time segment → earlier source → location in the original file → result of the earlier assessment → genuinely new content → independent state act → legally relevant change. Without this axis, a new act cannot reliably be distinguished from recycling of the old evidential core.

A file is not officially verified merely because it was received on a USB, assigned an ON number, reproduced as a screenshot or located again online. Verification requires a documented method, an independent source and a reproducible result.

14 Conclusion and source anchors

Overall VERHO finding

The accessible file does not show a purely state-generated evidential corpus. It shows a chain in which an adverse private circle selects material, a lawyer announces its delivery, the prosecution requests and chases the USB, receives Holzknecht's carrier with further documents, and the LKA then locates, compares and evaluates that selection within a predefined offence framework.

The strongest conclusion is therefore not that every individual suspicious statement must be false. It is that the evidential architecture is source-dependent at its core and potentially circular. A private selection becomes the official object; rediscovery of selected items online is then recorded as confirmation. Without independent comprehensive collection, technical provenance checks, timely incorporation of the acquittal and object-level comparison of the earlier evidence, it remains open whether the state process created autonomous new evidential value.

Principal file citations

Location	Documented content
1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 29, ON 1.10	Prosecution review of website/videos and discussion with LKA about securing.
1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 33, ON 1.12	USB request; interview after review; no LKA securing if private supply is complete.
1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 35, ON 1.13	Question whether and when the USB will be transmitted.
1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 37, ON 1.14	Received USB and further Holzknecht material forwarded to LKA.
1 akt.pdf, PDF p. 41, ON 1.16	Interim report requested following transmission of the USB.
1 akt.pdf, PDF pp. 183-187, ON 9.4	LKA lacked case outcome; no authority contacts; search limited to suspicion points.
1 akt.pdf, PDF pp. 271-272, ON 15	The 2021 judgment was later inserted as a separate component of the new file.
1 akt.pdf, PDF pp. 367-385, ON 18.1	USB analysis: location, comparison, section 120(2), limitations and folder structure.
2 akt.pdf, PDF pp. 29-42, ON 18.66-18.70	Annexes marked 'Holzknecht Herbert aus Web kopiert'.
2 akt.pdf, PDF p. 91, ON 19.1	Further direct Holzknecht submission dated 25 August 2025.

Completeness reservation: the supplied new PDF parts contain technical gaps, particularly around ON 18.19 to ON 18.51 and in later sections. Statements about the absence of an act therefore concern the accessible corpus and the cited documents. The report consistently separates documented fact, strong signal and open question.