

Request for the waiver of the immunity of Siegbert Frank Droese

2026/2019(IMM) - 07/07/2026 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

The decision concerns the request to waive the parliamentary immunity of Member of the European Parliament Siegbert Frank Droese, in order to allow the continuation of criminal appeal proceedings pending before German courts.

BACKGROUND

On 26 April 2024, the Dresden Local Court convicted Siegbert Frank Droese of two separate counts of insult and imposed a fine. An appeal against this judgment was lodged on 3 May 2024 by his defence counsel. Siegbert Frank Droese was subsequently elected to the European Parliament in the June 2024 European elections and was not an MEP at the time of the conviction or the lodging of the appeal. On 15 January 2026, the German Federal Ministry of Justice and Consumer Protection transmitted to Parliament a request from the Dresden Regional Court for the waiver of his immunity, in connection with the appeal proceedings, which was announced in plenary on 11 February 2026. Parliament examined the request in light of Protocol No 7 on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Union, the Act of 20 September 1976 on direct elections, Article 46 of the German Basic Law and its own Rules of Procedure, as interpreted by relevant case-law of the Court of Justice and the General Court.

CONTENT

Parliament notes that the acts underlying the alleged offences occurred before Siegbert Frank Droese became a Member of the European Parliament and therefore do not constitute, and are not related to, opinions expressed or votes cast in the performance of his parliamentary duties within the meaning of Article 8 of Protocol No 7. It recalls that, under Article 9 of Protocol No 7, Members enjoy in their own Member State the immunities accorded to members of the national parliament, and refers to Article 46 of the German Basic Law, which requires parliamentary authorisation for criminal proceedings, arrest or other restrictions of a Member's personal freedom, subject to certain exceptions. Parliament emphasises that parliamentary immunity is not a personal privilege of the Member but a guarantee of the independence of Parliament as a whole and of its Members, and that Parliament cannot assume the role of a court nor treat the Member as a defendant in immunity proceedings. It finds that there is no indication of *fumus persecutionis*, i.e. no evidence that the legal proceedings are intended to damage the Member's political activity or Parliament's independence.

On this basis, Parliament decides to waive the immunity of Siegbert Frank Droese and instructs its President to forward the decision and the report of the Committee on Legal Affairs to the competent authority of the Federal Republic of Germany and to Siegbert Frank Droese.

This summary was AI-generated and human-reviewed.