

Ampelokipi Case – 3rd Hearing – April 3, 2026 (detailed report)

Defense Counsel

Marianna Manoura: Thanasis Kampagiannis, Kostas Papadakis

Dimitra Zarafeta: Anny Pappas, Giannis Rahiotis

Dimitris: Charalambakis Yiannis

Nikos Romanos: Marina Daliani, Kalogirou, Lila Ragousi

Argyris: Alexandros Kanellopoulos

Court Composition

Presiding Judge: Spyridon Georgoulas

Prosecutor: Alexandra Pischina

Ampelokipi Case – 3rd Hearing – 04/03/2026 (detailed report)

The day began with the examination of the remaining witness for the prosecution. The witness is the owner of apartment C7. In response to questions from the presiding chamber, he estimated the total damage to his apartment at between 5,000 and 10,000 euros. He also stated that the issue of structural stability may have been raised by TERNA, without them having been provided with a copy of any technical report. The witness does not know who commissioned the TEE report or who handled the procedures for issuing the building permit. The witness confirmed that there are open shops on the ground floor of the apartment building and expressed the opinion that, theoretically, there is a structural stability issue in the event of an earthquake.

He also confirmed that the crew working on the restoration of the apartment building is small.

In response to the chairman's questions regarding whether the residents had collectively taken any action toward the authorities, the witness replied that there is a difficulty in communication.

He did not recognize any of the accused individuals.

The civil plaintiffs then took the floor, focusing on the informational meetings between residents and government representatives. It emerged that 3–4 meetings had taken place, during which the residents had received no written documentation. The name of a certain Vardakis (or Bardakis) was mentioned, who had represented the Technical Chamber of Greece (TEE) at these meetings; however, it was unclear

whether he had participated in any technical report. The witness stated that 30% of what had been announced by the state authorities had been implemented.

Subsequently, the plaintiff's counsel focused his questions on the same issues addressed in previous hearings, such as the habitability of the apartments and the structural adequacy of the building, the condition of the stairwell, and the potential timeline for the announced repairs.

The witness examination continued with questions from the defense attorney for the plaintiff, Marianna Manoura. The defense attorney clarified that the apartment building is not sealed off, but is under controlled access, a fact confirmed by the witness's responses, namely that one can enter by presenting identification.

The witness also stated that the residents have not received any explanation as to why the government or TERNA took the initiative to repair the damage. He added that they first heard the company's name from the prime minister.

Regarding Vardakis (or Bardakis) from the Technical Chamber of Greece, the witness stated that they had not received any document indicating his capacity, and certainly no document setting forth conclusions different from those issued by the municipality's urban planning department. The defense attorney concluded by stating that none of the work outlined in the urban planning report had been carried out within 20 days.

Next, Nikos Romanos's attorney, Marina Daliani, took the floor. It emerged that the witness was not present at the residents' meeting with the prime minister, 22 days after the explosion. The defense attorney added that, according to the government's initial statements, the timeline called for the full restoration of the apartment building within 9 to 12 months, something that has not been accomplished 17 months later.

She asked the witness if he knew whether the state had established a special communication channel between the Ministry of Social Cohesion and the residents. The answer was that, in fact, an email address had been created to which residents could write, but nothing more.

*

The proceedings continued with the documents included in the case file. With the unanimous consent of all parties, the documents were deemed to have been read.

This was followed by comments from the attorneys regarding the documents to be read. The attorney for the civil action spoke first. He focused on the report by the municipality's urban planning department, which he once again characterized as premature, resulting from a "clinical approach to macroscopic inspection" that, in fact, was not conducted throughout the entire apartment building.

*

Thanasis Kampagiannis, the defense attorney for his client Marianna, noted that there have been updates to some of the exhibits, as studies and reports on the same issues have since been published. Finally, the defense attorney read a medical document containing a detailed list of Marianna's injuries and highlighted the conclusions in the report regarding the weaponry.

Papadakis, referring to Marianna's serious physical condition following the explosion—which resulted from objects falling on her—highlighted the finding that the comrade was not present at the site of the explosion.

*

Next, Anny Pappas, the defense attorney for Dimitra Zarafeta, took the floor. The defense attorney focused on the report examining video footage from the apartment building, a report prepared by the Counterterrorism Unit (DAEEB), specifically noting that the unit lacks jurisdiction to produce such a report. The competent authority is the DEE.

The defense attorney explained that various sections of the report contain judgments, analyses, and observations that lack scientific substantiation. If it had not been the DAEEB that prepared the report, "we would have had a simple report without speculative conclusions." She added that this is how the DAEEB supports its allegations.

The defense attorney pointed out that the proper procedure, through the DEE, is to analyze the digital evidence, and if any identification of individuals emerges, the next step is to draw conclusions. "The DAEEB is substituting for legitimate scientific services." The defense attorney concluded by addressing the court, noting that if the mistake is made to accept the identifications, then the presiding chamber will have already legitimized an irregular procedure.

*

The defense attorney for Dimitris, Charalambakis (Jr.), then took the floor, noting only that his client is not mentioned in any of the documents.

*

Next to speak were the defense attorneys for Nikos Romanos.

They began their arguments by referring to a private report by expert witness H. Minopetra, a former senior police officer and specialist in fingerprint analysis.

Defense attorney Lila Ragousi commented that documents 506 and 3636, which concern Nikos's fingerprints, are completely inadequate. She continued by stating

that in document No. 15, drafted on November 17, 2024, which identifies her client, there are no photographs of the bag, nor of the fingerprint, nor of the location where it was found, and that this cannot be submitted as a report. She also referred to the motions for release filed at the 6-month and 12-month marks, both of which were denied. The grounds for the first rejection were that no other fingerprints had been found on the bag besides those of Romanos and A.K., and therefore they were being prosecuted correctly. Later, during the preliminary investigation proceedings, on 06/18/2025, additional fingerprints or fragments thereof were found on the bag. In the second application for release, therefore, the investigating judge, despite the prosecutor's recommendation for release following the new evidence, rejected the application again, claiming that the fingerprints were not clear and that they likely belonged to the two defendants, N.R. and A.K., or to one of the other accused individuals.

The defense attorney concluded that "whatever we present, there will be a counterargument." Then, referring to Minopetra's report—which they will submit as evidence in a later phase—the defense attorney said that their aim in doing so is to highlight what could be done with the fingerprints. Minopetras notes that in such cases, it is standard practice not to list the other fingerprints in police reports, implying that the reasoning behind the first dismissal is unfounded. Furthermore, Minopetras notes that a "strong" fingerprint on an object does not necessarily mean that the person to whom it belongs is the one who handled the object most "forcefully." The fingerprints could belong to anyone and could have been altered either by the explosion or for some other reason. Finally, it is not specified when the defendants touched the bag.

*

Marina Daliani took the floor immediately afterward. She began by stating that Nikos Romanos is right-handed, whereas the evidence is a partial print from the left middle finger. She presented this to illustrate the nature of the contact with the bag.

She then commented on document 3636, stating that it contains only assumptions, as it uses the word "usually," for example, which does not constitute certainty and cannot have any probative value.

In the same vein as defense attorney Ragousis, Daliani referred to other documents from the preliminary investigation, which demonstrate how the reasoning behind the six-month rejection is refuted. Finally, she referred to the supplementary autopsy report from the apartment (12/09/2024) and noted that, in the course of the investigation, many more pieces of the same bag were found. Even more fingerprints were found—clear ones—that have not been identified.

Attorney Kalogirou continued by stating that there is no evidence whatsoever regarding the circumstances, manner, and procedure of the bag's delivery to the DEE. The Minopetra report is based on two principles: scientific rigor and logic.

Specifically, the following points emerge:

- 1) The discovery of the fingerprint is not time-specific, and it is not linked to the contents of the bag. There is nothing illogical about this!
- 2) In order to use a fingerprint as evidence, we must consider it in relation to the other items found at the scene. There is no such connection.
- 3) There is no correlation with the incident in question. Contact with the bag occurred earlier.
- 4) Other fingerprints are also present.

The defense attorney stated that it is illogical and implausible for someone to have taken precautions to ensure a weapon was completely clean, with no traces of DNA or fingerprints, and then to go from being meticulous to careless and leave fingerprints on the bag. Furthermore, it is not clear where on the bag the fingerprint was located, nor what its orientation was. We have neither a photograph nor a method.

In closing, the defense attorney noted that it is regrettable that we are faced with a lack of evidence, yet there is a persistent effort to refute the defendant's claims. There is nothing incriminating against Nikos Romanos in the proceedings, nor any video footage; on the contrary, the case file contains photographs from his entire life, completely unrelated to the court.

*

This was followed by a statement from comrade Nikos Romanos himself:

There is a clash between objective reality and the prosecutor's interpretation of the law, and their logic is that when reality does not suit them, so much the worse for it. From the very moment of my arrest, the charges have been in a state of constant flux, adapted each time to the needs of the prosecution rather than to the actual facts, within a framework of constant incrimination. This creates narratives that contradict reality, which never changes but always remains constant.

*

Next, A.K.'s defense attorney, Kanellopoulos, took the stand, referring to the fingerprint as the only piece of evidence in the case file pertaining to A.K. He cited the DNA expert report in the case file, which showed that the weapon was clean, and pointed out how illogical it is for someone to take care to put a clean weapon in a

bag, which they would later handle with bare hands. He also pointed out the discovery of additional fingerprints, seven months later, which were not taken into account by the panel, resulting in the extension of detention. He commented that the same individuals were contradicting themselves, questioning why they focused solely on those of A.K. and Nikos Romanos.

He then noted that there are dozens of documents exonerating A.K., documents that are, however, overshadowed by the initial evidence, even though this has not been corroborated by any subsequent evidence.

He noted that DNA evidence has not been included in the case file, and concluded by saying that nothing has changed since day one, for the past 1.5 years.

*

The next step was the submission of new documents to be included in the evidence.

The civil plaintiff's attorney began by submitting two sets of photographs of the apartment building: One set taken 10 days after the explosion, and another with recent photos, taken a few days before the trial.

Next, Marianna's attorney, Th. Kampagiannis, initially presented a corrected floor plan of the apartment building. He then pointed out that the reports from the Forensic Laboratory regarding the items found on Marianna, in the apartment in Arcadia, and at her home in Skylitsi, did not reveal any new incriminating evidence.

The defense attorney referred to certain chemical analyses regarding the explosive material, as well as to the exhaustive investigation from the autopsy report on the apartment, which indicates that there is no detonator anywhere, thus refuting the scenario of a pre-set device, and suggesting another possibility, such as a material failure. He also submitted a USB drive containing screenshots from Marianna's master thesis' dissertation, which show that the electrical circuit—which, according to the counterterrorism agency, constitutes a bomb-making plan—is nothing more than a part of her thesis.

*

Anny Paparousou, the defense attorney for Dimitra, presented details regarding her client's academic background and professional career. She also added that the photographs of her, which were published after her arrest by order of the prosecutor with the aim of finding new evidence, essentially had no effect.

The defense attorney for Nikos Romanos, Lila Ragousi, submitted:

-the expert report by Minopetra,

- photographs showing examples of how bags are used by various collectives in different contexts,
- a certificate of completion of studies, a letter of recommendation, and a document showing that the comrade was accepted into a graduate program
- tax records
- screenshots of false news articles that attempted to link Nikos to the apartment building in Arcadia
- a petition signed by university faculty members in support of Nikos Romanos
- a document regarding the bag remnants
- news reports on government announcements that “coincidentally” coincided with the days the comrade was being held in the interrogation offices.

*

The presentation of evidence concluded with the defense attorney for A.K., who also submitted the Minopetra report on behalf of his client. In addition, he submitted photographs showing how bags are used in the context of protest activities.

*

Before the examination of the defense witnesses began, comrade Marianna spoke up:

On the first day, while I was still unconscious in the ICU at Evangelismos Hospital, the counterterrorism unit proceeded to collect my DNA without my consent, and of course without me being able to react to the situation. All my rights were violated.

During my hospitalization, one evening I received a visit from the counterterrorism unit; when they entered my room, with a nurse’s permission, they removed my oxygen mask, spoke to me, and tried to extract information from me. I am stating this to make it clear how the counterterrorism unit treats its political opponents.

My hospitalization continued with the door to the isolation room left open. Even during every examination, while the doctors were examining me, the door always remained open, and there were always police officers inside the room.

Thursday, November 14, 2024, was the day I underwent my final surgery to remove shrapnel from my face. Essentially, I had an open wound. The next day, on November 15, I was transferred to Korydallos Prison while I was still under the influence of the sedatives. We are all aware of the appalling conditions inside Korydallos and the risk of infection to my wound. Finally, I would like to address the appalling treatment meted out by the counterterrorism unit to Kyriakos’s parents, who, from the day of

the accident, showed willingness to cooperate, though were told lies that the child was not theirs.

*

Around that time, in the courthouse lobby, right outside the courtroom, tensions between supporters and the police escalated, resulting in a brief scuffle. The tension, the commotion, and the power of the chants could not fail to affect the proceedings of the trial. Comrades in the audience protested and called on the presiding chamber to take a stand, to set limits on the cops, and to allow more supporters to enter the courtroom.

*

The trial proceeded to the phase of hearing the defense witnesses. The first witness was the father of the defendant, Marianna.

He began his testimony by stating that they are a close-knit family, and then spoke about his daughters' academic career. He also mentioned how she met Kyriakos in Berlin.

Presiding Judge: Let me make this clear: I am not interested in their ideas. I am interested in their actions. Here we have a bomb, a device. In the conversations you had, did she ever bring up the topic of armed resistance?

Witness: There was no such discussion.

Presiding Judge: What was your first thought when you found out? Where did you hear about it—from the news?

Witness: The next day, my wife and I were summoned to the GADA for questioning. We were there for 7 hours, from 00:30 a.m. until 7:30 a.m. There, they informed us that Marianna would survive and that her life was not in danger. I was trying to call Kyriakos. After a day or two, on Saturday morning, Kyriakos's mother called us and told us that Kyriakos was dead.

Q: How did you react when you saw/heard the news?

Witness: I wanted to know exactly what had happened, to find out what had gone on.

Pr: When Marianna came to, did you talk to her about it? I mean, as a father to a child, did you ask, "My child, what happened there? Why did you do that?"

Witness: I asked her during a visit, but I didn't get an answer.

Prosecutor: Weapons and bullets were also found in the apartment. Didn't you wonder how your child ended up there?

Witness: We didn't discuss it; she didn't tell me anything. I suppose Marianna wanted to protect me, because later I found out about an electrician who had done some work at their house—that the police had visited him.

Prosecutor: The ideological aspect is relevant to us. In the ideological discussions you had, were there views that leaned in a certain direction, toward supporting violent actions?

Witness: We mainly had sociological discussions. We talked about the war, current events, Iran. Nothing more than current events.

Prosecutor: You said you were questioned at night.

Witness: The incident took place at noon; we were called in for questioning at 1:00 a.m. We were giving our statements until 7:00 a.m. The police took us to the children's home in Skylitsi, and I was asked to hand over the keys to my car, which I had lent to Marianna.

Prosecutor: Did you know that in Germany they've met Mrs. Zarafeta?

Witness: Yes, we'd seen her too.

*

Next, the defense attorneys questioned the partner's father.

Attorney: Did you have a relationship with Kyriakos's family?

Witness: Kyriakos's mother and Marianna's mother happened to be classmates when they were young.

Papadakis: Today, having reviewed the case file, we see that this is a trial of intent. Marianna is accused of causing the explosion with the intent to damage the apartments in the building and endanger human lives, including her own and Kyriakos's. Do you believe this is something that represents her, that corresponds to her intentions?

Witness: Absolutely not. She was raised with high values and ideals, and she shows respect for life. There is no way she would want to harm human life or destroy property. She is a person who has always helped others, and now in prison, two mothers told us during visiting hours that Marianna was helping their daughters, who are fellow inmates, write letters. When we didn't help the homeless, she would scold us.

Prosecutor: When she entered Arkadia, did she have in mind that someone would be in danger?

Witness: I don't believe that. No. From the beginning until now, based on my experiences with Marianna, I cannot form any other opinion.

Prosecutor: Is Marianna a violent, quarrelsome person? Did Kyriakos have those traits?

Witness: No, she was never like that; we raised her to love others. Kyriakos was sensitive, sociable, and kind.

Prosecutor: What kind of political activities was Marianna involved in?

Witness: She was involved in activities focused on mutual aid. She also participated in marches.

Prosecutor: Did you go to the house in Skylitsi (Marianna and Kyriakos's residence)? What condition was it in?

Witness: We had only managed to go there twice. It was a small house, about 40 square meters, tidy and well-kept. There was absolutely nothing objectionable about it.

Prosecutor: Did they maintain another residence, or did they own another vehicle?

Witness: No.

Prosecutor: Did you have any knowledge of explosives or weapons?

Witness: Never.

Prosecutor: Did she receive any awards regarding her studies or her work?

Witness: She was diligent in her studies; she received top honors in graphic design, graduating with a 9 out of 10.

Thanasis Kampagiannis: Let's mention at this point that Marianna's mother is also present. For the sake of brevity, we did not include her in the list of witnesses. So, did you go and see her, and did you spend even more time inside the prison?

Witness: Yes

Camp: Regarding her professional career, did she find a job quickly after finishing her studies?

Witness: She did a master's degree, and almost immediately found a job at a company. As soon as she finished school, without delay.

Camp: Were you present during the search at Skylitsi?

Witness: The searches were conducted under exceptional circumstances. We handed over the keys to the GADA(General police department of Attiki). They asked me for the car keys. Nothing was found in it.

Camp: The court has a picture of the situation so far. Marianna has stated that she will take responsibility for her actions. Does her attitude surprise you?

Witness: No. It vindicates our parenting methods; we raised a person who takes responsibility for their actions. From a young age, she had a very good relationship with the truth.

Camp: What exactly was she doing in Berlin?

Witness: She had gone there for graduate studies.

*

Following the conclusion of the examination of Marianna's father, Marianna made the following statement:

I'd like to make a brief comment and say that I've also worked as a cleaner in Berlin, cleaning both homes and shops. I was lucky to have parents who could support me, while there are people who don't have that support. During times when I couldn't rely on that support either, I took on other jobs. It's not graphic design or degrees—those don't define who I am.

You also asked if my partner or I were violent people. Violence is a daily reality for the grassroots. We experience violence everywhere, and just five minutes ago we witnessed violence being perpetrated (referring to the confrontation between riot police and supporters right outside the hall). I do not distance myself, nor do I condemn self-defense or counter-violence. In the world we live in, people die in train collisions, migrants drown at the hands of the coast guard, and there are deaths during random police checks.

It is not possible to rule out violence coming from one side, to consider it reprehensible, while considering that coming from the other side to be legitimate. The issue is to eradicate violence at its root.

I could not describe a person who chooses revolutionary struggle or armed struggle as violent. I would perhaps call them non-violent.

*

Second defense witness, mother of Kyriakos Xymitiris:

Our son Kyriakos was always focused on doing good. He cared about and valued all people, without any hierarchy, and what mattered to him was what was real, not appearances. He cared about helping, taking care of everything, supporting,

listening, and giving. He celebrated life every day, through both small and large acts of kindness. Because that's what we did in our family.

With us, he learned to share, to give even from his own meager resources; he learned that our family is part of the whole: We are part of society—which usually suffers. He learned that we are TOGETHER. We always fight for justice and equality, and we give in every way we can.

In our busy lives, his father cared for the sick—he was a doctor in the National Health System—and I, his mother, welcomed students and helped them find their footing in the vast—now—world we live in; I was a teacher in public schools.

As he grew up, messages came from all sides that he was becoming a warm-hearted person and a sparkling spirit. He passed his college entrance exams and enrolled at P.A.P.E.I. in computer science, while also working, so that when he decided to take classes at a private college and study sociology, he had the means to do so. He was then accepted by the Freie Universität in Berlin, where he moved to attend. He graduated with honors, working at the same time so as not to burden the family finances.

But he looked around him, at what was happening in the world. He saw and felt that people were suffering from anxiety about daily life, from financial hardship, from exploitation by the powerful, from racism, from the looming threat of war—all these scourges that, unfortunately, have never been absent from human societies. And he took a stand on all of these issues.

He chose to fight. He supported people facing health and housing issues, as well as immigrants in their efforts to adapt. He participated in collectives, in marches against racism, against the law of the strongest. For Kyriakos, there was no “us” and “them”; there was TOGETHER. Because he always loved to learn, to read, to broaden his mind, “to connect the dots,” and through discussion to reach new conclusions, without, however, becoming intransigent or absolute.

But now he is no longer with us. His loss is unfathomable for his father and me. The days go by, but the moments linger. We struggle every day. Our lives were divided into BEFORE Thursday, October 31, 2024, at 2:40 p.m., and AFTER Thursday, October 31, 2024, at 2:40 p.m.

What is now close to my heart is his beloved partner, his soulmate, Marianna. Because these two are so much alike. Like Kyriakos, Marianna is a rare soul; they have a sensitive gaze, they possess knowledge, love, and sincerity, and they are tireless presences wherever they are needed. With dignity and consistency.

I did not come here to have my son judged. I am here to give you a picture of him, and for you to feel his presence. After all, he took on his responsibilities in the most

exemplary way. This light, which reaches us, his parents, like a ray, tries to bridge the gap of time. It is his friends, his comrades—a word spoken with such suspicion. Children who could live an easy, carefree life, but instead choose to fight, to stand up for what is right, to feel another's pain as their own, and stand side by side in solidarity. Just as our son did. I find comfort in knowing that my son lived and lives fully among them. And so his absence becomes a presence.

*

At this point, President Georgoulis took the floor, stating that he had no reason to doubt what the partner's mother had said, but that the court would have to ask some difficult questions. He then asked whether, by October 31, she had realized that her son was leaning toward the logic of armed violence, receiving a negative response.

The presiding judge continued by saying that when a person crosses the boundaries of a social construct—such as in the name of an ideology—they engage in actions that carry specific criminal liabilities. He then asked whether, in the entire relationship described by the partner's mother, there was any element of violent or armed reaction in his speech, only to receive another negative response.

Subsequently, Kyriakos's mother was disarming in her response to the presiding judge's insinuations regarding the moral integrity of her sons' actions: Precisely because they borrowed an apartment from third parties, precisely because harm was caused to people who had nothing to do with it, "I am certain that Kyriakos did not believe something like this would happen."

The chairman concluded by asking whether Kyriakos's mother had ever learned from Marianna why this whole process had taken place. She was disarming once again, saying, "I don't discuss such matters with her, because Marianna is grieving and mourning. We had other things to talk about."

*

Prosecutor Pischina then asked a series of questions. She asked Kyriakos's mother to clarify what she meant when she said her son had no malicious intent. The answer she received was, "I know my child, and I am certain that if he had known what would follow, he would not have done it." The prosecutor replied that the court was not concerned with whether he acted with intent, but with whether he realized that what he was doing was dangerous, since it was clear that a bomb explosion has terrible consequences.

The mother replied, "We hear the word 'explosion' and automatically picture a bomb going off in our minds. We don't even know if it was a bomb."

*

This was followed by questions from the defense attorneys. Papadakis began by explaining that Marianna is charged with “causing an explosion through negligence.”

Papadakis: Do you believe that Marianna and Kyriakos accepted this possibility when they went to the apartment?

Witness: Absolutely not, because they are not that kind of people. They would not do anything that would make life difficult for the people they are fighting for. They didn't even accept it as a possibility.

Papadakis: Was Kyriakos aggressive or confrontational?

Witness: That question just makes me laugh. Kyriakos was overflowing with kindness; he wasn't violent—wherever he went, he left a trail of light. About Marianna: When you have a daughter, later you also get a son, and when you have a son, you also get a daughter, and I'm happy that now I have this daughter; she's a wonderful person.

The defense attorney then asked the partner's mother if she visited Marianna and Kyriakos at their home, and if she had noticed whether they were subject to any restrictions or limitations. “I had gone there many times where they lived; there were no restrictions. It was a pleasure for me to go and see them. I didn't go very often. Once a week. There wasn't a single thing in the house that could be considered objectionable, not even as a joke. They didn't have any other living space or vehicle.

The defense attorney then asked Kyriakos's mother, drawing on her experience as a teacher, to describe Marianna's personality, noting that it was remarkable that she regarded her as her own child. He explained the reasoning behind the question, stating that criminal law also assesses personality, and this can be reflected in different charges (e.g., the penalties for a charge of “intentional” conduct differ from those for “negligent” conduct).

The answer was as follows: “She is a young woman fighting for the common good. She is knowledgeable, a warm person, and I would love to hang out with her. She has many talents; she is a smart and sensitive young woman. She is the kind of woman I would have dreamed of being at her age. Both Kyriakos and Marianna are responsible individuals who take on their responsibilities and see through whatever they undertake.”

*

Thanasis Kampagiannis continued. He asked about Kyriakos's professional career in Berlin. His mother replied that he initially worked as a translator from Greek to German, and later also worked at a bicycle shop. The mother also mentioned that their home made a very good impression; there was nothing out of the ordinary. She concluded her testimony by referring to the puppy the couple had adopted, which is now being cared for by Kyriakos's parents.

As Kyriakos's mother finished her testimony, the entire courtroom erupted in a loud, spontaneous round of applause.

*

The next witness for the defense was Anastasis Manioudakis, son of Kostis Manioudakis, who was murdered by police in Chania on September 1, 2023:

In 2015, I met Marianna through mutual friends, and she was one of the people who helped me a great deal during my first days in Athens. We developed a very strong relationship. That bond grew even stronger when, on 09/01/2023, four police officers from the Souda Special Forces murdered my father in Chania. If it weren't for people like Marianna, my father's case would have been covered up, just as we see happen in various other cases. From the initial findings following my father's death—that "no injuries" notation on the death certificate, the local leak to the media before I even found out myself, a leak that, in fact, contained lies such as that my father died of a heart attack during a random traffic stop on the VOAK (Crete) highway, whereas he died while handcuffed during a stop by the Special Cretan Anti-Crime Unit on the provincial road between Fere and Vrysses. Mr. Kampagiannis is also a defense attorney in this case; he can confirm everything I'm saying.

Four months later, a medical examiner's report was released confirming what we had said. Eight months later, criminal charges were filed against the four police officers for "manslaughter with possible intent while in a calm state of mind and acting in concert." And nothing has been done to them either. We are overwhelmed by a sense of justice. Eighteen months later, and the investigation hasn't even begun due to a heavy workload. I didn't see the same level of diligence in the Ampelokipi case, when they took DNA from Marianna while she was unconscious. It was a completely different approach from the one taken by the four cops who murdered my father.

All of this is true, and if it weren't for people like Marianna, the case would have been shelved. After something like this, friendly and comradely relationships take on a whole new level. Marianna cannot be portrayed as an antisocial element, a person who is there for whatever you ask of her. And the same goes for the immortal comrade Kyriakos Xymiteris. The antisocial elements are the cops who killed my father.

Marianna supported my father's case to the utmost degree.

*

Questions followed from the presiding chamber.

Presiding Judge: Now that you've come closer—since we're dealing with an explosion that resulted in a death—did you realize that their views could cross a line and turn into armed violence?

A: Nothing of the sort had ever been discussed.

Presiding Judge: Regarding the explosion, how do you justify Kyriakos's possession/manufacture/assembly of a device?

A: I have no idea; whatever he intended to do would have been for the good of society as a whole. There was never any chance of it harming a living organism.

Q: But who is qualified to tell us what is good for society?

A: I don't know, certainly not the judiciary; perhaps the people—which is why it's better for such cases to go before a mixed jury.

Prosecutor: But a mechanism could cause harm.

A: Certain things that happen within society can lead a person to make these choices. As for my immortal comrade Kyriakos Xymitiris, I am certain he had no intention of harming anyone.

Pros: What good would a bomb do for the common good?

A: It puts a stop to the cannibals who dictate how we should be, how we should behave, and cover up all these crimes.

Pros: But how does such a choice help?

A: It's a form of action; it opens up a dialogue, because things can't go on like this.

Pros: So the centers of power can engage in dialogue, reflect on things—even if it's just a bomb placed in an empty building?

A: It is a tactic employed by an armed militant to force those in power to take notice.

*

Anastasis was then questioned by the defense attorneys.

Papadakis began:

Pap: So as not to confuse matters further, between actual events and theoretical discussions: They enter a residence with explosives, knowing that something will go wrong, that people will be in danger, and that damage will be caused. Is that their intention?

A: No.

Pap: Why?

A: Because of their kindness, generosity, and solidarity.

Pap: You met them through social circles, as you said. Were they involved elsewhere, on some committee? Were you involved?

A: Yes, the kids were everywhere. In protests regarding immigration, to be precise, gentrification, and the metro in Exarchia. I participated in some of them as well.

Pap: Had you ever been to their home?

A: I had been to Berlin; I had even helped them move.

When asked about Marianna and Kyriakos's personalities, Anastasis replied that as people, they wouldn't hurt anyone in any way. They are by no means confrontational or aggressive.

Pap: Regarding your father's case, what kind of help did they provide you?

A: Since this incident occurred, two rallies were organized, in Chania and Athens. In Athens, central actions were carried out to bring attention to the case, such as the one at the medical examiner's office, as well as the mass poster campaign featuring the names of the four police officers-murderers, which took place nationwide. Because until then, the names of the murderers were not known. The kids (Marianna and Kyriakos) were there from the very beginning.

Pap: What stage is the case at now?

A: The main investigation has begun.

*

The witness examination continued with Thanasis Kampagiannis:

Kamp: What was Marianna's role in the case of your father's murder? How much time did she have available? Because we saw that she was working at the same time.

A: It was touching, because she was there from start to finish. She was there, consistent, and did a great deal of good for me, my family, and society in general.

Kamp: How did she help you personally?

A: Just knowing that she was part of this struggle lifted a weight off my shoulders.

*

The final defense witness for the day was comrade Dimitra Valavani. The presiding chamber interrupted her from the outset, arguing that "we are not here to judge ideologies, but specific acts." Presiding Judge Georgoulas, in particular, attempted several times to "steer" the discussion toward the acts and charges, without, however, allowing space to address the political context that gives rise to the anti-

terrorism prosecutions, within which the practices employed by the agency are situated.

D: I am here as an anarchist, to speak as someone who has been persecuted and tortured by the counter-terrorism unit in the same way that my comrade Marianna has been tortured and persecuted. I am also here to defend the memory of the anarchist armed fighter Kyriakos Xymiteris. I did not have the chance to meet Marianna and Kyriakos personally, but I came to know them after October 31 through their political choices. What connects us to Marianna is our shared persecution by the counterterrorism unit, an agency that inflates charges and fabricates cases based on circumstantial evidence, and I believe this is what is happening in this specific case as well.

Q: Since you don't know them personally, what do you have to say to us?

D: Even though I didn't know either of them personally, I share common experiences with Marianna that bring me here. I didn't know Kyriakos until October 31. I got to know him through his political choices, through his comrades, through his parents, and through Marianna. We are connected by shared values and shared experiences. Both Marianna and Kyriakos are activists who inspire me. I now know both of them, and as someone who has been imprisoned on similar charges by the counterterrorism authorities, I have every right to be here to defend them.

At this point, the presiding judge interrupted, seeking to limit the testimony to the "procedural dimension."

D: The charges being examined here today do not have merely a procedural basis; they stem from conscious political choices.

Presiding Judge: Can a political choice involve violence?

Defense: Of course, a political choice can be accompanied by violence, just as every prosecution is accompanied by violence—and indeed, even more violence. It is the response to state violence.

Prosecutor: We are talking about specific acts here, not a revolution. The laws and the framework—the code of criminal procedure—are very specific.

At that point, defense attorney Papadakis intervened, addressing the prosecutor and saying, "You will never be charged under Article 187A, just as Golden Dawn was not charged under it either. Only anarchists are prosecuted under Article 187A."

The comrade continued by saying, "You judge based on your own code, but we have come to defend our own code of values. Our actions stem from this code."

Once again, the presiding judge interrupted, asking what Marianna's actions were. The comrade insisted on developing her argument, starting with the prosecution by

the counterterrorism unit. Once again, Georgoulis interrupted her, only to receive a response from Dimitra that she would not comment on Marianna's actions.

Presiding Judge: We are not here to engage in political debate, general declarations, or ideological manifestos. Here, we are judging the acts.

Dimitra: Here, there are five people accused by the counterterrorism unit based on an unclear framework of relationships among them, within which terrorist organizations take root. On the other hand, I have come to speak about a clear framework linking the counterterrorism unit with the judiciary. The counterterrorism unit's pattern is consistent, and it is soundly refuted in most cases. I, too, was accused in a similar manner. I found myself charged with participation in a criminal organization, bank robberies, and possession of weapons. I took responsibility for what I did, but I also defended myself against the charges brought against me.

Once again, the chairman interrupted, saying, "We understand what you're trying to tell us: that this is a fabricated prosecution, a standard tactic employed by the counterterrorism unit, leading to a trumped-up indictment."

Before the woman could add anything else, she was asked if she could explain the presence of Marianna and Kyriakos in the apartment; she replied in the negative, adding that this was something Marianna herself would explain.

*

This was followed by questioning by the defense attorneys. Papadakis began.

Pap: Marianna and Kyriakos are accused of entering the apartment knowing that dangerous handling could cause an explosion. Does anarchist ideology rule out this possibility of intent?

D: In the anarchist struggle, such intent does not exist. This is 100% historically proven and demonstrated by other activists. For example, organizations such as Revolutionary Struggle or Revolutionary Self-Defense used armed means of struggle, no one was put in danger, and they never advocated for such a thing—quite the opposite.

Pap: You say that the inflation of the charges stems from political identity. What makes you distrustful in your own case?

D: My distrust of the counterterrorism unit arose long before I was arrested, just as it did toward every state agency. I was arrested because, proudly faithful to the concept of active solidarity, I helped two wanted individuals: my comrade and fugitive from the Tiryns prison, Yiannis Michailidis, and my comrade on the run, Konstantina Athanasopoulou. I was charged with membership in a criminal organization under Article 187, theft, bank robbery, and possession of weapons. In

the end, I was definitively convicted for the charges I accepted responsibility for, namely the transport of weapons and the use of a forged document.

*

Kambayannis followed:

Kamb: You said that the reason you became close to Marianna was because you felt you had something in common?

D: Yes, it is the persecution we both faced and the torture by the counterterrorism agency during the process of collecting genetic material.

Brief comment following the examination of the first defense witnesses:

Despite the court's statements, the majority of the questions posed to the defense witnesses have an exclusively political basis. It appears that the court wishes to handle the case with a strictly democratic, militant statist approach. At the core of every question lies their conviction that the state is the sole regulator of any social relationship—a telling example is the prosecutor's question to Anastasis about whether the centers of power would be troubled by the planting of a bomb—as if planting a bomb were meant to open a dialogue with the centers of power.

They attempt to portray armed struggle as a dead end within the democratic framework. In this way, they wish to conceal the fact that armed struggle often comes into conflict (and) with the democratic framework that normalizes exploitation, that erases social competition, as well as the institutionalized violence of domination within and against society itself.

The trial is taking place at a time when the Greek state is celebrating the end of the post-dictatorship era, and—according to them—the end of armed resistance holds a special place within this celebration. That is why they are striving, first and foremost, to deconstruct the armed struggle in political terms.

Furthermore, it is certain that in the coming days we will be called upon to defend the moral integrity of our comrades as well. This is already evident from scattered insinuations by the prosecution, made at unsuspecting moments.

Our trust in our comrades is non-negotiable, and has been our guiding principle from the very beginning of this case. We continue to have the first and the last word.

The campaign—both to morally undermine the characters of our comrades and to politically undermine the armed struggle—will serve as the means for their conviction and the imposition of severe penalties. We still have the first and last word. Inside and outside the courtrooms.

**FREEDOM FOR THE COMRADES
ACCUSED IN THE AMPELOKIPI CASE**