Leeuwarden Litigation

Transcript
March 9, 2026 Hearing
Amsterdam Court of Appeal

AI English translation of Dutch transcript reviewed and corrected by Attorney Peter Stassen, cross-checked with AI audio-dubbed translation by Joseph Sansone[1] and edited by Katherine Watt for removal of timestamps; insertion of speaker headings, links and footnotes; addition of defendant diagram, orientation and defense attorney photos.

[1] https://www.josephsansone.com/p/breaking-netherlands-hearing-in-bioweapons

Respondents/Defendants



14. Feike Sijbesma
Special corona envoy
Facilitator, diagnostic test procurement



4. Mark Rutte
Prime Minister. 2010-2024
NATO Secretary General, 2024-

17. State of the Netherlands



6. Hugo de Jonge
Minister of Health
2017-2022



7. Ernst Kuipers
Minister of Health
2022-2024



5. Sigrid Kaag
Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2021
Minister of Finance, 2022-2024



9. Wopke Hoekstra
Minister of Finance, 2017-2022
Minister of Foreign Affairs, 2022-2023



16. Agnes Kant
medical scientist
Lareb (pharmacovigilance contractor) director



10. Cora van Nieuwenhuizen,
Minister of Infrastructure and Water Management
2017-2021



15. Bill Gates
Gates Foundation
GAVI
Vaccine development and supply funder



2. Dr. Jaap van Dissel
virologist
RIVM-CIB [Dutch CDC] Director
Outbreak Management Team (OMT) chairman
media personality



12. Giselle van Cann
news editor
Nederlandse Omroep Stichting-NOS [Netherlands Broadcasting Foundation]



13. Paul Jansen
news editor
De Telegraaf



11. Albert Bourla
Pfizer CEO
veterinarian
vaccine supplier



3. Dr. Marion Koopmans
microbiologist
veterinarian
OMT member
media personality



1. Dr. Everhard Hofstra
physician
OMT member
media personality



8. Dr. Diederik Gommers
physician
OMT member
media personality

Orientation

As of March 2026, there are two civil tort claim proceedings underway in Dutch federal courts.

Both cases rely on the same fact history and the same legal arguments. Both cases hinge on the truth or falsity of the information that was provided to the public, including the plaintiffs in the main case and the petitioners in the second case, by the defendants, which is the same group of defendants for both cases.

Both cases also hinge on whether the defendants knew or should have known that they were presenting false information to the public, whether they had an obligation to verify or check the truth of the information that they were providing, and whether they had an obligation to only present true information to the public.

The plaintiffs and the petitioners in both cases are seeking public evidentiary review, adversarial cross-examination and evaluation.

The defendants oppose public evidentiary review, adversarial cross-examination and evaluation.

Main Case

The main case was filed in July 2023 in District Court of Northern Netherlands, Leeuwarden Division. (Case No. C/17/190788, 23/172). Seven plaintiffs filed civil tort claims against 17 defendants. One plaintiff has since died, leaving six. In December 2024 and June 2025, plaintiffs requested a pre-trial hearing under Dutch Code of Civil Procedure, Article 87(2)(d) and (e),[2] on subjects including "evidence to be provided through the introduction of new submissions and the hearing under oath of national and international party experts."

In the main case, the District Court at Leeuwarden denied the plaintiffs' request for a pre-trial evidence hearing by order dated Nov. 26, 2025. By order dated March 11, 2026, the Leeuwarden court scheduled the next hearing in the main case for Oct. 22, 2026, "to give the parties' lawyers...the opportunity to further explain their legal positions."

Attorney Peter Stassen submitted an email letter March 13, 2026 requesting clarification from the Leeuwarden District Court on the presence of expert witnesses in the courtroom; online connection for witnesses unable to be present in the courtroom; interpreter services (to translate Dutch to English); the "procedural consequences" of participation by expert witnesses; and other details.

[2] Article 87. "(1) The court may, at the request of one or all of the parties or on its own initiative, in all circumstances and at any stage of the action, direct that a hearing be held. (2) At the hearing the court allows parties to explain their arguments and the court may: a. request that the parties provide information; b. allow the parties to further substantiate their arguments; c. explore the possibility of a settlement; d. confer with the parties on the next steps in the proceedings; and e. give such other directions or order such acts of process as it considers appropriate, and to such extent as it considers consistent with the requirements of due process. (3) With the prior permission of the court, witnesses and party experts may be examined at the hearing.

Second Case

The second case was initiated by a preliminary Request for Provisional Evidence Proceedings, filed in March 2025 (Case No. C/17/199273, 25/17). Three petitioners filed against 17 defendants. These three petitioners have not yet filed a summons and complaint; they are seeking preliminary evidence proceedings to assess available evidence, including witness testimony, to inform their decisions about further civil action.

The second case is currently on appeal at Amsterdam Court of Appeal (Case No. D100816) and was the subject of the March 9, 2026 hearing for which the transcript is provided below.

In the second case, the District Court at Leeuwarden denied the three petitioners' Request for Provisional Evidence Proceedings by order dated August 20, 2025.

The petitioners whose request had been denied in August 2025 appealed the denial on Sept. 15, 2025. Due to conflicts of interest, the case was transferred from the Arnhem-Leeuwarden Court of Appeal to the Amsterdam Court of Appeal,

The Amsterdam Court of Appeal held a hearing on March 9, 2026, to hear argument on whether or not the appeal should be allowed to proceed to a substantive review and decision on whether the Leeuwarden District Court erred in denying the request for provisional evidence proceedings.

The subject of the March 9 hearing was the applicability of Article 200 in the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure which bars appeal of preparatory evidence decisions, "unless the court determines otherwise." Article 200: "A decision on the application for one or more preparatory evidence events is not subject to any higher remedy except where the court decides otherwise. In such event, the time limit for initiating the higher remedy is four weeks."

The phrase used in Dutch law is to "break the ban on appeal." The case that both sides cite to make their arguments for and against breaking the ban on appeal is called Enke v. DuPont, a 1985 Supreme Court of the Netherlands case. Enke v. DuPont put forward three situations in which the bar on remedies can be broken through: (1) if the lower court has stepped outside the scope of the relevant provision; (2) if the lower court has wrongly left the provision unapplied and (3) if the lower court in handling the case has disregarded such fundamental principle of law that the case cannot be said to have been dealt with fairly and impartially.

The appellants/petitioners are arguing that the third provision applies: the fundamental principles of law pertaining to fair and impartial trials were disregarded by the Leeuwarden District Court in denying petitioners' Request for Provisional Evidence Proceedings. Appellants' Attorney Peter Stassen, in the appeal, challenged the lower court's procedures and reasoning on several specific grounds, and also cited the European Convention on Human Rights, Article 6, which protects the right to a fair trial.

The appellants argue that the Amsterdam Court of Appeal should allow the appeal to proceed. If the appeal is allowed to proceed, the Amsterdam Court of Appeal would then review the lower court's (Leeuwarden District Court) actions and could find that the lower court erred in denying petitioners' request for provisional evidence proceedings.

The respondents/defendants oppose the Amsterdam Court of Appeal taking up the appeal for substantive review of the lower court's decision. The defendants argue that the lower court procedures were conducted fairly and impartially and the lower court's Aug. 20, 2025 decision was sound, so there's no reason for the Amsterdam Court of Appeal to break the ban on appeal.

At the end of the March 9 hearing, Presiding Judge Mark Bosch stated that the Amsterdam Court of Appeal will issue a ruling on whether or not the bar on appeal may be broken, on April 9, 2026.

More Information

Additional litigation records and videos may be found at the following websites:

Stichting Recht Oprecht (Right to Justice Foundation):

https://rechtoprecht.online/

Stichting Recht Oprecht on YouTube:

https://www.youtube.com/@StichtingRechtOprecht

Bailiwick News Archives (records assembled by Katherine Watt)

https://bailiwicknewsarchives.wordpress.com/litigation-leeuwarden-netherlands/

- Feb. 2026 – Leeuwarden Litigation, video presentation
- Feb. 2026 – Leeuwarden Case Document Reading Guide
- Feb. 2026 - Leeuwarden Litigation, presentation slide deck
- Feb. 2026 - Memo in Support of Petitioners Appeal

Transcript

March 9, 2026 Oral Hearing - Amsterdam Court of Appeal

Presiding Judge Mark Bosch[3]

Okay, welcome everyone. Up for discussion is the appeal filed by three appellants.

Three appellants filed: Bos, Manubulu, and Staamer.

Mr. Stassen is present for that. Welcome.

Against 17 respondents [defendants].

[Presiding Judge recognized counsel present for respondents/defendants, colloquy summarized:

Ms. Maartje Möhring. Pels Rijcken law firm. Represents State of the Netherlands, Everhard Hofstra, Jaap van Dissel, Marion Koopmans, Mark Rutte, Sigrid Kaag, Hugo de Jonge, Ernst Kuipers, Diederik Gommers, Wopke Hoekstra, Cora van Nieuwenhuizen, Feike Sijbesma.

Mr. Reimer Veldhuis, Pels Rijcken law firm. Represents defendants State of the Netherlands, Everhard Hofstra, Jaap van Dissel, Marion Koopmans, Mark Rutte, Sigrid Kaag, Hugo de Jonge, Ernst Kuipers, Diederik Gommers, Wopke Hoekstra, Cora van Nieuwenhuizen, Feike Sijbesma.

Ms. Davine Roessingh, DeBrauw Blackstone Westbroek law firm. Represents Albert Bourla.

Ms. Marieke Bredenoord-Spoek, DeBrauw law firm. Represents Albert Bourla.

Mr. Pieter Lichtendahl, AC&R law firm. Represents Giselle van Cann and Paul Jansen.

Ms. Anne Bekema, AC&R law firm. Represents Giselle van Cann and Paul Jansen.

Mr. Anton Ekker, Ekker law firm. Represents Agnes Kant.

Mr. Willem Heemskerk, Pels Rijcken law firm. Represents William Gates.

Ms. Puck Mulder, Pels Rijcken law firm. Represens William Gates.]

No photos, no videos.

Yes, there's a livestream that works.

Okay. On this side of the table [identifying judges], you see Mr. [D.] Kingma on my right, your left. On the other side, Ms. [Pauline] Hofmeijer. The clerk on duty is Ms. Velers, and my name is [Mark] Bosch.

---

[3] Version 2 of transcript, published April 9, 2026, contains corrected name of Presiding Judge Mark Bosch. Bosch was incorrectly identified in a prior version of the transcript as Cees Bos, based on information contained in AI-generated transcripts of March 9, 2026 hearing video recordings. The correction was made possible by receipt (on April 9, 2026) of the Amsterdam Court of Appeal April 9, 2026 order, which contained the names of the three judges on the signature page.

We have a livestream today and a large audience. That means we have to use the microphones properly, as was just apparent. Those microphones are very sensitive, by the way. So I also warn the people who have a microphone in front of them that if you want to discuss something among yourselves, everything can be heard quite well. So maybe you can limit that to, the breaks. I see someone is standing there. Yes, I can't make it any clearer than this right now. The microphones are loud, and I'm talking into the microphone. I see the technicians are running. Thank you. We'll do our best. Let's see.

And for the lawyers, these days it's customary to remain seated during pleadings, but today it's even necessary to remain seated, because there's a camera pointed at you, and the intention is that only the bar officers [judges and lawyers] are visible today, and the appellant has indicated they have no objection. So you'll be on camera, but only the bar officers are visible, and the moment you stand up, then the public would also be visible. So, the kind request to plead while seated.

Okay. After the appellants' notice of appeal [September 2025], we received four statements of defense [January 2026]. I also received a letter dated December 7 with a USB drive attached [from appellants]. And after that, two more exhibits were submitted on the appellants' side, Exhibits 6 and 7. That's the file we have before us today.

We have a schedule, a tight schedule for today, and we're just barely on time. So I wanted to start right away with the first argument on behalf of the appellants.

So Mr. Stassen, you'll have an hour to present your case. Do you have a statement of arguments?

Peter Stassen

I do, but if you'll permit me, I'd like to raise a point of order first.

Your court has quite rightly instructed that the respondents must be present here in person today.

And I really haven't seen a valid reason why they're not here today. Their numerous absences are not just a big middle finger to your court and my clients, but also, if I may be so bold, to the whole world.

With their absence, the defendants are making a last-ditch attempt to silence the procedural debate that should be taking place here today. After all, it is precisely the context of the request I am making here today that should be the topic here today.

Even if it merely concerns an assessment of the admissibility of the appeal, that is still the case. I will address that in my plea. I find this really very serious. I also point out to you that you do not have to accept it. This case is too important for that, too important to society. You of course have the right under the Code of Civil Procedure, more specifically Article 22, to order defendants to further explain their arguments or to submit documents related to the case.

As you will see from my pleadings, there is every reason to do so. And I think, given this enormous absence of defendants who are obliged to attend, have been invited to your court, you should not close the oral hearing today. I think that it's up to the court to use their discretionary

powers here. That serves only one interest, and that is the interest in the truth. That is also the core interest of my clients. That must be served.

So I wanted to point out that I consider it a very serious matter, a great disappointment, that they simply don't appear and withdraw from the debate.

The second point I want to make, but I'm going to be very brief about that. You're applying the press guidelines. In the previous hearing in the court of first instance, I expressed fundamental objections to that. I'm just repeating that to you, and I'm not going to draw any conclusions from that.

Presiding Judge Bosch

No, the first point, yes, do you draw any conclusions from that? Because, of course, the party is free to appear with or without a lawyer or in person.

Peter Stassen [7:20]

Well, the court's invitation was very clear. It stated, in person. And that's your invitation, and that's what the [appellant] parties, of course, simply listened to it out of respect for your court, and they [the respondents] didn't.

Presiding Judge Bosch

Your opinion, your view, has been noted. Do you want to comment on that? Do you want us to do something with it now, or are you saying, well, I'll leave it at that for now?

Fine. Well, okay. Then I'll stick with that observation. Your opinion has been noted, and the parties are free to decide whether or not to appear, with or without a lawyer.

We're discussing a rather legal issue today, namely, can the prohibition on legal remedies be broken? And the decision on whether the party should appear with their lawyer is up to them at this point.

Mr. Stassen, you now have the opportunity to present. I'm going to keep you strictly on time. We're running five minutes behind, but that means you can also just go 5 minutes over. So, I see you have a plea note. Would you like me to hand it over?

What I forgot to mention is that the interpreters—there are three interpreters present who are attending the hearing via a video link elsewhere in this building.

And someone will be going to them with your plea note in a moment, because that's practical for them. They're in the back of the room, so they'll be here shortly to pick up a plea note. Very helpful.

[Distribution of prepared statement of Peter Stassen]

Peter Stassen [10:32]

Introduction

Noble, distinguished board, esteemed presiding judge, interested parties.

Today we are discussing a matter of global importance.

That's a given because my clients' request focuses on the executors of the COVID-19 project: The Great Reset, in which the COVID-19 mRNA injections are crucial.

You can only reach a balanced judgment in this case if you consider the facts and circumstances under which the request was made. So it's about the context of the request.

A significant portion of the grounds for appeal against the decision in first instance concerns the [Leeuwarden District Court] judge's failure to consider the context, or at least completely insufficient consideration of that context.

In this plea, I will convince you that this alone violates fundamental standards of a fair trial.

This is so serious that breaching the prohibition on legal remedies is essential. This is because otherwise my clients would not have access to a fair trial. **The context of the case is therefore of paramount importance for assessing the admissibility of this appeal.**

To make you aware of the context of this case, I will first address the official COVID-19 narrative and contrast it with a number of facts that are generally known.

I would like to note that since the appeal was filed, a new development has also emerged. These are important new facts, such that the complaint that the context of the case was not taken into account can now be further substantiated with additional facts.

Therefore, I am primarily of the opinion that the introduction of these new facts is not contrary to the two-conclusion rule from Article 347 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Alternatively, I argue that the full application of the two-conclusion rule contradicts good procedural order because there is a new development.

[Discussion of technical issues related to sound system omitted]

The official COVID-19 narrative of the defendants

Let me take you to the defendants' official COVID-19 narrative. Because as I just explained, I'm going to contrast it to facts that are generally known.

So let me remind you what the official narrative is, according to the executors of the COVID-19 Project, and therefore also according to the defendants in these proceedings.

We can easily find that narrative in Dutch legislation.

It's important to note that this narrative from governments and international organizations, including the UN and NATO, is the same worldwide.

The only explanation for this is that the COVID-19 project, the Great Reset, is a global project, i.e., a project of globalists.

Back to that official narrative. According to the defendants in this case, it reads as follows.

> In December 2019, a new coronavirus emerged in the Wuhan region of China, initially designated as the novel coronavirus 2019 nCov and now formally named SARS-CoV-2, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus.
>
> In the Netherlands, the developments surrounding the virus have been closely monitored.
>
> On January 28, 2020, the virus was, on the advice of the Outbreak Management Team (OMT), designated as belonging to Group A, as referred to in the Public Health Act (WPG) [Wet Publieke Gezondheid]
>
> And all provisions of the Public Health Act that apply to infectious diseases belonging to Group A have been declared applicable to the control of the virus epidemic.

That is the official narrative.

Placing the presumed virus in Group A had far-reaching legal consequences.

This firstly created a legal reporting obligation for this supposed new infectious disease.

Secondly, this activated all the control powers under the Public Health Act.

And thirdly, the Minister of Medical Care became responsible for leading the control of this supposedly new disease.

In short, a medical surveillance state was established in which citizens' fundamental rights were eroded, which is still being defended by defendants today by invoking this official narrative.

[16:23]

My clients argue that this official narrative, and the way in which defendants, as a group, promoted, imposed, and enforced this narrative, was unlawful.

This unlawful conduct misled my clients, resulting in them receiving a COVID-19 injection.

To this day, the defendants maintain that the use of these COVID-19 injections was a necessity and that these injections qualify as a safe and effective vaccine against the new disease COVID-19, according to the official narrative.

That the defendants do not dispute this narrative and continue to defend it is crystal clear from the court documents I submitted in these proceedings.

As a result of the COVID-19 injections, very little remains of my clients' health.

I would have liked to be here with the three of them today. I really need to excuse one of my clients because of the illness, which is so severe that he can't be here. I consider it a miracle that I still have two of them by my side today.

That's why my clients have a right and an interest in hearing the honest and independent experts they have presented, who should participate in a court proceeding with the opportunity for both sides to be heard.

Only in this way can my clients assess their chances of success in any substantive proceedings they will initiate.

The Leeuwarden court denied them that opportunity [by order Aug. 20, 2025], and I will therefore explain to you why this violated fundamental standards that guarantee access to a fair trial.

Facts of common knowledge

How does the official narrative that the defendants, as executors of the COVID-19: The Great Reset Project, defend, relate to facts that are now common knowledge?

I will mention, without limitation, a few that you should not have missed. But before I do so, I would like to make a very important comment.

When I mention facts of common knowledge, I'm also partly referring to facts that are the result of a controlled, preferred, and therefore false, deceitful reality by the defendants.

So, it's partly about lies that the executors of the Covid-19 project, the Great Reset, have made part of a "new normal." I will return to this later in my explanation.

I'm now talking about those facts that are now common knowledge because they have been admitted by official bodies and have been made public or are known to a wide audience as if they were true facts.

And this brings me to a list of facts that are now common knowledge.

[Coronavirus disease not more dangerous than mild flu]

The alleged malignant new disease COVID-19, caused by the coronavirus, was never more dangerous than a mild flu. This is also confirmed by Professor John Ioannides of Stanford University in California and now also by the WHO itself.

[PCR test cannot detect infection]

The PCR test cannot detect infections, as has been repeatedly stated publicly by its inventor, Nobel Prize winner Kary Mullis and also by former Pfizer vice president Dr. Mike Yeadon, the German university professor Dr. Klaus Steger, the American university professor J. Jay Couey , the Italian professor Gabriele Ségalla, and the Canadian physicians Dr. Mark Trozzi and Dr.

Roger Hodkinson, all of whom confirmed that the alleged dangers of the coronavirus and the COVID-19 disease never existed, but that the population was panicked on political orders.

[21:06]

[Covid-19 injections do not protect against infection]

The Administrative Court [Verwaltungsgericht] of Osnabrück Germany issued a very important ruling on September 3, 2024. This ruling has been published, and I have included the ECLE number[4] in this pleading as a matter of urgency.

This ruling was made by judges who, just like you, are judges in Europe, and you cannot ignore what they established as facts in that case.

In short, that case concerned the legal requirement to have a COVID-19 injection or to have proof of recovery from COVID-19 in order to be allowed to work in a hospital and in certain contact-based professions.

The German Constitutional Court had tested this regulation against the German Constitution and deemed it permissible.

For that reason, the case brought before the Administrative Court on this matter was initially, in principle inadmissible.

However, the Administrative Court declared itself admissible in that case based on new facts and new perspectives.

These new facts and circumstances primarily concerned the partially blacked-out [redacted] protocols of the RKI [Robert Koch Institute] Krisenstabs [crisis management team], which had been released in the interim, what we call the Outbreak Management Team (OMT) here [in the Netherlands].

The German Administrative Court examined these protocols and concluded that the COVID-19 injections did not provide effective protection against infection for the weaker members of society. And that, therefore, it was established in 2022 that this false narrative of an effective vaccine and the legal obligations for certain professionals based on it in Germany, violated the fundamental rights of citizens. That has been established.

But perhaps even more importantly, the German Administrative Court also established the far-reaching political influence exerted on the RKI-Krisenstabs during the crisis. In short, according to the German Administrative Court, these are criminal measures.

The respondents in this case, including members of the Outbreak Management Team (OMT), knew this.

And against that background, it is certain that the respondents knew, at least after 2022, that there was no effective vaccine and that it was in fact about political orders. Yet they continue to

[2] ECLI:DE::2024:0919.3A224.22.00

lie and deceive about this. This makes it clear that they are working together on a criminal project.

I am pointing this out to you because, although [the German court decision] was published, it is not being heard due to the deliberate failure by the executors of the COVID-19 Project: The Great Reset, which control the political media and the scientific landscape.

This statement is also not being heard in the fake parliamentary inquiry committee on the coronavirus established in the Netherlands, which also does not want to know about the procedures conducted by my clients and the published findings of the experts my clients have presented.

[Discussion of technical difficulties with sound system omitted]

The so-called coronavirus measures were economically destructive. Especially the lockdowns, and they lead to the deaths of millions of people and to serious side effects.

In my footnote in this plea, I already indicate that these are actually main effects.

[Covid-19 injections as cause of deaths and serious adverse effects]

According to the findings of Professor Denis Rancourt and pathologist and PCR test manufacturer Dr. Roger Hodkinson from Canada, this amounts to at least 20 million deaths worldwide and 2.4 billion serious side effects.

[Covid-19 injections do not prevent transmission]

The European agency responsible for authorizing vaccines, EMA [European Medicines Agency], has confirmed the following in a letter dated October 18, 2023[5], in response to questions from former Member of the European Parliament Marcel de Graaff.

EMA to Marcel de Graaff:

> You state that, based on the authorized indications, the vaccines "may only be administered to persons seeking personal protection and that they are not authorized for the purpose of reducing transmission or infection rates - controlling transmission."
>
> You also state that the authorized indication does not correspond to applications [uses] "promoted by pharmaceutical companies, politicians, and healthcare professionals."

[5] https://perma.cc/YRR2-6TU5 - Oct. 18, 2023 letter from EMA Executive Director Emer Cooke to Members of European Parliament Marcel de Graaff, Gilbert Collard, Francesca Donato, Joachim Kuhs, Mislav Kolakušić, Virginie Joron, Ivan Vilibor Sinčić and Bernhard Zimniok.

And then EMA says:

> You are indeed correct when you point out that the COVID-19 vaccines are not authorized for preventing transmission from one person to another. The indications are for protecting the vaccinated individuals only.

The EMA continues:

> The product information for COVID-19 vaccines clearly states that the vaccines are intended for active immunization to prevent COVID-19.
>
> In addition, the EMA's assessment reports on the authorization of the vaccines note the lack of data on transmissibility.

Thus says the EMA.

This means that, according to the EMA, administering a COVID-19 injection could only take place based on informed-consent in a doctor-patient relationship.

Everything we have seen and can see and hear in the new normal about a vaccine that, according to former [Netherlands Health] Minister [Hugo] de Jonge, was tested extensively, cannot in any way be traced back to the marketing authorization granted by the EMA.

By repeatedly explicitly, implicitly, and subliminally confirming the safety and effectiveness of the COVID-19 injections over an extended period of time, the defendants acted using the brainwashing method developed by the former Nazi German Minister of Propaganda [Joseph] Goebbels.

It is now common knowledge that the official COVID-19 narrative is incorrect and that all campaigns with "you're doing it for someone else" were based on nothing but deception.

Yet, the defendants maintain this. Their legal documents are completely clear on this point, and so it is also completely clear that we are dealing with professional liars here.

Epstein Files [31:29]

And now the new development I was talking about.

You've probably heard of the Epstein files. There's no escaping it. Without any speculation or uncertainty about the content of those files, the following is certain.

There is a globally organized, malevolent elite. At the top of this elite are at least some of the families who own the central banks, which have seized the right worldwide to create money out of thin air. They are the ones who lend this money to governments at interest and enrich themselves at the expense of the taxpayer.

Mr. Epstein plays an important role in this network. He is the bankers' agent and also a very important person at the Trilateral Commission, which has also been created by the Rockefellers, a banking family.

Mr. Epstein is a self-proclaimed transhumanist: someone who has no respect for the divine creation of man, unless they belong to the wealthy nobility.

At the behest of his superiors, Epstein is shaping the transhuman agenda, which is largely driven by the desire to eradicate a large proportion of the world population.

This transhuman agenda is a key component of the Great Reset agenda, of which the respondents are executors.

As early as 2011, Mr. Epstein, at [Bill] Gates's behest, advocated a financial model to profit from vaccines at the largest American bank, JP Morgan Chase.

You should know that a few years earlier, the WHO [World Health Organization] had changed the definition of a pandemic so that on June 11, 2009, it could declare the fake swine flu pandemic, also known as the Mexican flu.

You should also know that the WHO was founded after World War II and from the 1970s, due to the lack of real pandemics, has been increasingly funded by private parties.

Private parties don't just donate money, but they do so to make money. Gates, with his Gates Foundation, excels above all others as the WHO's largest private funder.

Neither at the [JP Morgan Chase] bank, nor at Gates Foundation, have Epstein's well-known conviction for the sexual abuse of minors encountered any objection to allowing Epstein's mediating role.

This entire financial model, with a donor-advised fund, offshore structures, and a bank’s hedge fund to invisibly pocket profits, was set up well before the rollout of the planned and fake COVID-19 crisis.

Of course, no doctor was involved in this, because the bankers, Gates, and all the other participants were not concerned with health at all.

The World Bank Group, for which our Queen Maxima is a top advocate in the area of financial health, inclusion and economic development, also played an important role.

The trigger mechanism in the complicated and shady financial construct was the number of "PCR deaths," which now makes you understand why the defendants, as executors of the COVID-19 project, pushed through the PCR test.

The planned COVID-19 crisis, including sufficient "PCR deaths," was a prerequisite for making the planned financial gain possible and therefore did not come about by chance.

The Epstein files prove that the superiors of Epstein have the global institutions that are supposed to enforce law and order, under their control.

Whichever way you look at it, Gates is part of this network and plays a crucial role when it comes to making money from so-called vaccines.

This aligns seamlessly with Gates's own statement in a 2010 TED Talk[6] that with new vaccines, healthcare and reproductive health services — read: abortion and sterilization — a reduction in the world population of 10 to 15% can be achieved.

It's shocking, but equally understandable, that none of the defendants in this case have any criticism of Gates. Apparently, they are all vulnerable and cannot afford any criticism.

Now, these Epstein files—approximately 3.5 million of the more than 5 million pages with many black lines—have been released.

And these files testify to the involvement of bankers, secret services, media, Hollywood figures, government officials, universities, and also many so-called scientists who are all corruptly connected in this network and are at the service of this transhuman, let's be frank, satanic, ideology.

[37:30]

A side note

The State [of the Netherlands], in its statement of defense in the main proceedings, indeed a completely separate procedure with other plaintiffs. However, the State writes the following:

> The State wishes to emphasize that the consequences of the theories formulated in the summons are not innocent.
>
> The narrative used with these theories of an evil elite targeting the population could ultimately have an undermining effect on about the democratic rule of law.
>
> It already provides a group of people with legitimacy for online hate speech, death threats, and worse.

It is now common knowledge that the Dutch State is lying.

After all, the democratic rule of law is being undermined by a malicious elite that is targeting the population. The Epstein files prove that.

And defendants' denial of the existence of such a malicious elite, is undermining the very functioning of a democratic rule of law.

These kinds of blatant lies from defendants are completely in violation of the duty to tell the truth under Article 21 of the Code of Civil Procedure, and the court of first instance [Leeuwarden District Court] was completely misled.

There is no doubt whatsoever that fundamental norms were violated.

[6] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JaF-fq2Zn7I - "Innovating to Zero!"

Back to the Epstein files. A few critical observations are appropriate here.

1. The members of this now partially-revealed elite network are not prosecuted.

2. The members of this elite network are adhering to the mafia code of silence and deny everything of material significance.

3. Citizens are not receiving all the information regarding the elite network.

4. The information released at the individual level about the members of this network is always too meager to draw any truly bitter legal conclusions regarding that individual person when it comes to what's called Pizzagate. If you don't know what that is, you should look it up, because you should know.

5. These Epstein files will therefore have a major psychological impact on the world's population. It will be a great disappointment to them that little to no action is taken against this elite and their accomplices.

6. This action is already leading to further demoralization, which, on closer inspection, must also be the intention of this evil elite. Otherwise, the full package of information would have been released, and hundreds, if not thousands, of arrests would have already been made.

7. This planned demoralization of the world's population is already accompanied by a further erosion of trust in institutions. It cannot be otherwise.

8. This is already diminishing many people's resistance to the idea of democratically legitimizing the replacement of existing institutions with new ones.

9. And this brings me to the point of what the Epstein files really are. It's a psychological operation to further facilitate the Great Reset.

10. The [appellants'] argument is that if the judge in first instance [Leeuwarden District Court, Aug. 20, 2025 order] had been aware of these facts and circumstances, they would have recognized the importance of the honest experts whom my clients presented and would have granted that request.

11. You, as judges, cannot ignore this reality.

I already noted that not everything that is considered common knowledge is actually true.

The truth must be investigated, and it is your primary duty as judges to establish the true facts and circumstances in order to reach a balanced judgment.

This is no different in your assessment of the admissibility of this appeal.

And it is my duty to provide you with the facts for this purpose.

The Roman law adage "Da mihi factum, dabo tibi ius," meaning "give me the facts and I will give you the law," also applies to assessing the admissibility of this appeal.

This implies that in a legal case it is up to the parties to state and prove the facts and thus to define the dispute about which the court is to judge.

You must therefore consider the facts I present to you in your judgment.

The expert evidence and its significance

The context of the request should have dawned on you by now.

Now I come to the in-depth explanation necessary to let you know the true facts, which is essential for a fair trial.

The true facts are essentially nothing more than what I have loudly and clearly presented in the first instance.

We are witnessing the largest genocide of the world's population that has ever occurred.

This is a key component of the COVID-19 agenda, of which the respondents are the executors.

To delve deeper, you need the findings of genuine experts who are independent from those implementing the COVID-19 Great Reset agenda.

All suggestions from the defendants regarding the person [motives, credentials, relevance] of the experts my clients are putting forward should be immediately discarded.

Given the context of this case, there is no other way.

In this case and in this context, you cannot ignore the findings of the experts presented by my clients.

Their motive is clearly not money, not fame, not power, but love of the truth.

Truth is the driving force and the research field of the true scientist.

A number of them have come to this courtroom today at their own expense. And you would be wise to ask them questions if anything about the video messages and reports they sent you is unclear.

Of course, I assume you've read those reports and watched the videos, but I'd like to explain some important elements to you.

Joseph Sansone's statement [44:38]

I'll start with Joseph Sansone's statement.

It's based on the sworn affidavit of what late Professor Dr. Francis Boyle has established and concluded. Professor Boyle is the leading authority in the field of bioweapons legislation. He is the author of it. So he knows what that legally means.

He knew better than anyone that the COVID-19 mRNA injection is a bioweapon.

He made that clear to the world, after which he died, despite being in good health, shortly after declaring himself willing to testify about this before the court in Leeuwarden under oath.

The core of Professor Boyle's argument is that the COVID-19 mRNA injections contain derivatives of illegal military gain-of-function research.

This means that the COVID-19 injections qualify by definition as a military biological weapon system. A bioweapon, in other words. This bioweapon consists of two integrated components: the pathogenic payload and the delivery mechanism.

The pathogenic payload is undoubtedly the product of illegal gain-of-function research. Boyle refers to an article in the scientific journal Nature Medicine[7], the link of which I have included in this plea note.

If you open that link, you will immediately read the warning that true scientists "believe" that an animal is the most likely source of the coronavirus.

You know immediately now that what is called in the new normal "true scientists" are not scientists, but religious fanatics. These are the scientists that the respondents are hiding behind.

The article in Nature Medicine about which Boyle reports was published in 2015 and the title, translated, is: "A cluster of circulating coronaviruses in bats similar to SARS shows potential for infection in humans."

I present to you what the summary of this research included in the article teaches us.

It says, "Based on these findings, we have synthetically developed an infectious fully SHC014-recombinant virus and demonstrated robust viral replication both in vitro and in vivo."

So, it says, we researchers have created a SARS-like coronavirus with a spike protein optimized for human infection. I can't think of a better example of illegal gain-of-function research.

And who wrote that 2015 article? These include researchers affiliated with UNC [University of North Carolina] Chapel Hill and the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

[7] https://www.nature.com/articles/nm.3985 - "A SARS-like cluster of circulating bat coronaviruses shows potential for human emergence" Baric, Menachery et al, 2015.

Wuhan. Yes, Wuhan! You know, where, according to the official narrative, people just dropped dead in the streets when COVID-19 broke out because a bat had mutated there.

The spike protein, the pathogenic load of the bioweapon, is the result of this research.

So it's not about a natural spike protein, but an illegally developed, synthetic pathogen that has been optimized for human infection.

The spike protein mRNA, which instructs human cells to produce this very pathogenic spike protein, is one of the two crucial building blocks of the COVID-19 bioweapon.

Now the delivery system, the NLPs [LNPs], you know, the nanolipid particles [lipid nanoparticles] that encapsulate the mRNA payload and deliver it to the interior of the cells. The propaganda term for this is fat globules. As if we're talking about something as innocent as a stick of butter. What did Boyle explain about that?

Boyle explained that it's actually a nanotechnology-enhanced delivery platform. This technology, as Boyle explained, was paid for, developed, funded, and conceived by the Pentagon and its research institute, DARPA.

This technology platform, nanotechnology platform, was not a side issue.

Dr. Boyle points out that the virus itself was aerosolized and processed with nanotechnology from the very beginning.

This indicates a long-term program aimed at applying advanced delivery systems.

And this technology was used in the COVID-19 injections.

Boyle determined that the NLP delivery system in the injections is the result of a specific military-sponsored nanotechnological biological weapons program.

You can read more about the legal implications of this in Sansone's explanation.

Here, it is also substantiated that Gates and Bourla qualify as suspects of crimes against humanity, as defined in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

Sasha Latypova statement [50:50]

I will also explain Sasha Latypova's statement. Sasha Latypova has a very impressive resume that demonstrates that she is uniquely familiar with the procedures and formal requirements of drug development. That resume is part of the court documents in this case.

Latypova teaches you that the technology used in COVID-19 mRNA injections is officially recognized as a dual-use technology.

This involves technology that can be used for medical applications, but is also highly suitable for creating a bioweapon.

She teaches you that as early as 1997, US defense advisors, the JASON Group, qualified gene therapy platforms based on mRNA and NLPs as technology that could be deployed as a bioweapon.

Latypova explains that even fragmented RNA disrupts the host's gene expression, even without coding for specific proteins. The officially-permitted amount of DNA scrap in COVID-19 mRNA injections is therefore particularly worrisome.

Latypova also teaches us that COVID-19 was not a public health incident, but a covert global military operation.

A national emergency was declared in the United States on February 4, 2020 under the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act, the PREP Act.

The PREP Act provides for a national emergency for a military, chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear emergency.

This national emergency was declared in the US on February 4, 2020, and will remain in effect at least until December 31, 2029.

Similar emergency laws were enacted in the European Union.

EU officials and other government agencies concluded predatory COVID-19 injection contracts with Pfizer and other manufacturers. And thus all consumer safety regulations and import and export laws were circumvented.

The key relevant statements and timeline regarding the course of events in the European Union and the Netherlands, are described in detail in Latypova's documents.

And I have submitted those documents as an appendix to the appeal.

All COVID-19 mRNA injections that were promoted as "safe and effective vaccines" were ordered and financed by the US Department of Defense as prototypes and demonstrations of large-scale production.

The US Department of Defense and NATO oversaw the development, production, and worldwide distribution of all so-called COVID-19 countermeasures.

The COVID-19 injections came onto the market in December 2020 as emergency use authorization [EUA] countermeasures: countermeasures that are permitted in an emergency situation.

These regulations have nothing to do with the usual regulations for pharmaceutical products.

When a product is designated as a countermeasure, all laws and regulations regarding consumer safety, including manufacturer liability, are void.

This category of products may only be distributed in the event of a declared biochemical or nuclear war, or terrorist emergency.

The emergency use authorization procedure for countermeasures may only be used in the United States if the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services declares an emergency based on advice from the Food and Drug Administration, whose counterpart in Europe is the EMA.

Section 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, FD&C Act, exempts countermeasures from pharmaceutical regulations and informed consent requirements. This will last as long as the state of emergency is in effect, which means in the United States at least until December 31, 2029.

But you see, exactly the same thing is happening here in the Netherlands. On the day my appeal was filed [Sept. 15, 2025], a new COVID-19 injection campaign started, for which people were called en masse.

Under this legal emergency status, compliance with pharmaceutical legislation is voluntary and unenforceable. This effectively creates a lawless situation.

Latypova hereby reminds you that misleading representations about the safety, efficacy, or content of products with an emergency use authorization are permitted under US federal law.

Similar exceptions to the law have been invoked in EU member states.

Please refer to the EU Regulation on Emergency Use 2016-369.

There, the European Commission allows the complete suspension of current good manufacturing practice, the cGMP, standards during a declared emergency.

This suspension actually takes place in Europe through supply agreements with pharmaceutical companies. Pharmaceutical companies, including Pfizer, are fully indemnified against injuries and deaths resulting from an unsafe product, except in the case of very narrowly defined intentional misconduct.

The European supply contracts are not coincidentally comparable to the provisions on this point in the American PREP Act.

The global recognition agreement, or the mutual recognition agreement [MRA], I should say, between the EMA and the FDA, which has been in effect since July 2019, allows qualified persons in the EU to blindly accept American batch data.

Therefore, claims by EU health authorities of the EU states or manufacturers cannot be considered reliable sources of information.

Latypova also explains in her contribution that although the FDA granted a biologics licensing approval, BLA, to Pfizer's mRNA COVID-19 injection in August 2021, this violated US biologics licensing laws and international laws on clinical trials on humans.

The COVID-19 mRNA injections that came onto the market through the non-research EUA emergency use authorization procedure cannot formally obtain a BLA license without first demonstrating that these injections fully meet the research standards for a BLA license.

Yet, the legally impossible has happened, which demonstrates the extent of corruption among the highest and most powerful regulators. The license has indeed been granted. And a formal citizen petition from Children's Health Defense to revoke the BLA license and relabel Pfizer's product as emergency use authorization is currently being processed by the FDA.

This is all very serious.

Latypova concludes that the defendants misleadingly promoted the COVID-19 injections, under a false drug label, as safe prophylactic vaccines against COVID-19.

The emergency permit I was talking about, the emergency use authorization, and the associated legislation in the field of public health, served as a convincing cover, a legal theater, while the legislation regarding chemical and biological warfare and the associated emergency exemptions was and remains the actual operating regime.

Latypova establishes that the Dutch government and agencies based their decisions on the regulatory information and decisions of the FDA and were therefore aware of the ins and outs. The intentionality of their unlawful conduct is thus established.

[Three other expert statements]

I will briefly comment on the statements of the other experts.

I cannot leave undiscussed the expert opinions of Katherine Watt, Mike Yeadon, and Catherine Austin Fitts. Given my speaking time and the lengthy lead-up that I have taken to reach your awareness, I am compelled to explain their equally important statements even more concisely.

Katherine Watt teaches you that everyone who has received a vaccination, regardless of the type, has been poisoned. Injecting foreign substances, which are found in all vaccines, into the bloodstream, is by definition toxic, making people susceptible to allergies, cancer, and autoimmune diseases.

She describes all the laws and regulations in this regard, and her conclusion makes it clear that we are being massively defrauded by the law and regulatory bodies in the field of medicines, and in particular by the pharmaceutical companies that produce and sell vaccines.

Mike Yeadon, a renowned scientist who held a senior position at Pfizer, is the most qualified person in the world to understand the design of a medical product. And he has seen the building blocks of the COVID-19 bioweapon for what they are.

His explanation of the malicious specific design of the COVID-19 mRNA injections leaves nothing of clarity to be desired.

Catherine Austin Fitts, a former high-ranking advisor to the Bush Sr. administration and insider in the banking system, has explained to you in no uncertain terms how the global economic and political playing field is dominated by a collaboration of criminals she refers to as Mr. Global. She places the COVID-19 injections within that reality.

The statements of all my clients' experts contribute to the evidence that the official narrative of the defendants is malicious and false and that the defendants in these proceedings, as a group, acting as executors of the COVID-19 Project: The Great Reset, are deliberately acting unlawfully.

[Conclusion]

I will conclude.

Article 21 of the Code of Civil Procedure[8] stipulates that the parties are obligated to present the facts relevant to the decision fully and truthfully.

Everything you know now shows that the defendants in the first instance have violated the duty of truth from Article 21 with no other purpose than to conceal the truth, so that the crimes against humanity can continue unhindered.

The most fundamental standard of a fair trial has thus been violated by them.

This undoubtedly justifies a very extensive examination of the admissibility of this appeal as a means to circumvent the prohibition of legal remedies.

Thank you.

[1:04:17]

Presiding Judge Bom

Yes, thank you, Mr. Stassen. Good, you stayed well within the time limit. Fine. Despite the annoying interruptions. I understand from the presence that it's still quite manageable [to hear] in the back. Oh, I get a thumbs up. Great. Yes, we've scheduled a break now. I also think that's a good thing for a while. It's scheduled until 1 o'clock...

We'll meet back here shortly at 1 o'clock, for the first statement of the respondent, where they can also respond to the first statement of the appellants. See you soon.

-BREAK-

[8] Article 21, Dutch Code of Civil Procedure - "The parties must make a full and truthful presentation of the facts that are relevant to the decision in the matter. In the event of non-compliance, the court may draw any adverse inferences it considers appropriate."

Presiding Judge Bom [1:05:00]

Welcome back everyone. Yes, those are original ones, actually, but everyone has found a place again.

Before going to the respondent's side, uh, I realized that, Mr. Stassen somewhere in the beginning of your argument, I forgot to ask who sat next to you. That's definitely Mrs. Manubulu, I assume. Welcome. And then it's either Mr. Bos or Mr. Staamer. Mr. Bos, welcome.

And no one else showed up on the respondent's side, not even digitally, because I occasionally looked at the screen. I didn't see anyone calling in.

Unknown speaker

There was a representative from Pfizer calling in. Although we...

Presiding Judge Bom

Yes, Ms. [Connie Ann] Matteo [Senior Corporate Counsel, Pfizer]

Okay. I see her in and out every now and then.

Unknown speaker

Yes, she let us know by email that sometimes it's not possible to stay in the loop.

Presiding Judge Bom

Well, maybe I can comment on that. Look, Pfizer is not a party to this procedure, so I wouldn't know why a Pfizer representative should participate in this case.

Unknown speaker

Ms. Matteo is someone on behalf of Mr. Bourla.

Presiding Judge Bom

Okay, that's different. Yes, the speaker has the microphone open, so we're hearing the speaker now. Ms. Djamila Le Pair.

And now I see at the bottom of the screen Ms. [Agnes] Kant is present as one of the parties. Welcome.

Good. Then we come to the respondents' first statements. Do you have a thought of order among yourselves or shall we just start with respondents 1 through, what is it, 11 and 16 [State of Netherlands and individual government defendants]?

So, Mr. Veldhuis, Ms. Möhring.

[Discussion of distribution of prepared statement omitted]

Ms. Möhring, attorney for State of Netherlands and government defendants.

Honorable college, Madam Clerk.

The disease COVID-19 exists. There has been a pandemic, and the vaccines against COVID-19 are safe and effective.

[Laughter among observers in the courtroom]

Presiding Judge Bom

Wait a minute, wait a minute. Just now with Mr. Stassen, it was also quiet in the room. I want that to be the case when the respondent's lawyers are speaking.

So if you would like to talk to each other, laugh, or make comments with each other, you are welcome in the room next door, but not in this room.

Ms. Möhring

That is the global scientific consensus supported by many independent and impartial experts.

It is clear that the applicants have a theory about COVID-19 that directly contradicts this.

However, that is not what we are discussing today.

Everything my esteemed opponent has just put forward is therefore also irrelevant today.

These proceedings before the court concern only the question of whether the applicants are permitted to submit questions to certain individuals through the court.

Such as the question, are the COVID-19 vaccines a bioweapon used to commit genocide?

These questions are already clear in advance as to how these individuals, chosen by the applicants themselves, will answer them.

The court rightly rejected that request for several independent reasons.

The court has determined, among other things, that the request is contrary to the legislature's intention, that hearing these individuals is not the appropriate means, that the applicants have no interest in their request, and that the request violates due process.

And even that judgment is not even the issue here today.

Today, the only question is whether the applicants can appeal the court's ruling.

And the answer to that question is no.

Appeal against a decision like the district court's is prohibited by law. There is a prohibition on legal remedies.

And that would have been different if the court had granted leave for this appeal. But the applicants did not request this, and leave was not granted.

The only option the applicants then have to appeal is to invoke a ground for breaking through [the ban on appeal].

This requires that the proceedings before the court have violated such fundamental legal principles that a fair and impartial hearing of the case can no longer be said to have been conducted.

A high threshold, therefore, which is completely unmet in this case.

None of the applicants' arguments justify the conclusion that the court's handling of this case was not fair and impartial.

The State has already explained this in its statement of defense and will not repeat it here.

Then, outside the pleadings. Regarding the aforementioned new facts (novum) [new developments, Epstein files], it does not constitute grounds for breaking the ban on appeal.

Moreover, the applicants have not explained why the new developments would lead to the conclusion that the court violated a fundamental legal principle that would make it impossible to speak of a fair and impartial handling of the case.

In the [Aug. 20, 2025] ruling, which was undoubtedly rendered within a reasonable time and after a public hearing, the court assessed the relevant positions of the parties based on the statutory assessment framework.

And that resulted in the request [for provisional evidence proceedings] being denied.

And the applicants clearly disagree with this. But that, of course, does not constitute grounds for appeal.

The applicants' appeal must therefore be declared inadmissible. Or at the very least, the appeal must be dismissed. Thank you.

Presiding Judge Bom

Thank you, Ms. Möhring. That was also your immediate response to the first round of Mr. Stassen? Okay.

Then Ms. Roessingh or Ms. Bredenoord on behalf of Mr. Bourla?

Ms. Roessingh and/or Ms. Bredenoord

We have nothing to add to this. No additions.

Presiding Judge Bom

Okay. Then, Mr. Heemskerk or Ms. Mulder [on behalf of William Gates]

Mr. Heemskerk and/or Ms. Mulder

We also have nothing to add...

Presiding Judge Bom

Okay, because you don't have a microphone, I'll repeat it. You say you have nothing to add, and we refer to the court's judgment.

Mr. Ekker? [on behalf of Agnes Kant]

Mr. Ekker

Oh yes. My client has nothing to add either.

Presiding Judge Bom

And then Ms. Bekema and Mr. Lichtendahl [on behalf of Giselle van Cann and Paul Jansen]

Ms. Bekema and Mr. Lichtendahl

Everyone also agrees with Ms. Möhring's argument.

Presiding Judge Bom

Okay. Well, in terms of scheduling the hearing, it's going pretty smoothly. We had an hour for this. Let's get to the court's questions.

Yes, Mr. Stassen, perhaps the first point that Ms. Möhring also touched upon in her plea note. Is it true that no leave was requested [from the Leeuwarden district court] to file an appeal?

Peter Stassen [1:13:42]

I appreciate you asking that. And I'll explain why that's true and why that is the case.

I started a case in the first instance of which the legislature says you can't [appeal] unless there is abuse of the law. Which is clearly not the case. A request to a judge to open a case to appeal where legal remedies are prohibited is, of course, a huge declaration of weakness. Because why would you ask that? That's definitely a signal that you expect that the judge will reject the request for which there was no reason.

And I think that's also why my esteemed opposing counsel constantly insists, "yes, you should have had asked that," or "you could have asked." I don't have to ask. The law doesn't require me to ask either. The judge has discretionary power to either open it for appeal or not.

And of course, it wasn't my place to ask that. It was the opposing parties' place to ask that. Because they had the weak case. They had the weak case. So I think it's a bit of a rhetorical reversal to keep putting that on me. Why didn't you ask? It would have made much more sense if the State had asked for it. That's my answer.

Presiding Judge Bom

Okay. But it's true that you didn't ask, and this is the reasoning behind your decision.

Peter Stassen

Right.

Presiding Judge Bom

Okay. Yes, go ahead.

Judge Hofmeijer [1:15:14]

[Microphone malfunctions]

Requests can also be made after the decision to... In principle, it can also be made after the decision to not do it....Look, the question of persistence. These types of requests can, in principle, also be made after the decision [has been issued by the court]. A request to open an interlocutory appeal, or an "interlocutory appeal" between quotation marks.

Did you consider that at the time?

Peter Stassen

I just read the law, of course, and the law is actually very clear. The judge can determine in the ruling whether there is the possibility to appeal. Yes.

And in my opinion, the basic principle is that once a ruling has been rendered, it's over.

After the hearings, the case is in a state of trial, and then a ruling will be issued, and then we cannot plead again.

Judge Hofmeijer

Just a moment. I'll interrupt you for a moment. Articles 31 and 32 of the Code of Civil Procedure, of course, deal with that. If there's a point that hasn't been decided on, which was expected to be decided upon, or if a mistake was made, then that can still be raised after the verdict.

Peter Stassen

Yes, that's right. There are all sorts of ways to correct errors or typographical errors, but I don't think those regulations apply to what this judge clearly stated in her finding, that no appeal is permitted.

Judge Hofmeijer

Okay. So you assumed that that was not an omission, and that's why you didn't ask.

Peter Stassen

Right, that's what I assumed. Yes, that's perfectly clear.

Presiding Judge Bom

The other [main] case, which you're saying, it's not at all the intention [of petitioners in second case] to join that. That was one of the considerations of the [Leeuwarden] court, we have read.

To the extent relevant, what is the current state of affairs there? Is there still a possibility of [second case petitioners] joining [the main case], or is that out of the question in your opinion? Can you tell us something about that?

Peter Stassen

Well, it's out of the question to the extent my clients do not wish to do anything with that procedure. They want their own procedure.

The [main] case is scheduled for October 22 next for a joint hearing of the parties, where I am receiving signals from the court that they want to handle this very briefly, to which I will also raise the necessary objections.

So yes, it's not obvious to connect with that case.

That is the status. The first oral hearing takes place [October 22], and then the [main case] court will decide whether they consider themselves able to appoint a final or interim decision, or, well, we'll see about that. Yes, of course.

Presiding Judge Bom

Yes. And so, what you're saying, is that it's your clients' explicit wish not to be joined onto that [main case].

Peter Stassen

Yes.

Presiding Judge Bom

But also not yet initiate your own procedure. What's holding you back?

Peter Stassen

A lot of things. Look, we live, and that's also been part of my pleadings, in a preferred reality where, what are called "true scientists," which I told you are not scientists, those are religious fanatics, are in charge.

And I've described the Epstein network to you. I've shown you that there is an evil elite, and of course, I've extensively stated in the court documents that there is also a global project, COVID-19: The Great Reset.

And in that project, a completely preferred reality is created, a lie.

And that's where we live. Unless you escape it, but most people live in it, in that lie, in that preferred reality.

A term that, by the way, didn't come from me, but from an ex-major, a [Netherlands Marine] Major General named [Frank] van Kappen.

He said: "We live in a preferred reality. Telefast reality." [April 2018 televised interview].

In that deceitful reality, scientists are deeply involved. They are connected in it with money, they are they connected to it with other agreements, with subsidies.

And that's actually a closed circuit. Those are closed ranks. And as long as you can't really offer a platform to any of the scientists who aren't in that circuit, before a judge under oath in a public trial, you keep waving with, "Yes, I have here, and what I've presented to you are really very serious experts."

But you will not get them recognized as long as they're not before a judge and also in a legal debate, and you see, there's no debate here, because these people [defendants] don't want a debate.

But as long as you don't, at least with the opportunity for a hearing of both sides, have this judicially established as their sworn statement, and a serious judge also asks serious questions about it in the context of such an expert examination, only then will you have evidentiary value for those expert statements, legally speaking, that you can make a difference with them procedurally.

Otherwise we'll always be stuck here, talking about this, "it's irrelevant," and "consensus" and that's all familiar jargon, of course.

Because that consensus is, of course, a very wrong idea. In science, it's not about consensus. It's about the quality of the research.

And if 1000 scientists agree with each other that something incorrect is actually correct, then that still doesn't make it good scientific research.

So I have called that "scientific consensus" a "monstrosity"[9] because science isn't consensus at all. There's no consensual aspect. It's about the quality of the research, and we have to get through that.

And I really don't see how I could achieve that for my clients if there isn't finally a judge who allows it. And that's also a necessity. So that's the reason why.

[9] July 9, 2025 hearing, Leeuwarden District Court, Second Case, Transcript at p. 17. https://bailiwicknewsarchives.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/2025.07.09-second-case-transcript-hearing-on-request-for-provisional-evidence-proceedings-english.pdf. Stassen: "...'Scientific consensus' is, in itself, a monstrosity of an expression. Consensus does not make something true or false. In science there is always room for debate and only provisional truths exist..."

Presiding Judge Bom

Yes. Yes. Clear. Yes. And you've outlined the context that's very important to you in detail there. I have no further questions about that. I'll just check with my colleagues to see if they have any questions. No questions, any questions?

Judge Hofmeijer

Well, maybe one question.

Is there a similar procedure pending in any foreign country? I see behind you nodding. You can't see that.

Peter Stassen

The question is always: what is similar?

Judge Hofmeijer

Where this same issue is at stake.

Peter Stassen

I haven't seen such litigation myself. This procedure [appeal in second case] is precisely about the expert testimony.

Did you mean this one [second case], or did you mean the main proceedings?

Judge Hofmeijer

Both.

Peter Stassen

The main proceedings is the separate other case. I personally am not aware of a case that, in the context of COVID-19: The Great Reset, that addresses a group liability civil case in the form of personal tort [wrongful acts], by these kinds of executors of COVID-19: The Great Reset.

I know of no other cases.

Judge Hofmeijer

And indeed, one where the expert side is presented before a judge?

Peter Stassen

I haven't seen that myself.

Presiding Judge Mark Bom

Okay. We had planned a break, but that would be very shortly after lunch break. So I propose that we now start the second round.

Is that okay with you, Mr. Stassen, or did you still need a short break?

Peter Stassen

I think it will work out. I'll organize my thoughts in the time I have here.

Presiding Judge Bom

Then I'd like to give you the floor. We had planned for fifteen minutes. Well, if you should go a bit over, then, considering our lead in the schedule, I won't make too much of a fuss about it, but you'll understand that it has to stay somewhat within limits. Go ahead.

Peter Stassen [1:23:39]

I started by saying that this is a matter of global importance, and it truly is. And the ease with which my honorable opponents dismiss this is really inappropriate.

Imagine, I have laid down the evidence that the COVID-19 injections are a bioweapon, not just with any parties, but I submitted it, among others, to the States of the Netherlands, of which, at least most of us here, are citizens and who should be protected by the State.

When filing the appeal, I also requested an interim injunction. Nothing happened with that either. I did that because the COVID-19 injection campaign also started the day I filed the appeal and I included reports from Latypova and Katherine Watt.

And the State has received all that, and all the OMT [Outbreak Management Team] members, defendants, and press have that too.

And they did nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Except for continuing with the project COVID-19: Great Reset and ignoring all this.

Because that is what they are. They are the executors of that project and are not allowed to go back.

Looking at the hearing here today, we are essentially seeing an application of the mafia code of silence. What I've told you is very relevant information.

Any self-respecting government that cares about its citizens would immediately enter into a debate with these experts to see what's going on.

But what's happening here?

They deploy an army of lawyers to prevent that from happening. You should see that signal!

And if I look at it procedurally, I actually see no defense at all against the context I've provided.

The defense statements contain essentially nothing.

Just as little as what is being argued here today.

We simply see a fearful attempt by the defendants to keep a debate closed. And I also started the hearing by saying to you: "This, the oral proceedings should not be closed."

You should instruct all these parties to explain their positions.

How it is still possible that they maintain the position that there is no evil elite?

There are currently debates in the European Parliament, which is simply what is being discussed there. How can the State not know that this is the case?

While everything is on the table, millions of pages, from which I extracted.

The same applies to findings I presented to what Professor Homburg from Germany establishes [RKI Krisenstabs meeting minutes]. It's not normal that this is still being denied.

And in that context, what's happening here is absolutely scandalous.

But I do want to bring you back.

I have also said: "I think it's important that I penetrate your consciousness."

The State has not disputed, and neither have any of the defendants, that the WHO declared that COVID was nothing more than a mild flu.

Then I ask you: how can that lead to a global crisis?

Why did [EU President Ursula] von der Leyen call for trusting only the WHO and not accepting disinformation?

Did the WHO have to introduce intensive care protocols for this, requiring people to lie on their stomachs and be intubated and then die, because no one could endure that?

Did people have to die in loneliness for this, for that mild flu?

Did funerals have to be held with a maximum number of visitors for that mild flu?

Were people hidden away for a mild flu?

Did elderly people have to sit in a glass cage for a mild flu?

Did schools had to be closed for that mild flu?

And did they really have to be given gene therapy for a mild flu?

LNPs what I explained to you, nanolipid particles, a bioweapon, did that really have to be injected into everyone for a mild flu?

You can no longer dismiss this criminal madness!

You can also see that the defendants make all of this possible. They allow everything and participate in it.

The government does not protect the citizens from anything. On the contrary.

I also told you that Dr. Boyle died, but in all likelihood, he was murdered. In the Covid file, many experts and doctors who spoke out were silenced.

Why is Reiner Fuellmich in prison? He only wanted to expose the truth. The [German] secret service didn't think that was a good idea. That's clear from the file. He had to be arrested.

Anyone who stands up for the truth is met with an army of lawyers or worse.

I already mentioned the ruling in the Verwaltungsgericht [German Administrative Court]. Those judges didn't participate. I hope you'll take that as an example.

Very recently, perhaps you haven't noticed, there's also a Dr. [Ron] Elfenbein in the US, a physician specializing in emergency medicine, who was nationally known in the US for his criticism of COVID-19 policy during the Biden administration.

In 2022, they charged that man, who was simply doing his job, for fraud in accounting. But of course, that was completely pointless. This too was an attempt to silence somebody who was telling the truth and just wanted to do his job, to shut him down. And the jury also convicted that doctor. So he was simply convicted by a jury.

But there was a judge and that was a real judge. That was James K. Bredar. Bredar, I should say, from the US District Court. And that judge wrote a 93-page verdict[10] himself, based on his own research.

And he acquitted this emergency doctor on all charges because he established that the burden of proof was not met. You have to meet a certain burden of proof to be able to formulate a charge. He simply concluded that hadn't been met, and no reasonable jury could have reached this verdict.

So there are judges who do take action. And I hope you are one of them.

And if you're really wondering who the good guys are and who the bad guys are, despite all the facts I've presented to you, then I'd like to refer you to 1 John 3:10 of the New Testament. And that's very clear. And it says:

> "By this we can recognize the children of God and the children of the devil. Everyone who does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor is he who does not love his brother."

And here on this side, no justice is being done in the defense they are putting forward.

These experts should have been embraced because they love the truth.

And then you must decide for yourself who are the children of God here and who are the children of the devil.

[10] Dec. 21, 2023, James K. Bredar Memorandum as to Ron Elfenbein, setting aside jury's guilty verdicts, vacating sentencing. USDC, District of Maryland, Case No. 1:22-cr-00146-JKB

Let me conclude with how I initiated the summons in the main proceedings. I have given the defendants and also the respondents in these proceedings, who are the same parties, the opportunity to admit liability, so that all of this we are experiencing now doesn't have to happen.

A legal recognition is, in a moral sense, a conversion.

And that's what we really need. A conversion of the parties who don't even dare come here today, hiding behind black robes.

They should repent.

And my clients even understand that these are people too, and that they find themselves caught in a malicious field of forces. I've described that to you.

But they don't understand that all this continues and that this malicious project COVID-19: The Great Reset, continues before our very eyes, with all its consequences.

So my appeal to the respondents is as follows.

Declare that you support this appeal and make a fresh start, with which everyone can move forward. Because I predict this Great Reset won't succeed for you. And the truth will come out one way or another, and then you will face a very tough time.

Thank you for your attention.

Presiding Judge Bosch
[1:33:00]

Thank you, Mr. Stassen.

I'll come to you both [appellants Mr. Bos and Ms. Manubulu], because ultimately, this case is about both of you. And there was a lot of legal talk today, of course, whether you can appeal or not. But there are also people behind the case who have initiated it. That's both of you. Is there anything else you'd like to add to the whole story? I'm looking at both of you. If you would like to, then go ahead.

Mr Bos and/or Ms. Manubulu

Everything said by Mr. Stassen.

Presiding Judge Bosch

Fine. Then we'll start with the defendants for the second round. And then I'll just go through the same process.

Mr. Veldhuis, Ms. Möhring.

Ms. Möhring

The State is content with a reference to the defense statement in the pleadings. Thank you.

Presiding Judge Bosch

Okay. Shall I go all the way around, or is it okay if you raise hands if you want to say something? You're all referring to the defense statements and Ms. Möhring's argument. Yes? Okay.

On the respondents' side we already established that on behalf of Mr. Bourla, Ms. [Connie] Matteo has called in, I'll just check the screen to see if she's still on his behalf.

Unknown speaker

She informed us that she has nothing to add.

Presiding Judge Bosch

Fine. And Ms. Kant was dialed in. We can see that on the screen now.

Agnes Kant

As well, I have nothing to add.

Presiding Judge Bosch

Nothing to add. Well, it's good that you were here, via digital means.

That brings us to the end of the session. I think we'll take a break for 10 minutes so we can take stock of whether everything has been discussed, or whether there are any loose ends or open questions.

And then we'll come back to you afterward to make further arrangements about the next steps. That will be a few minutes. We won't be here all afternoon.

I do suggest that you leave the room for a moment and then the usher will let you in for the conclusion of the session in about 10 to 15 minutes.

- BREAK -

Presiding Judge Bosch
[1:36:01]

Welcome back, everyone. Well, we've taken a moment to assess the situation.

There are no more questions, no open ends.

Your arguments, your positions are clear. And that brings us to the end of this hearing.

I still need to arrange with you on when you can expect our decision. We've already looked into that. That will be Thursday, April 9th at 2:00 PM.

And our proposal, then I'll just check with the lawyers, is that, after that decision has been made, that we send the decision by email that afternoon. Is that agreeable for you? Yes, I see everyone nodding.

Peter Stassen

I would like to point out that I have clearly stated that I think you should not close the hearing.

Presiding Judge Bom

No, that's the next point.

This was the decision that will be issued on April 9th at 2:00 PM, and it will be emailed to the lawyers.

Then your point of order regarding the oral proceedings. Yes, I already said something about that this morning. At this time, the court sees no reason not to close the oral proceedings.

This is also because, if we in chambers come to a different understanding, the oral hearing can also be reopened. So that brings me to the end, and I hereby close the oral proceedings.

I thank you all for coming and your explanations, and I wish you all a pleasant afternoon and a safe journey home. Thank you.

- END -

Respondents/Defendants' Attorneys






Ms. Maartje Möhring and Mr. Reimer Veldhuis. Pels Rijcken law firm. Representing defendants State of the Netherlands, Everhard Hofstra, Jaap van Dissel, Marion Koopmans, Mark Rutte, Sigrid Kaag, Hugo de Jonge, Ernst Kuipers, Diederik Gommers, Wopke Hoekstra, Cora van Nieuwenhuizen, Feike Sijbesma.



Ms. Davine Roessingh, DeBrauw Blackstone Westbroek law firm. Representing defendant Albert Bourla.



Ms. Marieke Bredenoord-Spoek, DeBrauw Blackstone Westbroek law firm. Representing defendant Albert Bourla.



Mr. Pieter Lichtendahl, AC&R law firm. Representing defendants Giselle van Cann and Paul Jansen.



Ms. Anne Bekema, AC&R law firm. Representing defendants Giselle van Cann and Paul Jansen.



Mr. Anton Ekker, Ekker law firm. Representing defendant Agnes Kant.



Mr. Willem Heemskerk, Pels Rijcken law firm. Representing defendant William Gates.



Ms. Puck Mulder, Pels Rijcken law firm. Representing defendant William Gates.]



Ms. Connie Matteo, Pfizer Office of General Counsel. Assisting represention of Albert Bourla.