Stichting Recht Oprecht



Invitation to the (international) press

in connection with the lawsuits in Amsterdam and Leeuwarden against, among others, the State of the Netherlands, Mark Rutte, Bill Gates and Albert Bourla

Dear Sir, Dear Madam,

The Recht Oprecht Foundation (Stichting Recht Oprecht) invites you to a press conference.

– Date: Monday, March 9. 2026

– Time: The press conference will begin approximately 5:15 PM, one hour after the end of the hearing starting at 11:00 AM at the Amsterdam Court of Appeal (IJdok 20, 1013 MM Amsterdam) earlier that day. The distance between the Amsterdam Court of Appeal and the location of the press conference in the center of Amsterdam can easily be covered within this time interval. Naturally, we will take into account any delays or unexpected circumstances that could affect the planning.

The press conference will last as long as necessary or desirable to fully inform the attending press. This is at the discretion of the RechtOprecht Foundation as organizer of this press conference**.**

– Location: A private event venue in Amsterdam's city center with food and drinks. Information about the location of the venue will be provided in due course.

– Speakers: In addition to the lawyer Peter Stassen (advocaat) for the three appellants in the appeal proceedings, the nominated experts Michael Yeadon, Sasha Latypova, Katherine Watt, Catherine Austin Fitts and Joseph Sansone were invited to speak as guest speakers at this press conference.

– Registration: Registration for this press conference is open exclusively to journalists via email wen-ror@proton.me stating your name, a clear photo of your face, and the medium in which your journalistic work will be published. Your registration must be received by March 6, 2025. Your photo and data will only be used for registration and access control.

– Access: The RechtOprecht Foundation strives to provide all journalists with access to this press conference. Because this is a private event and the number of guests is limited due to the size of the venue, only journalists who have received written confirmation from the RechtOprecht Foundation will be admitted. Please bring a printout of the written confirmation.

Stichting Recht Oprecht



– Contribution: By conducting sound journalistic work and publishing it, you contribute to the control over governments and other authorities, which is essential for the existence and functioning of a democratic legal order.

– Reason: On March 9, 2026, at 11:30 a.m., the Court of Appeal in Amsterdam, located at IJdok 20, 1013 MM Amsterdam, will hear the appeal, case number 200.360.223/01, against the rejection of the request to hear experts Michael Yeadon, Sasha Latypova, Katherine Watt, Catherine Austin Fitts, and Joseph Sansone in the context of a preliminary expert report. This is a public hearing open to the public and the press.

The Court of Appeal has set the following agenda for the hearing.

11:00 AM:	Opening of the hearing
11:15 AM - 12:15 PM:	First statement by the appellants
12:15 PM - 1:00 PM:	Lunch break
1:00 PM - 2:00 PM:	First statement by the respondents (also response to the appellants' first statement)
2:00 PM - 2:45 PM:	Questions from the Court
2:45 PM - 3:15 PM:	Break
3:15 PM - 3:30 PM:	Second statement by the appellants
3:30 PM - 3:45 PM:	Opportunity for representatives of the appellants to address the court
3:45 PM - 4:00 PM:	Second statement by the respondents
3:00 PM - 4:15 PM:	Opportunity for representatives of the respondents to address the court
4:15 PM:	Closing of the hearing

The court will hold its hearings in its largest courtroom, which has 85 seats available for the public. A second courtroom (with 40 seats) will also be available for the public to follow the hearing via livestream.

All procedural documents relating to this case, as well as those relating to the substantive proceedings explained below, can be found on the website www.rechtoprecht.online of the Stichting RechtOprecht (RechtOprecht Foundation), which supports these proceedings in the public interest of establishing the truth regarding the actual course of events, implementation, and significance of Covid-19 and the Covid-19 injections.

The three applicants in the aforementioned proceedings are represented by attorney P. (Peter) W.H. Stassen. Mr. Stassen is conducting separate proceedings (substantive proceedings) before the Leeuwarden District Court on behalf of seven other plaintiffs, one of whom has passed away. The central argument in the substantive proceedings is that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project. Covid-19: The Great Reset.

Stichting Recht Oprecht



The substantive proceedings also argue that the Covid-19 injections play a crucial role in the implementation of this project and that Mr. Stassen's clients were unlawfully misled by the defendants and consequently received a Covid-19 injection.

The interest of the three applicants lies in obtaining expert evidence under oath from the nominated experts before a judge. The probative value of an expert statement obtained in this way is crucial for the applicants' decision on whether to initiate further proceedings. Indeed, only in the case of a statement made under oath by the experts in the context of a preliminary expert report before a judge do the defendants in these proceedings have a legal right to a second opinion and to ask questions to be answered by the nominated experts. Whether and how the respondents will exercise these rights significantly impacts the probative value of the expert statements to be given under oath by the nominated experts before the judge.

The District Court of Leeuwarden initially rejected the request of the three applicants to hear these nominated experts. Notwithstanding the legal fact that in this type of proceedings, a statutory prohibition on legal remedies applies under Dutch law, the applicants' lawyer argues that this is a matter of principle in which the refusal of this request would conflict with the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and that Dutch case law allows a breach of the prohibition on legal remedies in this type of case and that this must also happen in this appeal because otherwise a fair trial is not possible.