PELS RIJCKEN

North Netherlands District Court
Session of November 27, 2024
Case/role number C/17/190788 / HA ZA 2023-172

Conclusion of Reply

regarding

William Henry Gates III
Residing in Medina (United States of America)

defendant sub 15,
lawyer: mr. W. Heemskerk in The Hague

at

1. [redacted] residing in Sneek, municipality of Súdwest-Fryslân,
2. [redacted], residing at Sneek, municipality of Súdwest-Fryslân,
3. [redacted], residing at Sneek, municipality of Súdwest-Fryslân,
4. [redacted], residing at Doetinchem,
5. [redacted], residing at Doetinchem,
6. [redacted], residing in Zaandam, municipality of Zaanstad,
7. [redacted], residing at Leeuwarden,

plaintiffs,
lawyer: mr. A.G.W. van Kessel in Leeuwarden.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 By summons dated July 14, 2024 (hereinafter "**Summons**"), plaintiffs (hereinafter "[redacted]**c.s.**") sued Mr. William Henry Gates III (hereinafter "**Gates**") in your court. In addition to Gates,[redacted] et al. also sued sixteen other parties, fifteen natural persons and one legal entity, the State of the Netherlands.

1.2 In short,[redacted] et al. claim that Gates and the other defendants as a group and each individually acted unlawfully against[redacted] et al. This wrongful conduct alleged that Gates and the other defendants intentionally misled[redacted] et al. and thereby induced them to have Covid-19 injections that defendants knew, or at least should have known, were not safe and effective.

1.3 These allegations are incorrect. Gates did not mislead[redacted] et al. nor did it act unlawfully in other way towards[redacted] et al. There is no basis for granting the claims of [redacted] et al. In the following, Gates will refute the contentions and allegations of[redacted] et al.

2 [redacted] ET AL. HAVE (UTTERLY) INADEQUATELY ARGUED

2.1 In these proceedings,[redacted] et al. claim a declaratory judgment that the defendants (as a group and each of them individually) acted unlawfully towards them by "*intentionally and unlawfully misleading them and thereby inducing them to have Covid-19 injections of which the defendants knew, or at least should have known, that these injections were not safe and effective*."[1] By extension,[redacted] et al. claim that the defendants should be ordered jointly and severally to pay damages, to be determined by the state.[2]

2.2 Gates argues first of all that[redacted] et al. have put forward wholly inadequate evidence to allow these claims. This requires (at the very least) that[redacted] et al. state facts (and in the event of dispute also prove them) on the basis of which the legal consequences they intend to invoke can be invoked. [redacted]et al. have not fulfilled this obligation to state facts.

2.3 In order to comply with the obligation to put forward evidence resting on[redacted] et al., they may in any case be expected to state, with reasons and substantiation: (1) that they have been vaccinated, and if so, (2) with which vaccine they have been vaccinated, (3) when they did so, and (4) what (allegedly unlawful) conduct of (which) defendant(s) has induced them to do so. These essential elements of their burden of proof have not been made plausible at all [redacted]et al.
[redacted] et al. did not produce any vaccination certificates showing that they - let alone

[1] Summons, petitum, under 1.
[2] Subpoena, Petitum, at 2.

when - were vaccinated, they have stated nothing about what vaccine they allegedly received (and whether those are the deliberate mRNA vaccines that [redacted] et al. claim would dangerous), and they likewise leave undiscussed what conduct and utterances of which defendant(s) were guiding them personally in getting vaccinated, and whether those conducts and utterances did occur prior to [redacted] et al. getting vaccinated (which is a minimum requirement for the existence of).

2.4 Moreover, substantiated statements by [redacted] et al. regarding the damages they allegedly suffered are lacking. [redacted] In substantiation of their alleged damages, c.s. only (almost) doctor's statements that can by no means be neutral, objective, reliable and expert (see in this respect margin 4.3.4). These doctor's statements should therefore be disregarded and cannot serve to substantiate the damages of [redacted] et al.

2.5 On this state of the case, Gates expressly disputes that [redacted] et al. had themselves vaccinated, and if they did, that they did so as a result of any action by him (or the other defendants), and that they suffered damages as a result. [redacted] et al. have failed (by a long shot) to meet their burden of proof. For that reason alone, the claims should be dismissed.

3 [redacted] ET AL. TAKE FACTUALLY INCORRECT POSITIONS

3.1 With respect to what [redacted] et al. did assert, those assertions lack factual basis. The views expressed by [redacted] et al. are based on nothing more than conspiracy theories and are riddled with unfounded suggestions and speculations that run counter to the worldwide consensus on the existence of the coronavirus and the safety of the . Gates disputes all that [redacted] et al. have argued, except to the extent that this conclusion shows that Gates recognizes its accuracy.

3.2 The coronavirus and vaccines

3.2.1 First, [redacted] et al. do not seem to recognize that the SARS-CoV-2 virus (hereinafter "**Coronavirus**") and the respiratory illness caused by it actually exist. They are under the impression that the "narrative" based thereon is part of a maliciously premeditated plan to inject the world's population with what [redacted] et al. believe to be an unsafe (or even toxic) vaccine. This is incorrect. The Coronavirus exists and can cause various health problems, the severity of which should not be downplayed. There is no global conspiracy and the vaccines that protect against the Coronavirus are safe and approved and licensed by the appropriate authorities.

3.2.2 That the contentions of [redacted] et al. are incorrect has been convincingly demonstrated by several other defendants in these proceedings. For example, defendants sub 1 through 11, 14 and 17 have addressed in their briefs in response, inter alia: (1) the existence of the Coronavirus and the scientific consensus thereon, (2) the course of the coronavirus pandemic in the Netherlands, (3) the government policy aimed at combating the coronavirus pandemic and the decision-making thereon, and (4) the development, authorization and safety of the mRNA corona vaccines.

3.2.3 Gates adopts and makes his own the contentions of the other defendants in this regard. These contentions are to be repeated and inserted. In particular, Gates refers to Sections 1, 2, 5 and 6 of Defendants' Reply Briefs Nos. 1 through 10, 14 and 17 (hereinafter, "**State's and Others' CoA**," which Gates hereby submits as **Exhibit** 1) and Section 3 of Defendant's Reply Brief No. 11 (hereinafter, "**Bourla's CoA**," which Gates hereby submits as **Exhibit** 2).

3.2.4 In addition, Gates values two crucial inaccuracies in the Subpoena of [redacted] et al. with respect to the safety of the corona vaccine explicitly refute them. At issue are the contentions of [redacted] et al. that: (1) the mRNA corona vaccine would contain graphene oxide,[3] and (2) it would follow from Pfizer's report dated April 30, 2021 with No. FDA-CBER-2021-5683-0000054 ("**Pfizer Report**") cited by [redacted] et al. that Pfizer's mRNA corona vaccine would be unsafe.[4] Gates disputes these contentions as follows:

(1) <u>The mRNA corona vaccines do not contain graphene oxide</u>

3.2.5 As explained in detail in the State c.s.'s brief and in Bourla's brief, the chemical composition of the mRNA corona vaccines is publicly available and the published list of ingredients shows that graphene oxide is not a component of the mRNA corona vaccine.[5] The allegations in this regard on the part of [redacted] c.s. are inaccurate and insufficiently substantiated. Gates refers for the refutation of the claims made by [redacted] c.s.'s contentions expressly refer to paragraph 6.3 of the State c.s.' brief (Exhibit 1) and paragraph 3.3.3 of Bourla's brief Exhibit 2).

(2) <u>[redacted] et al. misinterpret Pfizer report</u>

3.2.6 In addition, [redacted] et al. fundamentally misinterpret the Pfizer report.[6] [redacted] et al. argue in response to the Pfizer report that a clinical trial of Pfizer's mRNA vaccine was allegedly conducted in which 42,086 people participated, of which 1,223 died and 11,361 were seriously

[3] See Subpoena, marg. 150 et seq.
[4] See, inter alia, Subpoena, Marg. 42, 45, 55, 85, 99, 108 and 143.
[5] See CoA of the State c.s., Section 6.3 and CoA of Bourla, Section 3.3.3.
[6] See also CoA of the State c.s., marg. 6.4.1 et seq. and CoA of Bourla, marg. 88 et seq.

would have suffered permanent injuries. According to [redacted] et al. the Pfizer report would show that the mRNA corona vaccine is dangerous.

3.2.7 However, the Pfizer report provides no evidence of anything of the sort.

3.2.8 First, the Pfizer report is not a report of a clinical trial, but an analysis of adverse reactions to the vaccine reported to Pfizer worldwide. As the Pfizer report shows, a total of 42,086 adverse reactions were reported. The quoted numbers of 1,223 reported deaths and 11,361 reports of persons with serious permanent injuries should not be judged against *the total number of adverse reactions* (as [redacted] et al. do), but against *the total number of vaccines administered*. The latter number is precisely omitted from the Pfizer report submitted by [redacted] et al.[7]. Against this background, the figures from the Pfizer report confirm the safety of the vaccines rather than unsafety; according to the European Medicines Agency ("**EMA**"), more than 330 million doses of the vaccine had in fact been administered worldwide by April 29, 2021.[8]

3.2.9 Second, [redacted] et al. suggest that the reported side effects are a result of the corona vaccine, but that is incorrect. The Pfizer report shows only that the reported side effects at some point *after* the vaccination, not that they occurred *because of* the vaccination.[9] [redacted] et al. apparently confuse correlation with causation. That the reported side effects were caused by the vaccine is not endorsed by the Pfizer report, nor can it be inferred from it.

3.2.10 Third, [redacted] et al. concrete statistics from the Pfizer report. For example, [redacted] et al. claim that the Pfizer report shows, among other things, that 11,361 persons suffered serious and permanent physical injury, while the Pfizer report in fact states that 11,361 persons did not fully recover during the relevant period reported on by the Pfizer report.[10] These are two substantially different things. That 11,361 persons (i) would not have recovered at all (even beyond the reporting period), let alone (ii) that they sustained serious permanent injuries from the vaccination is not apparent from the Pfizer report. This contention of [redacted] c.s. is thus (also) incorrect.

---

7 See Production 40 to the Subpoena, Section 3.1.1, p. 6: "It is estimated that approximately [omitted] doses of BNT162b2 were shipped worldwide from the receipt of the first temporary authorization for emergency support on December 01, 2020 through February 28, 2021."

8 See Bourla-48, EMA, Assessment report on the annual renewal of the conditional marketing authorization (Comirnaty), 2021, accessed atwww.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/variationreport/comirnaty-h-c- 5735-r-0046-epar-assessment-report-renewal_en.pdf, p. 16.

9 See Bourla-49, Reuters, Pages of suspected side effects released about Pfizer's COVID-19 vaccine [...], March 17, 2022: "The FDA has confirmed that "In fact, reviews by FDA and CDC have determined that the vast majority of the deaths reported are not directly attributable to the vaccines. FDA requires healthcare providers to report any death after COVID-19 vaccination to VAERS, even if it's unclear whether the vaccine was the cause.", accessed at www. reuters.com/article/lactcheck-coronavirus-pfizer- idUSL2N2VK1G1/.

10 See Exhibit 40 to the Subpoena, p. 7.

3.2.11 As also concluded in the CoA of the State c.s. (Annex 1) and the CoA of Bourla (Annex 2),[11] it cannot be inferred from the Pfizer report submitted by [redacted] c.s. that the Pfizer corona vaccine would dangerous. This is also inconsistent with the fact that the Pfizer corona vaccine has been approved by the EMA, as (again) explained in detail in the State c.s.'s CoA and Bourla's CoA.

3.3 Gates' role during the corona pandemic

3.3.1 Furthermore, [redacted] et al. make incorrect assertions about the role Gates is alleged to have played in the execution of the conspiracy they assume to bring about a "Great Reset. In summary, [redacted] et al. seem to state that Gates, whether or not through legal entities or other organizations that according to [redacted] et al. would be under Gates' control, would have prepared the 'Covid-19 project' and would have had it implemented worldwide by, among others, the Dutch government and the World Health Organization (hereinafter: "**WHO**"). However, none of this is true.

3.3.2 First, [redacted] et al. ignore that Gates is not identifiable with the organizations with which [redacted] et al. associate him. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation ("**Gates Foundation**"), as a legal entity, is a separate legal entity with its own rights and obligations. The same applies to other legal entities with which [redacted] et al. associate Gates, such as Microsoft and Heineken, and organizations with which the Gates Foundation collaborates, such as the public-private partnership Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance ("**Gavi**")[12] or the John Hopkins Center for Health Security ("**John Hopkins Center**"). All contentions regarding the actions and conduct of these organizations are irrelevant to the claims against Gates.

3.3.3 Second, [redacted] et al. argue unsubstantiatedly that the Gates Foundation, along with Gavi, determines WHO policy.[13] This is incorrect. WHO is part of the United Nations and its policies are determined by the World Health Assembly: WHO's highest decision-making body consisting of delegations from all member states.[14] The decisions and policies of the World Health Assembly are implemented by WHO's Executive Board, in which 34 individuals with technical qualifications in the field of health participate.[15] The Gates Foundation and Gavi are not part of 's governance structure, nor are they part of the World Health Assembly or 's Executive Board.

---

11 See CoA of the State c.s., Section 3.6 and CoA of Bourla, Section 3.3.4.

12 In your court's incidental judgment of October 16, 2024, it is stated in paragraphs 2.2 and 2.3 that the Gates Foundation would be *affiliated* with Gavi and the World Economic Forum, but this needs nuance. The Gates Foundation is affiliated with these organizations as a partner, but is not in a corporate relationship with them.

13 Subpoena, marg. 204.

14 See: https://www.who.int/about/governance/world-health-assembly.

15 See: https://www.who.int/about/governance/executive-board.

3.3.4 For that matter, [redacted] et al. have also failed to demonstrate that (let alone in what way) the Gates Foundation and Gavi would exert decisive influence over WHO or other international organizations. It remains a bare assertion disputed by Gates.

3.3.5 Third, it is incorrect that Gates would have been preparing the so-called "Covid-19 project" for years. Gates understands the Summons in such a way that [redacted] et al. believe that this would appear from a sum of several events which, according to [redacted] et al. are connected. In essence, however, the events mentioned by [redacted] et al. have nothing to do with each other and do not in any way show that Gates has been preparing the alleged "Covid- 19 project" for years. Gates explains.

3.3.6 First, [redacted] et al. cite two media appearances by Gates that, they claim, would show that Gates knew that a corona pandemic was coming.[16] They refer to Gates' TED talk of April 3, 2015[17] and Gates' interview with *Vox* of May 27, 2015,[18] in which Gates, according to [redacted] et al. allegedly raised fears about the arrival of the Coronavirus.

3.3.7 However, that Gates would have known about the arrival of the Coronavirus at that time cannot be inferred from these videos and is not based on facts. Gates warned about new pandemics in the aforementioned videos using historical examples, not because he had prior knowledge (which [redacted] c.s. have neither stated nor demonstrated, by the way), but because scientists and public health experts have long known that the world is vulnerable to new infectious diseases. The idea that Gates would have deliberately planned or known that the Coronavirus was coming is based on a misinterpretation of his call for preventive measures. Rather, his messages from the aforementioned videos were intended to help prevent or best combat a pandemic, not to predict or cause one.

3.3.8 In addition, [redacted] et al. draw incorrect conclusions from the pandemic exercises organized by the John Hopkins Center. According to [redacted] et al. this would show that the Covid-19 project would have been prepared worldwide.[19]

3.3.9 Again, this is based on misinterpretations. The pandemic exercises referred to by [redacted] et al. were not organized to for a global pandemic, but to help governments and international organizations prepare to prevent and combat a pandemic by simulating a hypothetical situation

16 Subpoena, margins 206-207.
17 Production 66 to the Subpoena.
18 Production 67 to the Summons.
19 Subpoena, marg. 214.

of a possible future pandemic. These pandemic exercises were based on known scientific risks of new infectious diseases, and the insights from the simulations were shared publicly by the John Hopkins Center. For this, Gates refers to the John Hopkins Center's website, on which this information can still be accessed.[20] That no information was kept secret indicates precisely the intention to make the world more resilient to pandemics, not to secretly prepare one.

3.3.10 Furthermore, [redacted] et al. claim that the Gates Foundation has allegedly commissioned Moderna and Pfizer to develop an mRNA corona vaccine and that Moderna and Pfizer have been working on this since 2011, thus well before the corona pandemic.[21] However, this is not evident from the submissions submitted by [redacted] et al. to the Summons. The alleged Gates Foundation investment referred to by [redacted] et al. in production 73 to the Subpoena, relates to the development of an mRNA vaccine to prevent HIV infections and thus has nothing to do with alleged preparations of a vaccine against the Corona virus. In addition, it is apparent from the documents submitted by [redacted] et al. consulted patent application in production 72 to the Summons no involvement therein by the Gates Foundation, nor by Gates in person.[22] The relevance of these documents is lacking.

3.3.11 Finally, [redacted] et al. refer to two media appearances by Gates in which he allegedly reinforced the "*official Covid-19 narrative*" and in which he allegedly said that the corona vaccines would safe and effective.[23] This is, according to [redacted] et al. all the more objectionable because Gates would have known at that time that the corona vaccines would not be safe, for which [redacted] et al. again refer to the Pfizer report and argue that Gates would have known that the corona vaccines would contain graphene oxide.[24]

3.3.12 Gates does not see how these videos could show any involvement in a global conspiracy. Other than by arguing that Gates would have known that the corona vaccines would not be safe, this is also not explained by [redacted] et al. With respect to that knowledge, however, Gates has already explained that the contentions of [redacted] et al. regarding the safety of the corona vaccines (and, more specifically, about the Pfizer report and the incorrect statements about the presence of graphene oxide in the corona vaccines) are not correct (leaving aside that [redacted] et al. have also failed to make a plausible case that Gates personally knew about the Pfizer report or the chemical composition of the corona vaccine).

[20] See https://centerforhealthsecurity.org/our-work/tabletop-exercises/clade-x-tabletop-exercise and https://centerforhealthsecurity.org/our-work/tabletop-exercises/event-201-pandemic-tabletop-exercise.
[21] Subpoena, margins 215-218.
[22] See CvA of Bourla, marg. 42, footnote 44.
[23] Subpoena, margins 219 and 222. Productions 75 and 76 to the .
[24] Subpoena, margins 222-224.

3.3.13 That Gates would have known about the by [redacted] et al. assumed unsafety and ineffectiveness of vaccines is not supported by [redacted] et al. claimed and they have also failed to prove this. In what way the two videos dated April 30 and December 2, 2020, respectively, provide evidence of Gates' participation in a global conspiracy and a deliberate deception of the public completely eludes Gates.

3.3.14 Incidentally, Gates would like to note that the Gates Foundation is a foundation under U.S. law that operates on a not-for-profit basis with the goal of improving global health and fighting poverty. In that context, the Gates Foundation finances various projects related to the fight against infectious diseases, including indeed projects related to the fight against the Coronavirus. Contrary to what [redacted] et al. seem to suggest, the Gates Foundation does not operate covertly, but rather extremely transparent by, among other things, disclosing all of its investments in an online database, reporting regularly to the *International Aid Transparency Initiative Standard* and the *Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development,* publishing its audited annual reports and tax returns, and making public the vast majority of the research that the Gates Foundation funds.

3.3.15 All in all, Gates concludes that [redacted] et al. have failed to prove in any way that Gates would be part of a global conspiracy that would [redacted] c.s. would have induced him to take a corona vaccine when he would have known that the vaccine was neither safe nor effective. [redacted] et al.'s claims are based on air and cannot succeed.

4 [redacted] ET AL. DO NOT DEMONSTRATE ANY REQUIREMENT OF A TORTIOUS ACT

4.1.1 Not only do [redacted] et al. make factually incorrect assertions, they also fail to demonstrate any element of a tort. The assertions made (and incorrect) by [redacted] et al. do not show intentional and wrongful misleading of [redacted] et al. (whether as a group or not), nor have [redacted] et al. made a plausible showing that they suffered damages as a result of the corona vaccine, let alone that these damages are causally related to the alleged conduct of Gates (or the other defendants).

4.1.2 Only to the extent that the contentions of [redacted] et al. are to be understood as aiming at a derivative liability of Gates as (co-)director of the Gates Foundation, any assertion of liability of the Gates Foundation is missing; also otherwise no liability of the Gates Foundation can be assumed/established. On that, that claim would already miss the mark. For the rest, Gates raises the following defense.

4.2 No wrongful acts by Gates

(1) No violation of article 97a Sr.

4.2.1 Gates understands that [redacted] et al. accuse him of having the alleged interests of Klaus Schwab and the World Economic Forum ("**WEF**") in conducting the purported "Great Reset" supported and enabled it.[25] In doing so, Gates would have violated Article 97a Sr, according to [redacted] et al. However, this is inimitable.

4.2.2 Article 97a Sr criminalizes the solicitation of support abroad for an unlawful change or destruction of the order of succession to the throne, with the aim of protecting the Dutch constitutional form of government against such an upheaval.[26] However, [redacted] et al. do not explain why there would be a threat in this respect, nor what role Gates would have played in it, nor why a violation of 97a Sr. in this case provides a basis for awarding damages to [redacted] et al, in view of the relativity requirement of article 6:162 of the Dutch Civil Code.

(2) No mistreatment

4.2.3 In addition, [redacted] et al. claim that Gates is guilty of maltreatment by deliberately damaging the health of [redacted] et al. Gates understands [redacted] et al.'s allegations to mean that he is alleged to have section 300 of the Criminal Code.[27] There is no of this either.

4.2.4 Committing assault is a felony and requires the intentional and unlawful infliction of bodily injury.[28] As explained in Bourla's CoA (Exhibit 2),[29] the vaccines meet regulatory standards for safety, effectiveness and manufacturing quality, and the purpose and effects of the vaccines have been clearly communicated to the public. Thus, there no intentional infliction of injury; the vaccines are safe, and to the extent Gates would have influenced [redacted] et al. into taking a vaccine at all, Gates was also entitled to that safety.

4.2.5 In addition, [redacted] et al. were not forced to take a vaccine, which is why there can be no question of the unlawful administration of a vaccine. To the extent that [redacted] et al. were vaccinated, they consented to it. There can therefore no question of mistreatment in a general sense.

---

25 Subpoena, margins 58-59 and 226.
26 M.A.H. van der Woude, in: T&C Criminal Law, commentary on art. 97a Sr.
27 Subpoena, marg. 277.
28 H.D. Wolswijk, in: *T&C Criminal Law*, commentary on art. 300 Sr. See also: HR 9 September 2014, ECLI:NL:HR:2014:2677.
29 See CoA of Bourla, Sections 3.2 and 3.3.2.

4.2.6 Moreover, Gates did not himself administer the vaccinations to [redacted] et al. so, in any event, this action cannot be attributed to him.

4.2.7 Finally, as to plaintiffs , [redacted] and [redacted] , according to the doctor's statements they submitted (production 91 to the Summons), they did not experience any physical complaints at all from the vaccinations. In the absence of physical injury, there can be no mistreatment in their cases in any event.

(3) No genocide

4.2.8 Furthermore, [redacted] et al. argue that it is "plausible" that Gates and the other defendants are guilty of violating Section 3(1)(b) and (c) of the International Crimes Act.[30] They therefore ask your court to examine whether genocide has occurred. However, this presumption of [redacted] et al. is not explained at all and is on nothing. Your court should it.

(4) No act contrary to what is proper in society according to unwritten law

4.2.9 Finally, [redacted] et al. allege that Gates cooperated in the implementation of the "*Great Reset project and the widespread deception required for it*."[31] These conducts by Gates, according to [redacted] et al. are alleged to be in violation of what is proper under unwritten law in society.[32]

4.2.10 However, there no unlawful conduct by Gates. As explained, the actions of other (international) organizations cannot be attributed to Gates. Moreover, Gates has not been guilty of misleading [redacted] et al. With the media appearances to which [redacted] et al. refer - and on which they apparently base the allegations against Gates in person exclusively - Gates did not intend to mislead the world's population, including [redacted] et al. into taking an unsafe and ineffective corona vaccine. The messages and statements in those video messages were made accurately and truthfully, with the goal of providing accurate information. There no deception, let alone intentional deception.

4.3 No damage

4.3.1 Furthermore, [redacted] et al. have not made it plausible that they have suffered damages. Although for referral to the damages state procedure as referred to in article 612 Rv

[30] Subpoena, marg. 281.
[31] Subpoena, marg. 286.
[32] Subpoena, marg. 286.

only the possibility of injury must made plausible,[33] retrieve [redacted] c.s. not even that threshold.

(1) The vaccine contains no dangerous or toxic substances

4.3.2 In support of the plausibility of harm [redacted] et al. argue that they have been vaccinated with "*the toxic graphene oxide*." According to them, it is therefore plausible that they (will) suffer lasting adverse effects from the vaccinations.[34]

4.3.3 As already explained, it is incorrect that corona vaccines contain graphene oxide. In any case, the plausibility of harm cannot be shown from it. To the extent [redacted] c.s. would believe that there would be other toxic or dangerous substances in the vaccines, this is not stated by them.

(2) [redacted] c.s. also fail to meet their burden of proof in this regard

4.3.4 Furthermore, the plausibility of damages also cannot be demonstrated by the doctor's statements by [redacted] et al. as production 91. As explained in detail in the State c.s.' CoA Exhibit 1), as well as in Bourla's CoA (Exhibit 2), the submitted statements are largely identical to each other, the doctor's statements contain Mr. A.H. van Walraven's own opinions about the corona vaccinations and the pursued government policy, and the doctor's statements contain untenable conclusions regarding the causality between the allegedly occurring complaints and the corona vaccinations.

4.3.5 The doctor's statements are thus by no means to be considered neutral, objective, reliable or expert, and should be disregarded. This is explained in detail in Chapter 7 of the State c.s. CoA and paragraph 4.2.2 of Bourla's CoA. Gates adopts these contentions and makes them his own.

4.3.6 Moreover, it is true of plaintiffs , [redacted] and [redacted] that they did not experience any physical complaints at all from the vaccinations.[35] That these plaintiffs suffered damages is therefore not at all plausible.

(3) Alleged intangible damages not eligible for compensation

4.3.7 Finally, [redacted] et al. have not made it plausible that they have suffered immaterial damages that are eligible for compensation. They argue that their immaterial damage consists of, on the one hand, the mentally experienced disadva[redacted] (c.s.

[33] See also: HR 21 April 1967, ECLI:NL:HR:1967:AB5476, *NJ* 1967/241, HR 22 June 1979, ECLI:NL:PHR:1979:AC6624, *NJ* 1979/516, HR 13 June 1980, ECLI:NL:PHR:1980:AC3099 *NJ* 1981/185 and successive case law.
[34] Subpoena marg. 265.
[35] That production 91 attached to the Subpoena.

naming feelings of pain, suffering, shame, helplessness and uncertainty about their health), and on the other hand the ignorance about the exact consequences of the .[36] In doing so, [redacted] et al. apparently invoke Section 6:106(b) of the Dutch Civil Code, but they wrongly overlook the fact that mere psychological discomfort is insufficient for the award of damages.[37] [redacted] et al. have not submitted sufficient concrete and objective data from which it can be concluded that psychological damage has to them. The doctor's statements to which [redacted] c.s. reference are not sufficient for this in any case.

4.4 No causal relationship

4.4.1 Gates reiterates that [redacted] et al. have not made it plausible that they have ever been vaccinated, for example, not one of them has been presented with a vaccination certificate. But more importantly, they have not even claimed, let alone plausibly demonstrated, that they were vaccinated as a result of Gates' videos they mentioned. On the contrary: [redacted] et al. explicitly state that in response to the "*many public statements*" made by then Minister de Jonge and then Minister-President Rutte, which "consisted *largely of televised press conferences*," "*felt called to be injected with Covid-19 injections*."[38] [attorney's addition].

4.4.2 If these public statements by then Minister de Jonge and then Prime Minister Rutte were the reason for [redacted] et al. to get vaccinated, then it was very clearly not Gates' two videos of 30 and December 2, 2020, respectively, that moved [redacted] et al. to a corona vaccine. Incidentally, they do not claim the latter and this was also explicitly disputed by the lawyers of [redacted] et al. at the hearing Gates' jurisdictional incident that took place on September 18, 2024.

4.4.3 A causal connection between Gates' alleged conduct and having a corona vaccine administered has thus not been made plausible by [redacted] et al. Taking into account that [redacted] et al. have also failed to substantiate (1) that the vaccine in general has the potential to lead to the alleged damage and (2) that the vaccine has actually led to the alleged damage in the case of [redacted] et al.

4.5 No group liability

4.5.1 Finally, there is no group liability under Article 6:166 of the Civil Code. For this [redacted] c.s. should have argued substantiated that: (1) Gates has

[36] Subpoena, marg. 266.
[37] Asser/Sieburgh *6-II* 2021/143b
[38] Subpoena, marg. 77.

participated in, (2) a group conduct, (3) whose likelihood of inflicting harm should have prevented him from participating in that group, that (4) Gates' participation can be imputed to him, and that (5) (at least) one of the participants in the unlawful group caused the harm. In this c.s. did not succeed.

4.5.2 The facts alleged by c.s. do not in any way show that there was conduct in a group. As said before c.s. falsely make all kinds of non-existent connections between events and behavior ingen defendants that have nothing to do with each other. From none of the by c.s.'s alleged "facts" actually show that defendants worked together in bringing about and implementing a "Great Reset. Moreover, Gates did not act unlawfully (and the same is true of the other defendants). For that reason, Gates (as well as the other) is not liable under Section 6:166 of the Civil Code.

5 CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing, Gates concludes by rejecting all the claims made by et al. claimed, costs at law.

i.o.

[redacted]

Lawyer

handled by W. Heemskerk and P.F.B. Nlulder
correspondence P.O. Box 11756, 2502 AT The Hague
telephone +31 70 515 3847
email willem.heemskerk@pelsrijcken.nl
zaa knr 11020837

ATTACHMENT OVERVIEW

1	Conclusion of reply by the State et al. dated January 10, 2024
2	Conclusion of Bourla's reply dated February 21, 2024.