

July 9, 2025 hearing, District Court of Leeuwarden, NL
Case No. C/17/199273 / HA RK 25-17
Audio recording transcript, English translation from original Dutch

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:00:02] This way I can also be heard in the other rooms. I hereby open the hearing. Today concerns three applicants, whom I will first name. Mr. <bliep>—yes, that is you. Ms. <bliep> and Mr. <bliep>. I will begin with the most recent letter I received about the press guideline that must be observed. You have objected to that.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: Correct.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: Would you like to add anything?

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:00:39] Yes, perhaps that's good. Well, briefly: I think it is useful that everyone knows the content of my last email. I returned to the office yesterday and only then found the correspondence on this subject and the respondents' requests. So I wrote to you: "Having returned from a hearing at the Limburg District Court, Roermond location, I am reading the email regarding the admission of journalists to tomorrow's hearing. That explains the timing of my message. In a constitutional state, the profession of journalist is open to any person who feels called to report in an honest way on matters of public relevance. The point is that the truth should not be suppressed; censorship must not get a chance. The standards applicable to journalists serve to protect this calling. The openness of justice—and therefore the rule of law itself—is jeopardized if journalists are hindered in their work. That implies—this is my clients' position—that in a rule of law no distinction may be made between journalists who, for payment, join an association and commit to all sorts of rules in exchange for a piece of plastic, and journalists who wish to practice their calling without all of that. In view of this, it is indeed the applicants' position that in a constitutional state making such a distinction in journalists' powers is impermissible, and that the new press guideline is not worth the paper it's printed on. Therefore, we believe all journalists—people with that calling; I think many are in this room—should be free to make recordings. What's more, that is not objectionable, because recording equipment nowadays is so small and quiet that it presents no problem for order in the courtroom."

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:02:35] In addition—and I consider this a very important point—this case concerns a matter of great social significance, as will be clear, and that interest is so great that the restrictions set out in the press guideline—after all, it is a guideline; you may deviate from it—should not, must not, be applied here. That is what I wrote you. I would like to add something. Because the press guideline is, of course, central to this discussion, I want to make a fundamental remark. In a constitutional state, adjudication is entrusted to individual judges and, in this matter, that is you, Madam Presiding Judge. From your position in the rule of law, you determine the order in this courtroom—no one else. You have no superior here who tells you what to do. Neither do I; neither do you. And that applies as well to the question of whether the

journalists present here can do their work freely. You therefore do not have to abide by the press guideline when making that decision. But that also means, in my clients' view, that you cannot hide behind it either. It is your decision. You determine whether that guideline is applied in this courtroom—what my clients can only perceive as censorship—or not. And that decision is yours. I believe the decision should be that recordings may be made freely and that there is no reason at all to apply that press guideline. Thank you.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:04:11] Thank you. Before I continue—because, as you hear, this is important: what is allowed and what is not—we now work with accreditation. That is also because there are certain safeguards. And I was instructed to impress upon you, the public—this is what I heard via the communications department—that videos and audio recordings are not permitted. But I think you already heard that outside the courtroom. I would like to give counsel a brief opportunity to respond. I already asked you how you view recordings being made. There were objections to that, but perhaps I can very briefly go down the row. Frankly, I don't know who ended up sitting where. Perhaps—on that side? Is Mr. <bliep> Mr. <bliep>? But he is sitting somewhere else entirely.

Mr. R.W. Veldhuis: [00:05:10] Yes, we are here. We maintain our objection, as previously made for the State. And the distinction made in the press guideline is not for nothing. So we maintain that.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:05:19] Yes. Would you like to elaborate?

Mr. R.W. Veldhuis: [00:05:22] Not in addition to what has already been written.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:05:24] Okay, then I will still go down the row. Mr. <bliep> or Mr. <bliep>?

Mr. D.C. Roessing: [00:05:32] Yes, that's us. We have nothing to add and align ourselves with the objections already raised in writing.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:05:42] Mr. <bliep>?

Mr. A.H. Ekker: [00:05:44] The same applies for us.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:05:47] And Mr. <bliep>?

Mr. W. Heemskerk: [00:05:49] The same applies for us as well.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:05:50] And Mr. <bliep>?

Mr. R.H.W. Lamme: [00:05:50] The same.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:05:54] Yes, but then none of the lawyers can actually provide an argument as to what interest of their clients would be harmed if this is simply... it does not matter whether camera one or two records this or not.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:06:06] I recognize the significant public interest, and this morning we discussed various options—what can we offer? Because we also understand that you want more people to be able to take note of this. We thought we could make an audio recording so that at least that audio—provided it does not contain names of private individuals—could be made available to the general public. And what I, for my part, would also allow is a short recording only of us as the court, possibly during the introduction I’m about to give, and that would be all. Are there objections?

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:06:59] Certainly—I cannot agree to that proposal. Of course not, because that too is a restriction. All the non-verbal communication is not captured in that—here, from counsel, from those present. It is too limited. A case like this simply cannot be censored. That is our position.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:07:14] Well, it is the only option I can offer, provided there are no objections. I assume that does not lead to objections. We will in any event make an audio recording and then later decide what to do with it.

Mr. R.H.W. Lamme: [00:07:29] From my side there is some objection, because it is unclear what will happen to that audio recording afterwards. With a livestream, a recording is not allowed either, so if that recording is permanently available, that is quite a special situation. We do object to that.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:07:46] Very well, I will think about that as well. A recording will be made, and after the hearing we will consider what to do with it.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:07:53] Open justice is so important that you cannot say that no one may hear it. Imagine that.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:08:00] Yes, yes, I understand that—uhh. It is also of public interest that this not be swept under the rug, let me put it that way. Good, then I will begin my introduction.

What is today about? It concerns the three applicants seated there. All three of you, as I have read, received a Covid-19 injection, and afterwards you suffered serious health complaints. In your view, that can only have been caused by the injection, because no other cause can be identified. Together with your counsel, you now request that five people be heard, as experts or as expert-witnesses. Specifically on the question—which would be of importance in the main proceedings, as I understand it—whether there is a Great Reset, or whether the injections are bioweapons, yes or no. You want to assess your prospects regarding the procedure you intend to bring—either instituting your own action or joining the action on the merits that is currently pending, the main case that is ongoing but not yet concluded. Hence your request to hear those experts/expert-witnesses. That is also the only thing we will address today. It is solely about the question: should experts or expert-witnesses be heard so that you can make an assessment? It is

not about the merits. It is not about whether a tort has been committed. It is also not about whether the damage you suffered can be attributed to that.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:09:55] All of that remains outside today's scope. When, then, will that be discussed? I can imagine you would very much like to know that. I cannot make any pronouncement on that, because I am not on the three-judge panel that will address the merits. What I do know—because you sent me a statement of reply—is that it has been filed, a written submission setting out your (or your clients') position. The defendants' lawyers in the main action are now up next—that's the same parties as are here today. I do not know how much longer that will take, but that case is scheduled for the end of July. What usually happens after that? Availability dates are requested from all counsel involved and, of course, from the persons concerned. A date is then scheduled and there will be an oral hearing before three judges who will address the case on the merits. Now I will very briefly cover what letters and emails I have received so that it is clear that everything is known to everyone. I saw in the emails that everyone was always CC'd, but I will start a bit late, with an email of 16 June 2025 in which you sent me that statement of reply—you all know it, of course. Then, on 7 July, a link to a video recording by one of your experts. I will not name the person now, given that you may later receive that audio recording.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:11:47] Others may mention names, but I cannot say more about that. In any event, I have seen it and the letter with the link will be included in the file. Then there is an email of 2 July from Mr. <bliep> asking whether a digital hearing could be planned. Unfortunately that did not work out, because we were to sit in a different courtroom—today this courtroom was actually reserved for a very large criminal case that took place here yesterday. But because that concluded in time, we could sit here after all, and perhaps in hindsight a digital hearing would have been possible. In any case, it did not happen. What I further wish to say: I received a petition, which you will address later—you will have sufficient speaking time; I have promised you that. Then the statements of defense will be addressed on behalf of one of the parties involved—that will be Mr. <bliep>—who will argue orally; the rest has already done so in writing, except Mr. <bliep>, who has said he refers the matter to the court's judgment. That means you leave it to the court to decide what should or should not happen. But perhaps you will still wish to say something shortly—that could be. I think I have covered everything that needed to be addressed beforehand, and I would now like to give you the floor.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:13:15] Yes, may I still make two points of order? First, I heard you say, in connection with the recording, the names of the expert-witnesses—if I understood you correctly.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:13:24] Yes, perhaps those may be mentioned.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:13:26] They certainly may be mentioned. Absolutely. These people are entirely fine with that. They want to speak in the public interest. So their names may be mentioned—loudly if you wish. That is one point of order I wanted to make. The other: you

reviewed the documents. It was indeed a petition. You have seen that Michael Yeadon's CV was later submitted. And indeed I sent you a link to a video by Michael Yeadon that I would today...

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:13:53] I received it as well, and I assume everyone is familiar with it.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:13:56] Okay. I prepared some notes on paper, which I would like to hand out.

Mr. A.H. Ekker: [00:14:08] Thank you.

Mr. W. Heemskerk: [00:14:23] Thank you.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:14:34] Then a few extra copies for the room, because I have some slides for all the people who traveled so far. I've made small stacks here; if you would pass them along. That should be sorted quickly, I think.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: Also to the other side.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:15:34] I'll wait a moment until it's handed out.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:15:36] Yes, that's fine. May I address one of the applicants briefly? You have health issues—can you manage this hearing? Is it doable for you to sit here this long? Or would you perhaps like to leave the room halfway through? Yes? It's going well? Okay.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:15:59] It looks like we can begin.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:16:03] Yes.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:16:05] Madam President. "And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free." This is a saying I take from the Bible, John 8:32. As regards that truth, in civil proceedings the starting point is the court's passivity. The law provides in Article 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure that the court investigates and decides on the basis of what the parties have put forward in support of their claim, application or defense, unless otherwise follows from the law. My clients are considering starting a new proceeding and, as you said, to decide whether to bring a case, my clients want the views of the expert-witnesses put forward in the petition. And because the question was raised in the defense: it concerns, by definition, witnesses as well. They too can testify from their own observation about the existence of the Great Reset, the ongoing genocide and the deployment of a bioweapon, because they—like you and I—live in a time when all of this is taking place. The precise manner and form of the preliminary taking of evidence is, of course, up to your court, with this proviso: my clients insist that the five proposed experts be heard in the courtroom under oath, so that a debate can take place. Furthermore, it is essential that the experts be given the opportunity to submit documents and that the investigation not be closed until the experts have been able to give an exhaustive, evidence-based answer to the questions before us.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:17:57] It is true that the application is primarily directed against natural persons who are, for the most part, employed by the State. The State et al.—and by that I mean all respondents—argue that there is settled case law that conduct by persons in connection with their work for the State must be attributed to the State. Reading the case law cited by the State shows there is indeed personal liability where a personal and sufficiently serious reproach can be made. Precisely for that reason, respondents have been involved in this application and there is a compelling interest in this request.

What is special about the proposed expert-witnesses is their expertise, integrity, and independence. Each has demonstrably delved very deeply into the subjects on which my clients seek clarity. Each has a background, education, knowledge, skill and experience that allows expert treatment of these subjects. Michael Yeadon, as a scientist, knows Pfizer and the industry in which it operates and can explain that the Covid-19 injections are, by design, a bioweapon. Catherine Austin Fitts understands macro-economic processes and politics and can demonstrate, explain, and prove that we are indeed in a Great Reset. Sasha Latypova and Katherine Watt know U.S. regulation in the field of “vaccines,” and Katherine Watt can explain that, applying those regulations to the letter, no technical legal boundaries were crossed with the Covid-19 injections, contrary to what it seems in the preferred reality. [00:20:10]

This expert opinion by Watt is particularly grave. Through her study of this topic, Watt can demonstrate, explain, and prove that since 1902 the real purpose of vaccine regulation has been to enable harmful substances for humans to be “approved” through a sham validation process—“approved” in quotation marks. The truth is that this sham validation process aims to mislead people in order to make them willing to have biologically toxic mixtures of substances injected.

Latypova’s expert opinion largely aligns with Watt’s but differs on the Emergency Use Authorization used for admitting the Covid-19 injections. She can explain that those Emergency Use Authorizations indicate the countermeasures—the injections—may not be mass-produced and may not be deployed on the whole population. To that extent, these two experts are not 100% aligned, which once again shows there is no scientific consensus. The questions for Latypova and Watt are primarily factual: the course of events—the modus operandi by which a bioweapon was shepherd through the regulations.

Joseph Sansone can explain why the late Professor Dr. Boyle, the U.S. top legal expert on bioweapons regulation, could only conclude that the Covid-19 injections are a bioweapon.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:22:11] And that bioweapon was developed at the behest of DARPA, the U.S. Department of Defense. With his background as a psychologist and his experience in U.S. legal proceedings, Joseph Sansone can also explain why these—for many—unpalatable facts are true. None of the experts has any direct or indirect self-interest in their opinion. The integrity of the proposed experts is not in dispute; nor is their independence. None has financial or other interests that would impede an independent opinion. The State et al. believe they can argue that there is no interest in the requested preliminary taking of evidence because it is

already clear how the expert-witnesses will answer the questions. That is an Orwellian and false argument. It concerns an examination under oath, in which all parties can put questions to the proposed experts and respondents are given the opportunity to have a counter-expertise conducted. Such a process, which may be assumed will crystallize into two diametrically opposed camps of experts who must each give and substantiate their expert opinions under oath—such a process has simply never taken place. Only an expert opinion established in that way gives my clients sufficient insight into their legal position to determine whether they can prove unlawful conduct in the form of genocide by means of a bioweapon.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:24:12] For these reasons, it is necessary that the proposed expert-witnesses be heard by way of preliminary evidence—precisely to determine applicants’ position. The requested preliminary taking of evidence therefore cannot be replaced by a written repetition of public statements that the proposed expert-witnesses have previously made. We already spoke about public interest; to make clear what the immense public interest is here, I will outline what it means if the request is granted or rejected. Granting the request means that the proposed expert-witnesses can be heard under oath, by you and all parties, in a hearing open to the public. The experts will give their opinions and support them with evidence on which their views rest. As judge, you—and I and all other counsel—can ask the questions that until now have never been put to an expert in a courtroom. Is there genocide? Are the vaccines a bioweapon? Are we in a Great Reset with the aim of a New World Order? What is the role of governments, NATO, mass media, NGOs, and national authorities? And more importantly: how do you know this so certainly? Those answers can then be probed further by you and by all parties. Moreover, the experts, as said, will be under oath. Should respondents wish, they can have their own expert-witnesses heard in counter-examination or deploy them to put critical questions to the proposed experts about their reasoning, underlying evidence, and data.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:26:12] My clients would welcome that. A preliminary expert report, with its procedural safeguards and in particular the professional legal principle of hearing both sides, is the yardstick par excellence for my clients as seekers of justice to assess whether they will start proceedings or not. A one-sided written statement from the proposed experts is, for all these reasons, not weighty enough for applicants to assess their legal position. Such a one-sided statement simply does not have the weight and evidentiary force of an expert-witness opinion produced in a careful legal process with the possibility of adversarial testing. Aside from all this, the interests of applicants also carry a great public interest. Society benefits from knowing whether it lives in truth or in a preferred reality. In the statement of reply you mentioned in the main proceedings, I went into the theme of the preferred reality in depth. You confirm that statement is in this procedure and you are familiar with it. Already because of the public interest, the request to hear the proposed expert-witnesses must be granted. And contrary to what the State et al. argue, pitting experts from two opposing camps against each other is the only way to bring out the truth and to determine applicants’ legal position.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:27:58] The mere fact that these camps of experts exist shows there is no scientific consensus on these subjects. That the State will find many pseudo-experts in its camp, my clients do not doubt. I predict the State et al. will not succeed in finding experts who are truly expert, independent, and impartial. For that reason no names are given in the defense. It's still "whose bread I eat, his word I speak."

It follows that rejecting the request would deprive my clients of the ability to have the foundation of their claim supported by expert-witness evidence clothed in the procedural safeguards of a preliminary expert-witness report. My clients would then have to litigate without the opportunity first to assess their legal position. Far more weighty, however, is the impairment of the public interest a rejection would bring. Not only do my clients have the right and interest to see and hear how these expert-witnesses, in an open process under oath, answer questions from the court and all parties and support their views—everyone has this interest. Everyone has the right and interest to know whether he or she has been placed in a preferred reality; whether he or she is being threatened, attacked, driven to death, made ill, or otherwise deceived and mistreated by a bioweapon.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:29:52] And to be able to know this, there must be a public procedural debate in the courtroom in which experts not only state their opinions but can also be compelled, under oath in public before the court, to answer questions from the court, all parties, and any counter-experts. Only then can society see that no trace will remain of the preferred reality and of the pseudo-experts acting for the executors of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset.

The hard truth will prove to be that respondents are co-perpetrators of mass murder of the Dutch population, or at least are accessories to it, and that they have deceived and mistreated the entire Dutch population and murdered many well-meaning people who placed their trust in them. If the State et al. truly embraced the truth and wanted to combat disinformation, they would have no choice but to support this request.

This risk to respondents—that nothing remains of the preferred reality—is obviously the real reason why respondents oppose my clients' request. If the preferred reality is pierced, respondents' liability is established and it is over and done with them as suppressors and deniers of the truth.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:31:37] In other words: "And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free." Frankly, my clients find it incomprehensible that, in this situation, the judges in your court have still not filed criminal complaints against respondents and that respondents are still at large.

The State et al.'s defense rests on disqualifying the proposed experts, asserting there is no interest, and claiming this request would delay the main proceedings. Starting with the latter: whether joinder or intervention is possible in the main proceedings is up to the three-judge panel in that case. At the time of filing this request, clients had not yet decided whether they would join

or intervene or start a new action. The request shows they had not yet made a choice; I also heard that in your introduction. Here, too, the insinuations by the State et al. that applicants would not want to start a new proceeding rest on quicksand. To properly assess the legal position and the proper procedural course, the hearing by your court of the proposed expert-witnesses is of the utmost importance for my clients. For that reason alone it cannot be said that granting the request would delay the main proceedings. Moreover, intervention within the meaning of Article 217 of the Code of Civil Procedure involves bringing one's own claim and therefore does count as a new proceeding.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:33:19] A preliminary expert report can therefore indeed precede an intervention. But again, to avoid any misunderstanding: applicants must still determine their legal position and only then will they be able to decide whether, and if so which, new procedure they will institute. If applicants decide to institute a new proceeding, they will indeed do so, as is required for admissibility of this request—I guarantee you that. I will look at that very carefully. In all cases it will be a new proceeding, which thus does not fall under the concept of a pending proceeding as referred to in Article 196 of the Code of Civil Procedure. I have also discussed this with clients: they want their own proceeding. You can ask them. They want to act as claimants, the three of them. In these circumstances, in assessing admissibility one cannot proceed on the basis of a pending proceeding or an unacceptable circumvention, and the request is admissible—there is no trace of abuse of rights, despite the State et al.'s unfounded insinuations. My clients are, vis-à-vis the parties in the main proceedings, ordinary third parties who first want to determine their legal position before deciding whether, and if so which, new proceeding to start. Their questions are factual in nature. What was injected into them? Is it a vaccine or a bioweapon? All of applicants' questions are, at their core, factual.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:34:59] Applicants are interested in nothing other than the true facts, and all their questions relate to that. Where the questions concern regulation, they aim to obtain an explanation of how respondents, within that regulatory framework, were able to bring a bioweapon to market as a so-called vaccine. It is a factual explanation of the course of events—the modus operandi by which a bioweapon was piloted through the regulations. I repeat: that is a question of fact. The defense hammers on this, but these are factual questions; we do not need a legal institute for that. Once those facts are judicially established—which is what a legal process is about—then the legal characterization and the assessment of applicants' legal position will be child's play, and it will also be clear in law that there is a bioweapon with which genocide is being committed. The questions to the experts are precisely aimed at establishing the hard legal facts needed to draw conclusions—or at least obtaining sufficient insight into how that relates to their legal position. It speaks volumes that respondents believe they can disqualify the experts by citing their past public statements, for example on the characterization of the Covid-19 injections as a bioweapon.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:36:29] Precisely because of those expert opinions, these are the experts par excellence. But respondents' brazenness goes further when they write in their defense that they can set at least as many other experts against them. Does that mean that for respondents it is already certain that those other experts will never change their opinions—not even after the proposed experts have been heard? That is what respondents' statement assumes. Apparently respondents determine what those other experts will say. There is no other conclusion. And so it is. The mainly veterinarians whom respondents deploy as pseudo-experts have indeed always said what respondents wanted to hear. It is precisely the experts proposed by applicants who have the right qualifications. I have submitted their CVs and they attest to that, including Michael Yeadon's, which I sent later—you have seen it. We are waiting for the CVs of the State et al.'s experts—which will pale in comparison. They are missing from the State et al.'s defense, and that is no coincidence. Even if respondents can produce numerous pseudo-experts who support their assertions, it is not about the number; it is about the quality. There are only a handful of experts worldwide who are willing to answer the questions, independently and with integrity, under oath before the court and expose themselves to a dialogue. These experts have been named in this procedure.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:38:19] If my clients cannot avail themselves of preliminary evidence in this way, then this court does not want to know the truth and certainly will not set anyone free. For that reason too, there is only one proper decision on this request. I would now like to make some specific remarks about <bliep>'s defense. It is true that Dr. Yeadon has not worked at Pfizer for about thirteen years, and this simply means that his further academic career since then took place outside Pfizer, as appears from his CV. A doctor with Yeadon's background is perfectly able to conduct independent scientific research and report on it. In that connection I sent you Yeadon's video from the Impfopfer Resistance Conference of 9 November 2024 in Vienna. You are aware of it, and I think it shows very clearly—indeed, I know—that Mr. Yeadon has delved very deeply and thoroughly into the subjects that are important to applicants and that he has the qualifications to give an expert opinion about them. I would also have liked to show that video during the hearing, but you had already made your decision. Dr. Yeadon is the expert par excellence, and if someone wants to refute his conclusions, he gives them the opportunity to do so. To date no one has come forward to refute his conclusions, nor have any proceedings been brought against him for so-called disinformation.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:40:07] This despite all the big words about scientific consensus that respondents invoke. Yeadon has always substantiated his expert opinion with arguments and evidence—often peer-reviewed studies. The statements Yeadon makes qualify him precisely as an expert in this case. Everything I submit to you about Yeadon's qualifications applies equally to the other proposed experts. Citing Yeadon's past statements as a defense against this request is a futile exercise and proves nothing except that Yeadon has studied the subject for years and wants to entrust his findings to the public. <bliep>, by contrast, is himself a party to this and to the main proceedings, so his opinion about what is true or not is of no significance. <bliep> is

trained only as a veterinarian and believes he can measure a scientific giant like Yeadon. As a veterinarian, <bliep> should at least see the difference between a Greek Kokoni and an English Mastiff. Furthermore, for anyone who wants to understand it, it is easily explained that it is precisely <bliep> who uses the term disinformation. That fits entirely with NATO PsyOps and Info Ops deployed to keep the official narrative intact. It is clear that <bliep> is completely partial and where he stands. <Bliep>'s purpose with his defense is to silence Yeadon to prevent him from being unmasked as a mass murderer and dragging his co-respondents down with him.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:41:58] I note that the new law of evidence did not take into account a Great Reset in which the executors are mass murderers who do not shy away from killing experts like those proposed by my clients, in order to push through the Great Reset and the New World Order. Millions of people have already been killed for the sake of that Great Reset, including one of my own clients in the main proceedings and, I assume, Professor Dr. Boyle, who, as an expert on bioweapons, had no doubt about characterizing the Covid-19 injections as a bioweapon. And Professor Dr. Boyle wanted to come before your court—and therefore before you personally—to explain that. Securing evidence is—this is a serious example—of great importance, not only for applicants but for society as a whole. Finally, I would emphasize that it is for your court, in your supreme legal judgment, to determine whether my clients—and with them the entire Dutch population—may know the truth and thus be set free. If we truly live in a rule of law and you truly wish to dispense justice, you have no choice but to grant this request. I persist in the request and thank you for your attention.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:43:23] Thank you.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:43:32] Before I give the floor to someone else, a word about procedural rules. If your request is granted, another judge will be appointed who is not part of the three-judge panel. So that examination would then take place before another judge. But that doesn't matter further.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:43:50] That's correct, but he certainly had the willingness—Yes.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:43:53] Uhm—yes. I made my own list of who goes first and who last, but you are all mixed up. We can also just go down the row and you state your name. Shall we do that?

Mr. A.H. Ekker: [00:44:08] Yes, my name is Mr. <bliep>. I am here on behalf of <bliep>. I have no further remarks.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:44:15] You have no remarks. Okay. Mr. <bliep>. I just heard that you are <bliep>.

Mr. W. Heemskerk: [00:44:23] Yes, that is correct. Our client refers the matter to your court's judgment. I will very briefly explain what that means. It does not mean the request is supported, but it also does not mean a defense is conducted. It is a neutral position. It is left to your court to

decide, having read everything and heard both sides today, how the request should be decided. That is a referral to judgment. Thank you.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:44:54] Good then. Oh yes.

Mr. P.F.B. Mulder: [00:44:58] Yes, I have nothing to add to what I just said.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:45:02] Okay, fine.

Mr. R.H.W. Lamme: [00:45:05] My name is Mr. <bliep>. I am here on behalf of Ms. <bliep> and Mr. <bliep>. They are the editor-in-chief, or former editor-in-chief, of the NOS and De Telegraaf. I have prepared a short pleading note, which I will now hand out, with your leave.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:45:33] Thank you.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [00:45:42] Yes, thank you. One is not enough for me, but perhaps one for my clients—that would be useful as well.

Mr. R.H.W. Lamme: [00:46:20] Yes, Your Ladyship, I will start slightly outside my notes so that everyone in the room understands what my clients are defending against. It is important to understand that it normally does not, or hardly, make sense to hold private individuals working in journalism personally liable, and I will set out why. The NOS and De Telegraaf, where my clients work, would not have run away from these proceedings. So this is not a substantive judgment on the Covid-19 vaccine or its effects. Today the main thrust is the additional arguments why they cannot be addressed as people, as family members, by applicants. With that said, I begin my plea by noting that my clients actually endorse the statement of defense by the State et al. and the additional comments on behalf of Mr. <bliep>. My clients agree that this proceeding is an extension of the <bliep> case against all respondents. In that action on the merits, <bliep> reproaches the editor-in-chief of the NOS and, as it were, the former editor-in-chief of De Telegraaf, that as editors-in-chief of mass media they, with their reporting, fueled maximum fear among the population about the Covid-19 pandemic. In addition, they are said to have deliberately withheld from the public reports about the alleged lack of safety of the Covid-19 vaccine. <bliep> It even goes so far that they—<bliep>—as citizens, as people—are personally accused of co-perpetrating genocide on the Dutch population.

Mr. R.H.W. Lamme: [00:48:14] <bliep> therefore aligns today with the content of the State's defense and Mr. <bliep>'s addition, as I noted. You have seen in the defense the stated grounds, which boil down, briefly, to inadmissibility and dismissal of the request. You can read those grounds; I think you are familiar with them. As for the prospects for <bliep>, under the same counsel and with explicit reference to the main proceedings for <bliep>, this request is an attempt to add an extra burden on private defendants, while there is no legal basis at all for personal liability in this case. Additionally, <bliep> believes there are more reasons to reject the request. Applicants have insufficient interest in the evidence sought, because the claims against <bliep> as human beings in the <bliep> case, in which they seek to join, are utterly hopeless.

Moreover, the evidence sought contributes to a chilling effect on press freedom, which is an equitable reason to reject it. The summons shows that the claims are in fact directed against the employers of <bliep>, namely the NOS and De Telegraaf. Nevertheless, <bliep>—and thus <bliep>—chose to summons <bliep> in person. That choice rests on a strategy devised by the Stichting RechtOprecht, of which <bliep> and their counsel are a part. In that vein, they apparently base personal liability [00:49:58] on a qualitative liability said to flow from their positions as editors-in-chief of the NOS and De Telegraaf. That is legally incorrect. For press publications, the medium—and not the editor-in-chief—is ultimately responsible and, where applicable, liable for the content of publications. It is the publishing legal entity that performs the relevant formal legal acts of placing a publication or a series of publications. Settled case law confirms this and that there is no place in media law for a qualitative liability of editors-in-chief or a rule under which editors-in-chief are, in principle, always liable for what the media publish. On the basis of the foregoing, you can conclude that the underlying claims by <bliep> [00:50:43]—leaving aside the merits—against <bliep> as people have no chance of success, and they therefore have insufficient interest in the requested evidence. One of the reasons why such qualitative liability in media law is unacceptable is the danger of a chilling effect on press freedom. That is the difference compared to the other respondents in this case: they work for a medium and may rely on Article 10 ECHR—freedom of expression. Personal liability of editors-in-chief can lead to restraint in investigating or publishing a societal [00:51:20] issue. In this proceeding, <bliep> are a litigation vehicle for Stichting RechtOprecht, which, led by their lawyers, deliberately directs a personal attack on <bliep>.

Mr. R.H.W. Lamme: [00:51:31] In the eyes of their supporters, Stichting RechtOprecht portrays <bliep> as serious criminals. These intimidating tactics are fueled, among other things, by banners directed against <bliep>, combined with the already known violence against journalists, the NCTV’s warnings about conspiracy extremists, and the recent arrests of one of <bliep>’s counsel [00:51:59] for involvement in a violent anti-institutional group. Viewed against mass protests—including here outside—these insinuations create an extremely threatening and very unpleasant situation for Ms. <bliep> and <bliep>. It can therefore be stated that <bliep> [00:52:19] indeed aim for the chilling effect mentioned. Given that it is entirely clear what the proposed experts will say, the requested evidence does not appear to stem from a sincere desire for truth-finding but functions as a means of pressure. <bliep> assess the request as a measure aimed at personal disqualification and intimidation. The proposed measure is completely detached from a viable underlying claim and is presented in a context in which those involved have already been publicly stigmatized and threatened. Considering the combination of the obviously hopeless legal claim and the chosen personal targets, the public framing of those involved as criminals, and the broader societal tension around journalistic reporting on Covid-19, this request—an extension of the pending action on the merits—amounts, by its nature, to an improper increase of their personal burdens, with the aim of discouraging further journalistic participation in the public debate on Covid-19 or forcing the publication [00:53:23] of content that pleases <bliep>. This constitutes a weighty reason to reject the requested evidence. On

behalf of <bliep>, I therefore request that the measures be declared inadmissible, or at least be rejected, with an order that <bliep> be ordered to pay the subsequent costs of the dispute, plus statutory interest.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:53:41] Thank you. The floor is yours.

Mr. M.E.A. Möhring: [00:53:44] On behalf of the State. I have also put a few points on paper.

Mr. M.E.A. Möhring: [00:54:45] Applicants wish to hear various persons as experts and put various questions to them, such as whether the disease Covid-19 exists, whether there was a pandemic, and whether the vaccines against Covid-19 are a bioweapon with which genocide is being committed. They want this in order to determine their legal position. This request—if admissible at all—must be rejected. The request is contrary to due process, constitutes an abuse of power, and there is no interest in it. The State has explained this extensively in its written defense; at this hearing the State will briefly highlight several arguments. A preliminary taking of evidence, as requested here, cannot take place during pending proceedings. It is for the judge in that pending case to determine whether evidence is necessary; the request founders on this. There is already a proceeding in which, moreover, the same request is on the table. The persons named by applicants are also not experts, certainly not independent and impartial experts. Furthermore, experts can only be heard on factual questions that are also relevant, and many of the questions applicants wish to ask are neither factual nor relevant. The State also readily believes that, if these persons are heard, they will answer in a way that aligns with applicants’ position. These persons have already publicly expressed such views—namely that Covid-19 does not exist, that there was no pandemic, and that the vaccines are unsafe [00:56:44]. Applicants therefore do not need these persons to be heard as experts to know what they will say. Moreover, these persons are also prepared to set out their opinions for applicants in writing, which would be sufficient for applicants to determine their legal position. And the fact that these persons would so declare does not at all mean that applicants’ position on Covid-19 would then be established. There are many independent and impartial experts who would say the opposite. The views of the persons named by applicants run counter to the broad, worldwide scientific consensus. The scientific consensus is that Covid-19 exists, that there was a pandemic, and that the vaccines against Covid are safe and effective. Hearing the persons named by applicants would therefore not advance the dispute between the parties. Against this background, the State cannot escape the impression that this request in fact serves a very different purpose: to have certain persons heard by a judge as experts in order to obtain a certain legitimacy for their views. But preliminary evidence is not intended for that. The request must, if admissible at all, therefore be rejected. Thank you.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [00:58:32] The next one—your turn. We will skip you. Next is Mr. <bliep>.

Mr. D.C. Roessing: [00:58:41] Okay. Yes. We will present a brief defense on behalf of Dr. <bliep>. We have prepared no speaking notes. We will respond to what has just been said. I think that for my <bliep> as well, the fact that he is addressed personally should not be at issue. We will briefly address what Mr. Stassen put forward about Mr. Yeadon specifically, because I think that particularly concerns Pfizer, and it addressed the defense advanced for Pfizer—or at least by <bliep>. First, in paragraph 21 of the speaking notes it was said that Mr. Yeadon has the necessary qualifications and has done thorough research. I would first address Mr. Yeadon’s qualifications. We have already explained in the written defense that Mr. Yeadon does not have the qualifications that would justify assuming he has particular expertise that makes him suitable to give an expert statement here. I think Mr. <bliep> also referred to that. It would validate a certain degree of expertise that he does not possess. For Pfizer that is particularly relevant because Pfizer does not want this gentleman to feign an expert view on pharmaceutical products that Pfizer develops and spread incorrect information about them. That cannot be allowed. Then about that in-depth research. The reproach is then that Yeadon’s view has not yet been refuted and that he has not been sued or anything like that. But there has not been a proceeding in which his opinion was at issue. Instead, for example, the video we received on Sunday—we have not seen that in the pending main proceedings, so there was as yet no need to respond to it. If I listen to what Mr. Stassen proposes by way of examination and counter-examination, then we are effectively already dealing with a case on the merits. We would all have to question Mr. Yeadon and you would then have to make a judgment about his expertise or the facts on which he testifies. That should not be at issue. Positions have already been taken in that main case and what Mr. Yeadon is stating has indeed already been refuted; I’ll let Mr. <bliep> explain that.

Mr. M. Bredenoord-Spoek: [01:01:14] Yes, that all relates to the statement of defense in the main case. It sets out extensively how the entire vaccine came into being, the regulations it had to meet, how that process ran, which approvals were required—and the conclusion is that it is safe and effective. That applies not only to Pfizer’s vaccine but to the other manufacturers as well. So this has been sufficiently addressed in the main case—and that is where it should be addressed. It is therefore not the case that nothing has been said in response to the assertions Mr. Stassen has made here, but that is all in the already pending main case. If other assertions are made there, our clients will undoubtedly respond again. This is not about muzzling a certain gentleman or about censorship. Anyone is free to submit a new statement or record another video and submit it, and the debate will take place there. And finally, Pfizer does not see why it should have to refute everything—prove negative facts. Rather—and you heard Mr. Stassen say this—“say the name as loudly and as often as possible.” This is a campaign. This is not how a legal proceeding needs to be organized, so for that reason as well, Pfizer believes this should be rejected. That’s all.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:02:47] Thank you. Mr. Stassen?

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:02:52] Yes, I have a few remarks. If I listen carefully, none of the lawyers actually responds to what I have truly said here on behalf of clients. That underlines that we are in a situation where all respondents apparently—this is quite obvious—are simply obliged to maintain the official narrative, which we have also often discussed in the main proceedings. We return to this in the statement of reply. Maintaining the official narrative is an absolute precondition for being an executor of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset. And you see it before your eyes: how that official narrative—against better knowledge—“safe,” “effective,” vaccine development, all that nonsense—must be repeated. Because these executors of the Covid-19 project are obliged to do so. That is why we stand here squarely opposed, while the facts have long since overtaken the official narrative. I want to give some context to how we are sitting here today, which is actually unimaginable. Let me begin with the reaction of Mr. <bliep> for <bliep>. He says, “I refer to the court’s judgment,” and I hear in that that he does not distance himself from the defenses that have all been raised. He does not distance himself, and I therefore infer that he sees no reason to distance himself; I thus take it that he aligns himself with them.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:04:38] And of course we—on behalf of applicants—find that very unfortunate. The statement of reply you have read is packed—packed, packed—with evidence with which the entire official narrative and the preferred reality are, at the very least, on the verge of bursting and, in my view, already exploded. A recurring point is the ability to address private individuals. I have already said the necessary about this in my notes. If you can make a sufficiently personal and serious reproach, you can indeed address private individuals. That is precisely why, for example, not the NOS and not De Telegraaf have been sued, but <bliep>, because they behaved unlawfully on a personal level and a serious reproach can be made about that. They cannot hide behind an institution funded by tax money, such as the NOS, or something like De Telegraaf, which incidentally was banned for years after the Second World War for collaboration with the Nazis. They cannot hide behind that. We address them personally. It doesn’t actually matter, because the main proceedings are not what we are here for today. My clients want their own new proceeding; let there be no misunderstanding.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:06:17] And that, of course, is one of the defenses I have already answered in my submissions. This is not an extension of the main proceedings. My clients want their own new proceeding and want to assess their legal position. However much this is being spun, that is not what is at issue. And then, coming back to <bliep>, because some feel the need to stand up for them: They have, through the organizations they control, brought nothing to light about what my clients should have known. If they had been properly informed, with all available information—including the Pfizer report that we have often discussed, which I believe was on the table as early as April 2021—then no one here would ever have taken a shot. They did not bring any of that to the public. They only cooperated in implementing the project Covid-19: The Great Reset, with the goal of misleading people into taking an injection. That is as clear as can be, and you may indeed address them personally. Let’s see. Yes, I will look at Mr. <bliep>’s pleading note. The first point is all repetition—so I have already repeated it in my notes. But I

want to draw out one very important point—or actually two. One: at paragraph 1.6 it says: “Moreover, these persons are willing to set out their opinion for applicants in writing again.”

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:08:00] I don’t know where they got that information. I can tell you that the experts have often been willing, with many parties, to set out opinions in writing, but concluded that people don’t listen or easily set them aside. These experts insist that if they cooperate, there will be a preliminary expert-witness examination, so that they can present their case before an institution—in this case the judiciary—the highest institution in the rule of law. Nothing stands above the judiciary. That is where they want to speak. These expert-witnesses are not at all waiting to scribble some little piece without being heard here at court. They have an expert opinion, but they know it is useless if you only put it on paper. These people are now fully censored. That applied to Michael Yeadon as well. He is fully censored—has made perhaps 200 videos and you probably know none of them because they never get through. He is fully censored, has attended conferences, done everything, but you hear and see nothing. That is also thanks to <bliep>, among others, because they broadcast nothing about it. They do nothing with it. That is why we said in the main proceedings that the tort claim continues up to the date of the judgment.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:09:28] And that is the situation. Another very important point, paragraph 1.7 of those notes: it says, “The opinion of the persons named by applicants runs counter to the broad scientific consensus.”

In my introduction and submissions I already said there is no scientific consensus. But let me go a step deeper. What is scientific consensus? We can at least establish that there is disagreement. I can name five world-class experts who do not at all support that “scientific consensus.” But scientific consensus is not democracy. It is not the case that if most people say A, then it is scientifically true. The question is: who has the best-substantiated judgment? It is not about, “we all think it’s so, so it’s so.” No. Who has the best arguments? “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. If you test a hypothesis and you arrive at a positive answer, that is provisionally true. But in science we have often seen that what was assumed true is later overtaken by another hypothesis that is again tested true.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:11:06] So the whole concept of scientific consensus is, I think, part of a large psychological and information operation to mislead people by saying: look, we have so many experts—all paid by the State—who have declared this; now it is true. That is not what this is about. This case is about truth-finding, and you cannot cut the corner by saying there is already a scientific consensus. No, that is precisely why these experts must be heard, and not others. And of course in counter-examination anything can be set against them and those people can be asked anything. But that is why it is vital that these particular experts be heard—those outside that monstrosity of “scientific consensus” on which the State relies. It is a flop and that will also become apparent when these people are heard. They will substantiate very well how they arrive

at their opinions. That substantiation is lacking from all respondents. That is what I wanted to note. Then I have Mr. <bliep>'s notes here, and I think they are very objectionable. Again the story of addressing private individuals. I have covered that and will not repeat it. The chilling effect I have addressed. Let me see; at paragraph 4 it says that the claim against <bliep> in the case <bliep>...

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:12:38] Why try to join? I already told you they will not join. They will start a new proceeding. Yet that is put in our mouths. It says that claim is utterly hopeless. I find that exceedingly disrespectful to the judiciary. That case—with 146 exhibits of evidence—has been brought before the three-judge panel of your court. And this party simply says: “this is hopeless.” What is this? I would say: let’s wait and see. I tell you: that case is not hopeless. That case is rock solid, and we will see. And then this “chilling effect.” What nonsense is that? If you truly believe the case is hopeless, why then are you chilled? What are you worried about if it is so hopeless? Something in this reasoning doesn’t add up. Either it is promising and then there is a chilling effect, or it is hopeless and then there is no chilling effect. This reasoning cannot be followed. Then a bit of disinformation in this pleading note. It concerns the position of Stichting RechtOprecht. As a lawyer, I want to avoid any misunderstanding about whom I act for, so let me be very clear. This note says something that is simply not true. They did not ask me about it either. They just claim. But I have clients—indeed, they are the clients <bliep>

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:14:09] and the three persons here—two gentlemen and one lady—and those are my clients. I am not counsel to Stichting RechtOprecht. I have nothing to do with it, other than that the foundation supports my clients financially in the case. That’s all. But here it says: no, that foundation, of which my clients are supposedly a part, has some very nasty plan towards the NOS and De Telegraaf. My clients have nothing to do with Stichting RechtOprecht. Absolutely nothing. So where this assertion comes from—I really don’t know—but this is framing that is absolutely unacceptable. And in the other lawyers’ contributions, I hear that they build on these foundations, which are quicksand—strange stories about anti-institutional and conspiracy and whatnot. My clients need not be associated with any of that, and I expect to hear apologies—not for me, but for my clients—about these absurd statements attributed to my clients.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:15:16] There is not a shred of evidence for it. Absolutely nothing. That this can simply be stated—I must make some remarks about that. Uhm—well, I have spoken about personal liability; I will not repeat it. I have addressed the chilling effect. Let’s see—yes, paragraph 10: it is aimed at personal disqualification and intimidation. Well, these people disqualified themselves. They do not need the foundation or my clients for that, because their journalistic duties have absolutely been breached. And yes—everything is turned upside down, which is characteristic. They talk about public framing, right? Well, we have, I think, a very extensive file in which we have described along which NATO guidelines, and so on, such operations are carried out. This is no longer framing. It is simply an investigation into the facts and it must be possible to discuss them. Uhm—let me see; do we have more? I think so.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:16:26] Perhaps a few general remarks. We distance ourselves from everything that has been put forward here—which, I think, really rests on nothing. But in general: what is this about? I think the starting point should really be that applicants themselves may determine in which experts they place their trust. That must be the starting point. That respondents disagree with that choice has only one reason: these experts are independent, expert, and have integrity. And what does that mean? That if they deliver a well-substantiated expert opinion, it affects not only my clients’ legal position but also its mirror image—namely respondents’ legal position. Because if my clients can assess their legal position on the basis of the evidence that will indeed come to light in this expert-witness examination—and I predict it will stir up much I do not yet know, because these experts know a thousand times more than I do—then respondents’ legal position will be shaken, namely that they will simply be held liable for tort, as claimed.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:17:55] That is what this is about. So respondents argue on the basis that they say: “you have no interest in determining your legal position.” But the underlying driver is, “do not touch our legal position,” because for now we still get away with it thanks to that whole apparatus of the preferred reality. “And please do not pierce it, because then we have a problem.”

Thus this discussion is conducted with forked tongue here today in the courtroom. Applicants’ legal position is tied up with respondents’ legal position. Those positions cannot be viewed independently of each other and explain all the odd defenses we hear. Well then, let us look briefly at those respondents. I will not say too much, but for example Mr. <bliep>, mentioned several times today: the police unions in Italy, I believe a week or two ago, simply filed a criminal complaint about crimes against humanity.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:19:07] Against Mr. Bourla.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:19:08] Those are police unions—Gewerkschaften. They do so because, with thousands of pages of Pfizer papers, they substantiate that they were gravely mistreated, that fraud was committed—corporate fraud—and everything that goes with it, up to and including murder. Then it is not so strange that the conflict in one party’s legal position affects the other’s if that evidence comes up, because this is about truth-finding. Yes, and this is then fought out in a legal process. And look, for example, at <bliep>. Yes, he has already fled to Singapore. There is no extradition treaty, so that man is far away. They are already covering themselves. Look at what kind of people these are. Look at <bliep>. He happens to end up at NATO and thinks he can enjoy immunity there. Because that is in the NATO treaty. None of this is a coincidence. And yes, they try—essentially—to escape the dance by misleading and hurling false ad hominem arguments—because that is what they are. They fire them at the highly respectable experts we have proposed. With false ad hominem arguments they try to attack those experts, and the underlying interest—I hope I have outlined it well—is the work of a crime syndicate of which respondents are a part. And in that crime syndicate...

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:20:51] You still have quite a lot of argument.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:20:53] Well, I am responding. I am making very clear where this defense all comes from—and that crime syndicate commits genocide. The largest genocide ever, against the entire world population.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:21:05] I am going to interrupt you. Once again, today is not about the substance. I understand that.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:21:10] No, but they have addressed the substance, so I will say something about it.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:21:13] Could you try to conclude?

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:21:18] Well then, I will certainly come to a conclusion. But I will still say it. As I already said: this is criminal. Criminal. Genocide of the entire world population through deception, coercion, intimidation, and terror—and through the deployment of that Covid-19 bioweapon. And I think—let me underline it again—if you, as judge, reject this request, which I do not expect, but if you did, then you must reckon with the fact that the same blood will be on your hands as on respondents'. That is—because they will continue with this project Covid-19: The Great Reset.

The deployment of a bioweapon is at issue. Deception is the method—deception, intimidation, and so on. So this must become a public debate—it cannot be otherwise. And it must be in the courtroom, because that is the highest institution in a rule of law. It cannot be left to politics—as has become apparent. It must be in the courtroom. So today the rule of law must show what it is worth. I wish you great wisdom in your decision. Yes.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:22:43] Mr. <bliep>. I see you thinking. Would you like to say anything?

Mr. A.H. Ekker: [01:22:47] No, thank you.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:22:50] Mr. <bliep>. It was said just now that you in fact align with the respondents. Would you like to comment?

Mr. W. Heemskerk: [01:22:58] We have referred the matter to judgment, and I tried to explain what that means. You know what it means. I will leave it at that.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:23:04] Would you like to say anything?

Mr. R.H.W. Lamme: [01:23:07] Briefly, uhm. I have heard Mr. Stassen. The NOS and De Telegraaf have no objection at all to discussing the content of articles. What we are discussing today is only whom you address for that. My position remains: you do not come in through the front door of someone who works for an employer, and <bliep> and <bliep> have a managerial role. The actual articles are written by editors; they do so independently in teams, and, as far as I

can see, there is no single piece or indication in the file—my clients are barely even mentioned in the petition. So if it indeed appears that they have a personal, serious reproach or acted unlawfully, it is of course for you to judge that. But I do not see facts to that effect in the file, and I regret that we cannot discuss the content of the articles today. Because if what Mr. Stassen asserts on behalf of his clients is true, then we can have a substantive discussion. But we cannot do that now, because the wrong parties are being addressed. I will leave it at that.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:24:09] Would you like to say anything?

Mr. R.W. Veldhuis: [01:24:10] No, I refer to the statement of defense and the pleading note.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:24:13] And you? One of you.

Mr. D.C. Roessing: [01:24:16] No, we will leave it at that as well.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:24:18] Then, finally, I would like to ask one of you three—would you like to say anything? Is there anything you wish to add? No, nothing either. Then we will now come to the conclusion of this matter. A decision will issue in six weeks. We will consider it carefully. I hereby close the hearing and thank you all for coming. And one more thing for you: should your press people say that about that audio recording, we must communicate with the communications department whether that is feasible. Because I did hear various names of those involved mentioned, so there will be some communication about that.

Mr. P.W.H. Stassen: [01:25:05] See what the court is willing to do voluntarily. Of course it must do that. I have no objection. But if you ask me whether it is principled, I have answered that. So I am certainly not blocking it.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:25:14] Quite clear.

Mr. M.E.A. Möhring: [01:25:14] Thank you. There is still an objection from the State.

Judge Ms. J.A. Werkema: [01:25:17] Yes, I will take that into account as well.

Notes on the translation

- I retained all timestamps and original redactions (“<bliep>”) and used “applicants”/“respondents” consistent with Dutch civil-procedure terminology.
- Legal terms were translated in context: e.g., *bodemprocedure* → “action on the merits/main proceedings”; *meervoudige kamer* → “three-judge panel”; *voorlopige bewijsverrichtingen* → “preliminary taking of evidence”; *contra-enquête* → “counter-examination.”
- Rhetorical flourishes and quotations (e.g., John 8:32) were preserved.