Press release dated August 20, 2025

regarding the application procedure at the Leeuwarden District Court with reference number C/17/199273 / HA RK 25-17)

On behalf of three clients who suffered serious physical and non-material harm as a result of receiving Covid-19 mRNA injections, the undersigned initiated a petition procedure at the District Court of Noord-Nederland, Leeuwarden location. The request to the court is to hear five international expert witnesses whose opinions differ from the official Covid-19 narrative (a request for preliminary evidence). My clients, like many who realize that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project, have pressing questions of great social importance. A social or scientific debate on these questions cannot occur without judicial intervention. For this reason, it is of the utmost importance that experts are heard in court, before the judge and with the opportunity for a public procedural debate and second opinions. This allows my clients—and others—to determine their legal position based on this information.

The questions in the petition proceedings concern, among other things, whether the Covid-19 mRNA injections constitute a bioweapon used by the defendants, as executors of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project, to commit genocide. The experts nominated in this context are Catherine Austin Fitts, Michael Yeadon, Sasha Latypova, Katherine Watt, and Joseph Sansone. For details of the petition and the CVs of these expert witnesses, please refer to the court documents published on the website of the RechtOprecht Foundation, which facilitates these proceedings (www.RechtOprecht.online).

On the aforementioned website, you will also find the complete procedural documents in a substantive proceeding (summons proceedings) I am initiating on behalf of seven other clients – one of whom has since died as a result of the Covid-19 mRNA injections. These substantive proceedings contain extensive evidence supporting the claim that the Covid-19 injections are a bioweapon used by the defendants as a group to commit genocide. These substantive proceedings are also being facilitated by the Stichting RechtOprecht (RightOprecht Foundation). An oral hearing will still be required in these substantive proceedings before the Leeuwarden District Court can issue an (interim) judgment. No date has yet been set for this hearing. Given the similarity in subject matter, both proceedings are of great public importance.

Both the substantive proceedings and the application proceedings concern civil law proceedings in which legal area I have extensive experience and have specialized extensively through my more than twenty years of legal practice and by following a great many postgraduate (Grotius) courses.

Alle diensten en (andere) werkzaamheden worden verricht uit hoofde van een overeenkomst van opdracht met Stassen & Kemps Advocaten B.V. (KvK: 17225491).
Op de overeenkomst zijn onze Algemene Voorwaarden van toepassing waarin ondermeer een beperking van de aansprakelijkheid is opgenomen tot het bedrag van € 4.000.000,- per schadegeval.

To financially support these two procedures, the RechtOprecht Foundation relies on donations from donors, which are essential for their continued operation. Donation options can also be found on the aforementioned website.

Shortly before the oral hearing of the request on July 9th, a new press guideline was introduced in the Netherlands, which stipulates that only so-called "accredited journalists" are authorized to make video recordings of hearings. Despite the fact that the judge is not bound by this press guideline and my urgent request to the judge to allow video recordings by the many journalists present, the hearing was censored. The accredited journalists were conspicuous by their absence. Regarding the questionable course of events at and around this hearing, I refer to the post-trial correspondence with the court, which is also published on the aforementioned website.

There was no cogent defense against the request to hear experts during the oral hearing on July 9th. During this hearing, I extensively discussed the enormous public interest. The judge, who heard the case, also stated at the hearing that he recognized the public interest in the request. Bill Gates's lawyer deferred to the court's ruling at the hearing, so no objections were raised against him to granting the request, and it was therefore ready to be granted. With complete disregard for my clients' situation, several of the respondents, in their defense, repeated the official narrative that the Covid-19 mRNA injections were safe and effective. The media respondents argued that their employers (NOS/Telegraaf), not themselves, should have been sued. I concluded my plea by noting that if the judge were to reject the request, she would have the same blood on her hands as the defendants, and I wished the judge much wisdom in her decision.

Today's decision makes it clear that the judge lacked the much-needed wisdom to keep her hands clean in this case.

An edited audio recording of the hearing, authorized by the court, will only be available at the same time as the verdict. You will not be able to see the non-verbal responses of the public and the defense on this recording. This audio recording will also be posted on the aforementioned website of the Stichting RechtOprecht (RightOprecht Foundation). In response to my questions, the court declined to explain why it decided to distort the voices of the defendants' lawyers in these recordings.

This blundering ruling by this court of first instance will be appealed to the Court of Appeal in Leeuwarden. The defendants still have a lot to face procedurally. In that regard, at the end of this press release, I would like to draw your attention to upcoming procedural developments that are of great social importance.

Regarding the aforementioned substantive proceedings, the media, and in particular the press (journalists), are reminded in the aforementioned context that further evidence will be introduced in the substantive proceedings in the foreseeable future. This evidence

makes it abundantly clear that the Covid-19 mRNA injections qualify as a bioweapon used to commit genocide. This also demonstrates that the public continues to be completely misled by the perception that the Covid-19 mRNA injections are a vaccine developed and produced with safety guarantees. In the substantive proceedings, it was argued in this regard that former Dutch Minister of Health Hugo de Jonge, among others, misled the public by stating (synchronously with other fellow implementers of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project) that "the vaccine has been rigorously tested and no corners were cut." This, while, as the new evidence will demonstrate, it is in fact a bioweapon.

A new press release will follow on the occasion of the introduction of this new evidence in the main proceedings.



Peter Stassen