Main Case - March 13, 2026 email from Attorney Peter Stassen, to District Court of North Netherlands - Leeuwarden Division, translated from Dutch to English

---

From: "stassen@uwadvocaten.nl"
To: handel.leeuwarden@rechtspraak.nl.uwadvocaten.aangetekendmailen.nl
reimer.veldhuis@pelsrijcken.nl,
anne@acr.amsterdam,
Cc: anton@ekker.legal,
davine.roessingh@debrauw.com,
w.heemskerk@pelsrijcken.nl

Date: Friday, 13 March 2026 14:22

Subject:

[Plaintiffs] et al. v. The State of the Netherlands et al.
Your ref.: Case reference C/17/190788
Attachments: Case number 23/172 [D100607_I68483254]
Vonnis_2026-11-03_Rb North Nederland.pdf;
Deed statement partijen.pdf Case reference C17190788 case number 23172.pdf;

Request for additional/correction of judgment pursuant to Articles 31 and 32 of the Code of Civil Procedure
Also request for livestream

Your Honor, Sir, Lady,

In the meantime, I have taken note of your judgment of 11 March 2026. This judgment contains a number of obvious errors that lend themselves to simple rectification (Article 31 of the Code of Civil Procedure) and/or it has failed to comply with a number of parts of the information requested in my deed of 14 January 2026.

That [Jan.14, 2026] deed includes, in so far as relevant here:

[Plaintiffs] request the court to ensure that [plaintiffs] have the experts they have put forward Michael Yeadon, Catherine Austin Fitts, Sasha Latypova, Katherine Watt and Joseph Sansone to the hearing as witnesses and/or experts and have them sit in the courtroom.

For the sake of good order, it is hereby noted that the rejection of your court's decision regarding the hearing of party experts under oath does not affect the right of plaintiffs to bring witnesses and experts to the hearing. The exercise of this right does not require the prior authorisation of your court. The requirements of due process require no more than a timely announcement to the court, which announcement has been made hereby.

Furthermore, in the event that one or more of the experts nominated by them is unable to be physically present at the hearing, [plaintiffs] request the court to allow an online connection to be established with that expert or experts during the hearing. The court is politely requested to play a facilitating role in this.

Furthermore, the court is requested to admit an interpreter in order to enable the experts brought by [plaintiffs] et al. to follow the hearing, as these experts do not speak the Dutch language. The court is also politely requested to play a facilitating role with regard to that interpreter.

[Plaintiffs] et al. have a great interest in being able to bring in the experts they put forward, because these experts, who have relevant and crucial knowledge for the assessment of the case, are able to further explain their statements, which are already part of the procedure, and to discuss everything that the State et al. can object to their findings.

In addition, being able to consult with these experts at the hearing is of great importance for [plaintiffs]et al. in order to be able to respond adequately to positions taken by the State et al. and possibly to be taken at the hearing with regard to the competence and integrity of these experts and/or with regard to the correctness of their reported findings.

Furthermore, this presence is of great importance to the lawyer of [plaintiffs] et al. because he also wishes to have the opportunity to consult in case the State et al. and/or your court have questions or comments about the evidence submitted by [plaintiffs] et al. on 7 December 2025 that are of great importance for the assessment of this case.

In its judgment of 11 March 2026, your court has not decided on:

- The request to ensure that the witnesses/experts can be seated in the courtroom;
- The timeliness of the announcement of the bringing of the experts;
- The procedural consequences of this announcement of the participation of these experts;
- The requested opportunity for the lawyer of [plaintiffs]et al. to consult with the experts;
- The organisational wish of [plaintiffs] et al. to establish an online connection with the experts by the court insofar as they cannot be physically present;
- The organisational wish for the court to facilitate an interpreter for the benefit of the experts.

[plaintiffs]et al. request that the judgment of 11 March 2026 be corrected or supplemented. taking into account the previous points.

<u>Request for live stream</u>

In connection with the great social importance in this procedure and the great social, national and international interest in it, as well as the therefore great interest in the public nature of this procedure, [plaintiffs] et al. also request a live stream of the planned oral hearing.

[Plaintiffs] et al. note that this request for a live stream is outside the framework of ground 2.14 and ground 2.13 of the judgment of 26 November 2025 regarding wishes regarding the substantive part of the oral proceedings.

I will send a copy of this message to the defendants' lawyers.

I am happy to hear from you.

Sincerely,

Peter Stassen

Stassen & Kemps Advocaten B.V.
Office address: Nachtegaallaan 6, 5611 CV, Eindhoven
Correspondence address: P.O. Box 7004, 5605 JA, Eindhoven
Tel: +31 40 2676260
Mob: 06 - 41663460
stassen@uwadvocaten.nl
http://www.uwadvocaten.nl