District Court of the Northern Netherlands, Leeuwarden

branch. Hearing: 22 October 2026

Case reference: C/17/190788

Case number: 23/172

PS/D100607

MINUTES OF THE HEARING
PROCEDURAL AND PRACTICAL MATTERS AND
SUBMITTING EXHIBITS, AND ALSO
CONTAINING A DEED
CORRECTION OF AN OBVIOUS CLERICAL
ERROR AND OFFER OF EVIDENCE

concerning:

Claimants:

1. M[redacted]
2. Ms [redacted]
3. M[redacted] **deceased**
4. M[redacted]
5. Mr [redacted]
6. Ms [redacted] **deceased**
7. Mr [redacted]

Lawyer P.W.H. Stassen, LL.B.

v.

(public officials)

1. Mr **EVERHARDUS ITE HOFSTRA**
2. Mr **JAAP TAMINO VAN DISSEL**
3. Ms **MARIA PETRONELLA GERARDA KOOPMANS**
4. Mr **MARK RUTTE**
5. Ms **SIGRID AGNES MARIA KAAG**

6. Mr **HUGO MATTHEÜS DE JONGE**
7. Mr **ERNST JOHAN KUIPERS**
8. Mr **DIEDERIK ANTONIUS MARIA PAULUS JOHANNES GOMMERS**
9. Mr **WOPKE BASTIAAN HOEKSTRA**
10. Ms **CORNELIA VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN**

Solicitors: Mr R.W. Veldhuis and Mr M.E.A. Möhring

(pharmaceutical industry)

11. Mr **ALBERT BOURLA**

Solicitor: D. C. Roessingh, LL.B.

(mass media)

12. Ms **GISELLE JACQUELINE MARIE-THÉRÈSE VAN CANN**
13. Mr **PAUL JANSEN**

Lawyer: Mr A. Bekema

(non-governmental organisation (NGO, WEF))

14. Mr **FEIKE SIJBESMA**

Lawyers: Mr R.W. Veldhuis and Mr M.E.A. Möhring.

15. Mr **WILLIAM HENRY BILL GATES III**

Lawyer: W.H. Heemskerk, LL.B.

(quasi-governmental body)

16. Ms **AGNES CATHARINA VAN DER VOORT-KANT**

Lawyer: A.H. Ekker, LL.B.

(public authority)

17. THE **STATE OF THE NETHERLANDS**, a legal entity under public law, having its seat in The Hague ("the State") and with its registered office at Korte Voorhout 8, The Hague (2511 CB);

Lawyers: R.W. Veldhuis, LL.M., and M.E.A. Möhring, LL.M.

The Claimants hereby give notice on behalf of:

STATEMENT SETTING OUT PROCEDURAL AND PRACTICAL MATTERS

Access to the court

1. In a letter dated 15 September 2026, the court announced that it would be implementing a number of measures relating to the safety of those present at the oral hearing on 22 October. In that letter, the court stated that the lawyers and parties would be given the opportunity to enter and exit the court building via an entrance other than the main entrance. The court requested the parties to inform it by 1 October 2026 at the latest whether, and if so, how many people they wish to make use of this arrangement. In response to this, the claimants and the undersigned hereby inform the court as follows.

2. The claimants, or at least some of them, have previously entered and left your court via the main entrance in connection with the oral hearing of the jurisdictional objection raised by Bill Gates

in these proceedings on 18 September 2024. On that occasion, a huge crowd turned out. It was a very peaceful
and one that was committed to the rule of law. For many years now, this peacefulness has characterised the way in which people express their interest in these proceedings and, more broadly, their interest in and concern about the functioning of the rule of law.

3. The claimants, represented by the undersigned, have no factual grounds for entering or leaving your court other than by the normal and legitimate route, that is to say, via the main entrance.

In view of this, they will not make use of this offer from your court. ***Let this be noted!***

Statement and request in response to your court's letter dated 25 August 2026

4. In your court's letter dated 25 August 2026, your court commented on the possibilities of a hybrid hearing. To date, the claimants have not made any request to your court in this regard, as they attach great importance to appearing in person before your court.

5. The sad news that must be reported in this regard is that Claimant No. 3 (following in the footsteps of Claimant No. 6) passed away on 10 May 2026. Claimant No. 3 died at the age of seventy-five, a few weeks after being diagnosed with aggressive cancer. Your court is hereby notified of this. A copy of the death certificate relating to Claimant No. 3 forms part of this document (Exhibit 147). There are no grounds for staying the proceedings in connection with this death. The late claimants 3 and 6 remain parties to these proceedings.

6. Claimant No. 4, on whose behalf her father spoke at the aforementioned hearing in the preliminary proceedings on jurisdiction because, as a result of the Covid-19 injections, she was physically
to raise her voice, is now physically unable to speak in a way that can be clearly understood. Her physical condition has deteriorated to such an extent that her motor skills barely allow her to move. As a result, Claimant No. 4 has
no longer possesses the abilities that are essential for effective communication. She is physically no longer able to undertake the travel required to attend the hearing in person and to participate in the oral proceedings in court, although she would like nothing more to do so. On the other hand, claimant 4 is still in very good mental health and, insofar as she is still able, wishes to attend the hearing.

In view of these compelling circumstances, the court is respectfully requested to excuse Claimant No. 4 for her physical absence from the hearing on 22 October and to facilitate her participation in the hearing online. ***Duly noted!***

7. The letter from your court dated 25 August 2026 notes that none of the parties has given explicit consent to the making of video and audio recordings. However, your court is fully aware of the plaintiffs' position of principle on this matter, and it was discussed at length at the aforementioned hearing on 18 September 2024, of which a video recording was made for the press and for publication. The claimants continue to attach great importance to the openness of the administration of justice, and the explanation and consent previously given at the hearing before this court on this matter of principle remain fully applicable.

Insofar as is still necessary, the claimants and the undersigned hereby (once again) inform your court that they have no objection to being seen and heard during the live stream (video recording) and (once again) expressly grant their consent to this. ***This is hereby recorded!***

8. At the end of the letter dated 25 August 2026, your court is requested to state the number of persons with whom it intends to appear at the hearing. This concerns 27 persons, including claimants 1, 2, 5 and 7, the claimants' solicitor, two of the experts proposed by the claimants and 20 other persons in respect of whom The claimants consider it very important that these individuals are granted access to the courtroom in connection with the right of journalists and members of the public to gather information and news without government interference (freedom of the press).

In view of the foregoing, the claimants respectfully request that your court arrange for 20 people, in addition to the aforementioned claimants and their solicitor who will be physically present at the hearing, to be granted special seating in the courtroom where the oral proceedings are to take place, specifically in the front row or rows of the seating designated for the public, as far as possible on the plaintiffs' side. The claimants' solicitor hereby makes the practical suggestion that your court should issue 20 seating vouchers prior to the hearing, whereby the claimants' solicitor will ensure that the persons concerned can present these vouchers upon entering the courtroom and take their seats in the places designated for them at that time. ***Duly noted!***

9. In a letter dated 7 May 2026, the court asked the claimants to confirm whether the experts they had appointed would be attending the oral hearing in person, accompanied by an interpreter, so that the court would know whether it needed to make available the separate room referred to in its letter.

10. Firstly, the approach adopted by the court in its letter implies that the experts in question cannot be seated in the courtroom (where the oral hearing takes place) in such a way that they can clearly hear what is being discussed in a language that is foreign and incomprehensible to them. Secondly, the approach adopted by the court in this case effectively undermines a party's right to bring experts to an oral hearing of their case. On this point, the following applies.

11. Article 200(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure provides that, at the request of a party, the court may hear an expert who has not been appointed by the court. The claimants and their solicitor are aware that this is a matter of the court's discretionary power of your court, whereby, according to established case law, it is left to the discretion of the judge adjudicating the facts to decide whether to exercise the power to seek advice from an expert. In view of the importance of the having heard the experts, which is evident in itself from the evidence explained and filed by the plaintiffs' solicitor by letter dated 7 December 2025 concerning the classification of the Covid-19 injections as a biological weapon, and, moreover, from the arguments put forward by the plaintiffs in the writ of summons and the statement of reply, the claimants are of the opinion that your court has used the discretionary power of assessment vested in it for a purpose other than that for which that power was granted and, furthermore, that the court has exceeded the boundaries within which (all) judges acting reasonably in a state governed by the rule of law are required to remain.

12. It may well be that the court has the aforementioned discretionary power, but this does not alter the fact that the requirements of proper procedural order and a legally sound interpretation of Article 200(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure preclude the experts called from being prevented from following the proceedings in the courtroom with an understanding of what is being said there, whilst, moreover, the claimants' solicitor is also prevented from

communicate in any way whatsoever in the courtroom in the context of (brief, non-disruptive or barely disruptive) consultation with the experts they have brought with them.

13. This approach adopted by your court was (partly) the reason why the plaintiffs' solicitor, in the interests of his clients and the proper conduct of the proceedings, recorded a (video) submission prior to the oral hearing, in which he necessarily put the questions to the experts himself, as might be expected of your court in this case of great public importance. This video submission forms part of the exhibits to be submitted with this document.

14. Furthermore, this also affects the right to freedom of the press, as set out above. This applies equally to the 20 individuals whom the claimants are requesting be admitted to the hearing.

In view of the foregoing, the claimants respectfully request that this Court permit the two experts to be brought to the hearing, namely Ms Latypova and Mr Sansone, as well as the 20 other persons to be brought to the hearing, to listen in the courtroom, using a smartphone and earphones, to an interpretation service to be provided by the claimants, whereby
an interpreter to be engaged by them – who is located outside the courtroom – on the basis of Article 7 of the
7
live stream authorised by your court, an interpreter to be engaged by them – who will be situated outside the courtroom – will provide a translation (into English) which the relevant (maximum) 22 people will be able to listen to via their smartphones and the earphones connected to them, without causing any disturbance to anyone else. ***Duly noted!***

15. In the aforementioned letter from your court dated 15 September 2026, your court undertook to make a separate room available to the lawyers and their clients where they can withdraw. Furthermore, as set out above, the court has offered to provide a separate room for the experts to be brought along. Notwithstanding the response set out above, it should be noted that, as far as the claimants are concerned, a single separate room or chamber for the duration of the oral hearing is sufficient and would be appreciated, on the understanding that they are permitted to admit the two aforementioned experts to that room as well.

PROCEDURAL DOCUMENTS:

The Claimants submit the following documents to the proceedings, accompanied by a brief explanation where necessary.

Due to the nature and content of the documents (size, digital video and data files), a USB stick is also attached to this document, containing the full text of all the exhibits listed below.

EXHIBIT 91 Evidence of Covid-19 vaccinations

(explanation) By deed dated 11 December 2024, the claimants submitted Exhibit 91 submitted, containing evidence of the Covid-19 injections administered to the claimants. Your court and all the defendants therefore have this in their possession. In a case list notice dated the same day, this document was rejected.
As a result, it is unclear to the claimants whether, in your court's view, Exhibit 91 forms part of the case file. The claimants are therefore once again, now supplemented with details showing all the specific batch numbers.

8

EXHIBIT 147 Eudravigilance database relating to Covid-19 injections as at 2 April 2022 (Excel file)

(explanatory note) As of 2 April 2022, the Eudravigilance database already contained 102,657 Reports of adverse reactions following Comirnaty vaccination have been received in the Netherlands. According to the data, the specific batches with which the claimants were vaccinated are linked to reports of adverse reactions as follows:

Batch number EJ6134 is linked to 2,445 reports of adverse reactions (claimant no. 6)
Batch number EJ6790 is linked to 885 reports of adverse reactions (claimant no. 6)

Batch number FC3143 is linked to adverse reactions (claimants nos. 5, 4 and 2)	4,666	reports	of
Batch number FF0688 is linked to adverse reactions (claimants No. 5, No. 4)	2,565	reports	of
Batch number FF2834 is linked to adverse reactions (claimant no. 7)	1,516	reports	of
Batch number FE1573 is linked to adverse reactions (claimant no. 1)	4,702	reports	of
Batch number EX7389 is linked to adverse reactions (claimant no. 2)	2,355	reports	of
Batch number EX0893 is linked to adverse reactions (claimant no. 3)	1218	reports	of

Significant differences in the number of reports are also evident here, which demonstrates that toxicity varies between batches and that the product is not uniform; consequently, there can be no
informed consent can exist. The late claimant 6 was injected 9, one of the early and highly toxic batches, which were undoubtedly produced before November 2020.

EXHIBIT 148 Death certificate relating to the death of claimant 3, who died on 10 May 2026 following a short illness as a result of cancer.

EXHIBIT 149 Invitation from the RIVM dated mid-August 2026 for a (ninth) 'COVID-19 jab'.

(explanation) This demonstrates the continued nature of the . The lethal and harmful Covid-19 injections, which cannot offer any health benefits whatsoever, continue to be deliberately and misleadingly promoted and imposed on the population, against better judgement.

EXHIBIT 150

Article by David Willman, an American investigative journalist, published on 16 September 2026.

(explanation)

This article reveals that US officials knew that the safety system for Covid vaccines was flawed – but ignored the FDA doctor who warned them. American officials embraced an algorithm for detecting signals of harmful effects from mRNA Covid-19 vaccines, whilst knowing it was flawed, and blocked attempts to improve it.

This is a clear example of a cover-up of which the defendants were aware, or at the very least must have been aware. A key feature of this is that doctors who do speak out – because they take their oath seriously in the context of implementing the Covid-19: The Great Reset project, are being silenced.

EXHIBIT 151

Article published by researchers affiliated with Yaffa Shir-Raz (University of Haifa) and Yaakov Ophir (University of Ariel) published their findings in the scientific journal EXCLI Journal (Experimental and Clinical Sciences Journal) on 3 September 2026.

(explanation)

In this article, the researchers publish their findings on based on detailed case reports compiled by the Israeli Ministry of Health between March 2021 and May 2022.

These reveal, amongst other things, that on 28 February 2021, the Israeli Ministry of Health issued an official alert regarding no fewer than forty cases of myocarditis resulting from the Covid—19 injections in young people, to both the European

European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the US CDC. Three days later, the Ministry's Deputy Director of Epidemiology wrote directly to the CDC: large numbers of cases of myocarditis and pericarditis were being observed in young people shortly after administration of the Pfizer vaccine. The internal CDC memo was flagged as "Importance: High".

This article shows that as early as 25 March 2021 — barely three weeks after Israel raised the alarm internationally — 157 hospital admissions and 46 deaths had been documented. Of those admissions, 65 were cases of myocarditis or pericarditis. In the final version of the report, containing data up to 9 May 2022, this figure rose to 250 out of 531 admission reports — almost half.

Each of these detailed case reports was submitted to Pfizer.

Pfizer – and therefore, in effect, Bourla and the defendants acting in concert with him – are lying through their teeth when they claim that the Covid-19 jabs are safe and effective, and that, as they continue to be rolled out, attention is being paid to safety signals indicating that people are dying or becoming critically ill. On the contrary: a cover-up has been orchestrated and is being maintained precisely to suppress those signals.

The defendants demonstrably keep all information – which makes it painfully clear that the Covid-19 injections are neither safe nor effective and, moreover, offer no health benefits whatsoever – as secret as possible and/or extremely difficult to find, and ensure that, when such information does eventually come to light, it is presented in a reassuring light and subject to extensive censorship, thereby preventing it from receiving the necessary public attention. This alone constitutes the tort alleged by the claimants.

EXHIBIT 152 Toronto Sun news article dated 17 September 2026

(explanatory note) The Toronto Sun is an English-language tabloid newspaper and digital news website. This newspaper is published daily in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. The article relates to a press conference on the Allison Inquiry.

The Allison Inquiry consists of hearings held on 8, 9, 10 and 11 September 2026, during which Canadians who have suffered injuries as a result of the Covid-19 injections gave evidence. The hearings were broadcast live from Parliament Hill in Ottawa and can be viewed at https://covidtestimony.com/hearings/

This was the first time that Canadian MPs had listened to Canadians' experiences with Covid-19 injections. In addition, testimonies were recorded from, amongst others, including the US Senator for Wisconsin, Ron Johnson, and Dr Denis Rancourt, a former professor of physics at the University of Ottawa.

The official narrative of a safe and effective vaccine – insofar as it still held any credence – has been shattered before the eyes of the world during these public hearings, prompting the Toronto Sun to rightly ask: have we, at best, witnessed the greatest mistake in public health policy in (Canadian) history, or, at worst, a crime against humanity?

Through their arguments and evidence, the claimants demonstrate that the latter is the case, and that the defendants are deliberately playing a key role in this as implementers of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project.

EXHIBIT 153 Judgment of the Regional Disciplinary Tribunal for Healthcare A2024/7870 ECLI:NL:TGZRAMS:2026:205 dated 25 August 2026 concerning GP Frank Roodenburg.

(explanatory note) This shows that a general practitioner who underestimates the danger of Covid-19

Although he correctly assessed the vaccines, protected his patients from that risk and conducted research into the efficacy of the Covid-19 vaccines, in the preferential reality imposed by the claimants he is portrayed as a threat to the safety of his patients.

EXHIBIT 154 Judgment of the United States Federal District Court States, District of Maine, dated 24 July 2024

(explanatory note) This concerns proceedings in which an American GP (Nass) was suspended in connection with the statements made by she made regarding the harmful effects of Covid-19 injections on people's health.

In the civil proceedings in question, Nass is seeking a declaration of law and an order to cease certain acts, damages (both compensatory and punitive) and reimbursement of legal fees and costs of the proceedings. The crux of Nass's argument is that the conduct of the defendants (enforcement officers) has had a chilling effect on her freedom of expression and that the disciplinary proceedings constitute a retaliatory measure for expressing views that are unwelcome.

The Federal District Court considers that absolute judicial immunity (also) applies to officials who are involved in enforcement proceedings of

administrative bodies, provided that these proceedings exhibit "sufficient characteristics of judicial proceedings".

The significance of this ruling lies in the fact that the Federal District Court considers that this may be a case in which it is appropriate to deny absolute immunity.

The ruling thus serves as a warning to regulatory bodies, enforcement authorities and those subject to disciplinary proceedings in (medical disciplinary) tribunals and organisations that curtail the right to freedom of expression by, for example, depriving a general practitioner or another member of the liberal professions of the opportunity to practise their profession or to act freely within that profession by expressing their opinions and acting on the basis of their own professional judgements.

EXHIBIT 155 Statement by Saskia Mostert before the US Senate on 3 June 2026, accompanied by the report to which she to which it refers, a report published in 2024 in *BMJ Public Health*, which examined all-cause mortality figures from Western countries between 2020 and 2022.

(explanation) The legal plausibility that the use of Covid-19 injections constitutes genocide against the world's population is thereby substantiated by the claimants.

EXHIBIT 156 Excerpts (text) from De Jonge's testimony before the parliamentary inquiry committee on the coronavirus, in which he lies.

(explanation) Lying is a form of deception. The claimants have argued that It has been explained that the defendants are lying through their teeth. This is a typical example of that and also makes it clear that the defendants are continuing their unlawful conduct in the context of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project undeterred.

EXHIBIT 157

A video submission prepared by the plaintiffs' solicitor on for the attention of this court and (the lawyers of) the defendants.

(explanation)

In this video submission, the plaintiffs' solicitor discusses in detail the context and the significant social importance of this case.

A key part of this video submission consists of the questions posed in this submission to a number of the experts called by the claimants, who give evidence on this matter under oath.

As already explained in this document, these are questions which the claimants believe should be put to the experts by your court in open court, in the presence of the public and the defendants, whilst under oath, so that their knowledge of the facts and their expertise may be shared in a dialogue with the presiding judges and the defendants (and their solicitors). This so that a clearer understanding may be reached and the expert evidence submitted by the claimants in the form of reports may form a substantial part of the procedural debate during the oral hearing scheduled for 22 October 2026.

Your court and the defendants are expressly invited to give due consideration, during the oral hearing, to the expert reports submitted by the claimants and the content of the video submission, so that a urgently needed procedural debate on these matters may take place.

The claimants aim, in this way, to make a significant contribution to the establishment of the truth, which is crucial to a fair trial within the meaning of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

EXHIBIT 158

Updated version of the expert report by Sasha Latypova in English and Dutch, which examines the situation in the Netherlands and the significance of the email exchanges contained therein in even greater detail.

(explanatory note)

An earlier version of this report was submitted to your court sent on 7 December 2025 via a USB stick. That USB stick contains all the appendices and evidence to which this report (also) refers.

This report and this evidence clearly demonstrate that Covid-19 is a military project, that the Covid-19 injections are military agents, and that they have been deployed against the population through deception, whilst it was known in advance that these injections are highly harmful and, due to their factual and legal nature (countermeasures), were developed, procured and distributed by the military

.

EXHIBIT 159

Statement by Joseph Sansone dated 28 August 2026, which is a This statement provides an explanation, based on psychological theory, for the injustice that the defendants have inflicted on the claimants through deliberate deception. Attached to this statement is a summary, signed by Sansone, regarding Dr Boyle's legal opinion.

(explanatory note)

This statement makes it clear that the late Professor Francis Boyle, the world's leading authority on biological weapons legislation, was correct in concluding that the Covid-19 injections qualify as a biological weapon.

Sansone demonstrates that Boyle made the aforementioned statement and, drawing on his expertise, offers a scientific and

plausible explanation for the existence of people in high-ranking social, political and executive positions who are seriously mentally ill, whilst those people, due in part to their psychopathic traits, continue to hold on to their positions.

EXHIBIT 160 Documents in support of Catherine Austin Fitts in response to the questions put to her by the plaintiffs' solicitor in the video submission.

(explanatory note) This concerns issues of the Solari Report. Catherine Austin Fitts is president of Solari, Inc., the publisher of The Solari Report, and a managing partner of Solari Investment Advisory Services, LLC.

These issues cover numerous aspects of the Great Reset which Fitts refers to as the 'Going Direct Reset'. Fitts explains the Great Reset, drawing on her expertise, primarily from the perspective of an economic policy framework in which central banks and fiscal authorities, in particular, act as the implementers of the The Great Reset project aims to enslave humanity through the financial system, in particular through digital, programmable money managed directly by central banks and linked to a digital identity.

PRODUCTION 161 Video by Sasha Latypova containing a concise explanation of why there is no such thing as 'Gain of Function' viruses

CORRECTION: OBVIOUS TYPO

16. In your court's judgment of 26 November 2025, your court granted the plaintiffs' amendment to their claim and cited this amended claim in its judgment. An apparent clerical error has crept into this amendment to the claim, whereby the phrase 'of the defendants and/or the Dutch people' has been mistakenly included at the end of the first part, where it should read 'of the claimants and/or the Dutch people'.

17. Minks et al. request that this obvious clerical error be recorded and, insofar as necessary, that the relief sought in this part be amended. ***Let this be recorded!***

OFFER OF EVIDENCE

18. In so far as the burden of proof rests with the claimants pursuant to Article 150 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the claimants offer evidence in support of all their submissions by all lawful means. The claimants wish to avoid a situation where, by making this general offer of evidence, they end up bearing a burden of proof which, according to the general rule set out in Article 150 of the Code of Civil Procedure, does not rest with them. They expressly note that they do not assume any burden of proof which is not legally incumbent upon them.

In the plaintiffs' view, the defendants bear, amongst other things (this list is not exhaustive), the burden of proof regarding the following assertions:

- that Covid-19 is a new disease;
- that at no point did any natural immunity, or at least no sufficient natural immunity, exist against the new disease, Covid-19, as alleged by the defendants;
- that there was a pandemic in the sense of a threat to human health posed by a virus, which manifested itself in huge numbers of deaths and cases of illness;
- that viruses exist and can cause infections which may lead to illness
- that diseases can be transmitted from one person to another via viruses;
- that the PCR test can reliably detect viral infections;
- that the Covid-19 injections can deliver health benefits;

- that the Covid-19 injections are safe and effective;
- that the Covid-19 injections were produced in a uniform manner;
- that the Covid-19 injections were so uniformly produced that informed consent was a viable option;
- that the Covid-19 injections are of a civilian origin and nature and are therefore not of a military nature;
- that the Covid-19 vaccines were developed with the aim of protecting people's health;
- that Covid-19 had a more severe impact than a mild flu, as stated by the WHO;
- that the only way out of the pandemic alleged by the defendants was the mass administration of Covid-19 injections;
- that it was reasonable to decide to deploy Covid-19 injections in response to the pandemic alleged by the defendants;
- that the defendants, in particular the State of the Netherlands and Ms Kant, monitored safety signals regarding the harmful effects of Covid-19 injections and acted upon them in the interests of public health.

19. The claimants offer to prove their claims in so far as, in the opinion of this court, the burden of proof rests with them.

20. In this regard, they refer first and foremost to the evidence already submitted and once again offer to have the experts they have put forward examined under oath. These experts not only possess specific expertise, as demonstrably evidenced by their CVs, but also all have the legal status of witnesses to the implementation of the Covid-19 project: The Great Reset, in which people were deliberately and unlawfully misled into receiving a Covid-19 injection, a project being carried out by a group of individuals to which the defendants belong. In particular, these witnesses can provide evidence regarding the defendants' assertions:

    - that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project;
    - that this project is known, amongst other names, as the 'Great Reset' or 'Going Direct Reset';
    - that the aim of this project is to bring about a new world order;

- that governments such as the State of the Netherlands, public institutions and government agencies such as the RIVM and the Tax and Customs Administration, as well as NGOs and global players who largely determine the content and accessibility of that content on (social) media, as well as universities and schools, and even religious institutions such as the Vatican and many so-called research institutes and scientists, are actors or fulfil executive roles in the service of the unlawful Covid-19 project identified by the claimants, in which the deception of people is crucial and which deception takes place by placing people within the 'preferred reality' described by the claimants, of which Major General Van Kappen has rightly remarked, 'and everyone is participating in it';
- that this project shares its objective with, amongst other things, the UN 2030 Agenda and developments in the field of programmable digital currency and digital identity, climate and nitrogen agreements, mass immigration and warfare, and in fact constitutes the same project with the same aim, namely a new world order;
- that the defendants are implementing this project both individually and as a group;
- that the Covid-19 injections play a crucial role in this project;
- that the Covid-19 injections are a biological weapon, or at least possess all the characteristics that can be attributed to a biological weapon;
- that the Covid-19 injections were developed under the legal framework of bio-defence regulations on behalf of the US Department of Defence, more specifically under the regulations for 'countermeasures' as referred to in the US Prep Act, and were distributed by NATO, all as described in the expert report by Sasha Latypova;
- that the Covid-19 injections, by virtue of their technical design and the choices made by their creators inherent therein, were clearly developed and brought to market with the intention of harming people's health and fertility, as explained by Michael Yeadon;
- that, in the implementation of the Covid-19 project, critical (Dutch) citizens, including civil servants, doctors and journalists, are being systematically sidelined through the deployment of security services and (other) military organisations, personnel and resources, as described, amongst other things, by Sasha Latypova

on the basis of the leaked emails which she has incorporated into her updated report;

- that the media, including NOS and De Telegraaf, under the influence of Jansen and Van Cann, systematically practise censorship in order to perpetuate the 'preferred reality' alleged by the claimants;
- that the claimants were unlawfully and deliberately misled by the defendants, as a result of which they received a Covid-19 vaccination;
- that the defendants continue to implement the Covid-19 project, in the context of which they continue to mislead the public, including the claimants, through unlawful acts and omissions, inter alia by continuing to assert that the Covid-19 injections are safe and effective and, more broadly, by perpetuating the 'preferred reality' alleged by the claimants, which causes the claimants to suffer material and non-material damage;
- that the claimants have suffered and are suffering damage as a result of the defendants' unlawful acts and omissions (among other things) because the defendants, through deliberate unlawful deception consisting of acts and omissions, have

  caused the claimants' physical integrity to be unlawfully 21

  or could be violated, whereby, without their informed consent, a biological weapon was in fact injected into them, which has led and continues to lead to material and non-material damage to the claimants.

21. Furthermore, the claimants submit as evidence that the defendants be heard as witnesses under oath. The defendants may give evidence regarding all the assertions set out above and their role in the 'preferred reality' in which they falsely present all of this and through which they have acted, and continue to act, unlawfully and with intent towards the claimants. When your court and the claimants put critical and probing questions to the defendants, focusing on facts (and not, as is often the case in the COVID-19 committees, on opinions, impressions and feelings), under oath in the context of public legal proceedings in which the defendants are confronted with evidence, they will, without any doubt, be exposed (even more thoroughly).

22. Incidentally, the claimants hereby reiterate all the offers of evidence they have made, as set out in the correspondence with your court, the writ of summons, the documents filed by the claimants and their statement of reply.

23. Finally, the claimants note that, given the nature of this case – in which the existence of a preferential arrangement maintained by the defendants is, at the very least, plausibly alleged by the claimants – the requirements of proper procedural order and a reasonable application of the law of evidence dictate that account must be taken of the fact that the claimants are at a disadvantage in terms of information compared with the defendants. Even if and to the extent that your court were to conclude that the burden of proof is allocated differently from as alleged by the claimants, the defendants are, in these circumstances, subject to a very onerous duty to state reasons, which requires a fully reasoned and detailed challenge to everything asserted by the claimants and the experts they have called, supported by arguments and/or evidence.

Peter Stassen,
Solicitor