

The fight to submit expert testimonies – Update Dutch criminal proceedings against Bill Gates & Co.

Transcript, interview of Attorney Peter Stassen by Djamila le Pair, Dec. 15, 2025, Leeuwarden NL

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TxlmMU3vLds>

Case documents at Stichting Recht Oprecht website: <https://rechtoprecht.online/>

Interview excerpt

Peter Stassen

...What is clear from this evidence is that these COVID 19 injections are not a vaccine but are equal to a bioweapon. I think that's one of the most clear results of the evidence they presented...

Press conference clip

Ido Dijkstra (journalist)

This is a major case. You started it with [Arno] van Kessel. Is that doable, on your own?

Stassen

Yes, that is doable. Yes.

Interview excerpt

Stassen

...Under this regime there is no safety whatsoever. There are no rules. You are developing a product without rules because it's a countermeasure...

Interview

Le Pair

Good afternoon. It's Monday [December 15, 2025] afternoon 2:00 a little bit after we're standing here in front of the court in Leeuwarden. My name is Djamila le Pair. I'm standing here with lawyer Mr. Stassen. Mr. Stassen together with the lawyer Arno van Kessel started a procedure, when exactly did, was the first?

Stassen

July 14, 2023, we started the proceedings here at the court in Leeuwarden.

Le Pair

Meanwhile, lawyer Arno van Kessel has been imprisoned and Mr. Stassen is bravely going on with this procedure. You just had a press conference here to do with the evidence you submitted to the court on the 7th of December, I understand, and to invite everybody around the world to look at all the documents you have put on your website, also in English, to start court cases themselves.

Can you tell me in, because you said a lot, it's probably impossible to translate that now, but can you say what the press conference was mainly about?

Stassen

Yes, of course. I can. The reason we are here today is because I was invited by the Stichting Recht Oprecht Foundation to present the evidence that has been sent to this court at 7 December as you said, and to the court in Amsterdam, the Court of Appeal in Amsterdam where another procedure for my clients is going on.

What happened is that we had a hearing [[July 9, 2025](#)] about evidence before. It was a hearing where there was a request to hear five experts, five, I think, of the best experts in the world such as Michael Yeadon and Sasha Latypova, Catherine Austin Fitts, Katherine Watt and Joseph Sansone. And they all are very much willing to let them hear, with their knowledge and evidence about the true, what is really true about the Covid 19 injections.

And what is clear from this evidence is that these Covid-19 injections are not a vaccine but are equal to a bioweapon. I think that's one of the most clear results of the evidence they presented.

And the other thing which is very useful to get more understanding of what happened in the so-called Covid crisis and pandemic, which was not a crisis but a project. And this project is called Covid-19: The Great Reset. We put it very widely in our documents in court.

But we also now have a very clear vision about how, under the regime of countermeasures which were developed from the, developed in the US, the Covid-19 injections are countermeasures against chemical, bacteriological, radiological, nuclear threats.

That's how they are developed and under this regime, there is no safety whatsoever. There are no rules. You are developing a product without rules because it's a countermeasure. And that is what has been brought to the world and also to Europe via the European Medicines Agency.

And what in fact happened is that they told the public "This is a vaccine" and they knew that what was developed was a countermeasure without any safety, guards for safety.

This is especially described by Sasha Latypova and Katherine Watt in a very broad and very very well done way with lots of documents to prove that this is what really happened in a legal sense.

So also for the legal litigation which is going on here in the court in Leeuwarden, it's very important. We can now really show this evidence to the court and make very sure, "Look, this is what happened. This is the legal part, how this product, countermeasure, not a vaccine, came here and reached my clients."

The whole procedure is about how my clients were misled to take this product which was sold to them as a vaccine.

Le Pair

Your clients are victims of the injections, the gene therapeutic injections. First of all, I would like to ask you, so Ms. Watt and Ms. Latypova have provided evidence about the vaccines.

Mike Yeadon, what was the content basically of his testimony?

Stassen

He gave a very, very important testimony. If you look at, the core of this testimony is his expertise about developing products and reading the design of development in a product. So what he can really explain from his experience is, if you look at how this was made, which substances were used, which formulation, then you can only have one conclusion: it was not intended to be safe or effective. In his professional knowledge and view he can explain perfectly why this product, if you take a look at it as an expert and you look at what it is, then you can see this is intended to be a dangerous product. So, safe cannot be.

Le Pair

How does that differ from the testimony from Latypova and Watt?

Stassen

Their focus is more I think on the legal side of the case explaining us how a bioweapon came through this legislation and reached us as a so-called vaccine. I think that's the core.

Le Pair

And Catherine Austin Fitts, what is her testimony about?

Stassen

Her testimony is important on the on the project side of this all. So Covid-19: The Great Reset. She, with her expertise, which is also on the financial field and the political field, she can show us that in fact this project of lowering life expectancy, with also a financial goal and meaning, is already going on for a long time. She describes this from her own experiences working as an adviser at that moment for the [US President George] Bush Sr. administration.

She puts it in a far more broader context of a project and the goal that this project wants to reach, and that is a really existing re-set going on. And lots of people just deny that there is a re-set while everything is changing and they deny it's a re-set. And for this aspect I think her declaration is very important.

Le Pair

And who is the fifth again?

Stassen

Joseph Sansone. He has a valuable background also in psychology. But one of the things that is very important about him is that he had lots of personal contact with Professor [Francis A.] Boyle and Professor Boyle passed away. We also -- in the court here in Leeuwarden, he was willing, Professor Boyle, to give his statement before the court. He was one of the first to confirm us that he was, without any doubt willing to do so, and he is the expert on the legislation of bioweapons.

Le Pair

And he passed away unexpectedly, unexplainedly just a couple of weeks after he agreed to come and testify.

Stassen

That's correct. And that's also one of the reasons we were interested to come in contact with Joseph Sansone, because he also litigates in the US, I think especially in Florida and uses there the declarations, the [affidavits from Boyle](#) and can also, so talk about his own experiences in these litigations where he also has successes and also really stand for the real, that the proof of what Boyle said is real and this is also one of the things that was useful to use as an expert.

Le Pair

On Twitter I saw that there might be another witness. Is that correct? There was a woman who said she might be an additional?

Stassen

I don't have any social media, so I don't see a lot of what is going on on the internet. I really try to focus on what's real. But I'm not aware of any other witness and a woman which tells something like that.

Le Pair

Then just technically, you started a case in 2023 together with Arno van Kessel that was for several people who were hurt by the gene therapeutic injections. Then there was an incident, I believe, where Mr. [Bill] Gates said "This court cannot judge on this case or at least not me." Then the court decided "Yes, we can. We do have the authority to judge." Then there was another hearing about the witnesses where Mr. Gates said he would comply to whatever the judge would decide.

In the meantime other people came forward or contacted you that they also wanted a case because of their hurt of the vaccinations. Or am I mixing things up now?

Stassen

Well, we have two legal court cases going on. One we started here in 2023 in Leeuwarden for the seven plaintiffs. It is [available] in English [translation], and from one which one passed away. And everything you described is in this case except the [July 9, 2025] court hearing we had, about hearing the witnesses and that is a legally a total separate case. It's also for other clients. It's for three other clients.

But of course the whole context of the case is the same. And this was a request to the court here in Leeuwarden in separate proceedings to ask them to hear the experts we just talked about. And so that was a formally total different case.

But what happened, in the verdict that was given there, by also this case, is that they said "Well, it will interfere, these two proceedings." And this was an argument which was simply not true because there are legally two proceedings.

Everybody can start litigation all over the world everywhere, also here in the Netherlands.

Now, just because there was one case, one other case for the other seven clients going on, they said we cannot help these three clients. So there was no logic to that, but that's how they blocked the hearing of the experts and that's the reason I went to an appeal.

It was first appealed here in the high court in Leeuwarden. This high court did not do the case. They had it lying on the desk for a long time, for months, and then I got the message that because two of the [defense] lawyers are also what we call [inaudible] judges in the court, they sent the case to Amsterdam. And that's why the other case is in Amsterdam.

Le Pair

It's a case of the witnesses that is on appeal in Amsterdam and the original case we're still waiting for the next proper hearing.

Stassen

Exactly. And the next proper hearing here at the court in Leeuwarden for the main case, so the proceeding in the merits, still has to be planned. I got a request, I think I need to do it next week, to send the dates of availability from March till October [2026]. So that's the span where they will plan it and from the high court in Amsterdam they asked me to give them for February and March [2026]. So this will be a bit sooner.

If you want to know the details, maybe relevant, in Amsterdam they said to the defendants "You do not need to react to the content yet." So that was really about: "You just need to react to the formal side of the case, if an appeal is possible or not."

Because we changed the law in the Netherlands. There's new law on evidence and in this law is stated that you in fact cannot appeal.

But we still have our judges with the verdicts, jurisprudentie [case law] and this says that, as a very fundamental rule of law was denied, then you can appeal even when it's in the law [that] you cannot appeal, you don't have a right to appeal or use any other measures.

So this is the reason I appealed and I also explained that what happened here is really not in line with our rights as human beings on a fair process.

Le Pair

But I'm sure the foreign viewer will be totally baffled now when you say the judge, the Dutch have changed the law and you cannot appeal a case anymore. Can you explain when that started and what exactly it applies to?

Stassen

Cases that, I need to do by heart, but cases that started this year, and I'm only talking about request procedure to provide evidence or to gather evidence. Only, of course you can appeal in all cases, but only for this kind of cases they said: "No, for this kind of cases, there's an exemption of the right to appeal."

So if the judge in a request, denies you to get to collect evidence in the way you ask him to, then you cannot appeal from this decision and that's what happened.

Le Pair

The research part you cannot, right. You've said a lot more in Dutch. You also ask people to donate because this might be a very long drawn case and also to write cards to the people who are imprisoned, because Arno van Kessel is not the only one. There are several people that got incarcerated with him. Is there anything you want to add for the foreign viewers?

Stassen

There's a lot of going on, what you describe. But as a lawyer in this case, I refrain from commenting on that, what's going on. There are lawyers who take, I think, very good care of that and we should let them do their work.

Le Pair

Thank you very much for your time and good luck with the case.

Stassen

Thank you.