

**URGENT**

District Court of the  
Northern Netherlands,  
Leeuwarden Branch, Civil  
Division

For the attention of  
the duty judge PO Box  
20130  
8900 HM Leeuwarden

By email:

With a copy

Date 25 September  
2026 Our reference KD100607  
Your reference Case reference C/17/190788 Case number  
23/172 Re et al. v. The State et al.

Your Honour,

In the aforementioned case, I took note this morning of the case list notice published today in the case list journal, which states:

***23-09-2026 case decision U a/zEprod157VIDEOplead.REJECTED***

By judgment of the District Court dated 11 March 2026, it was ruled, amongst other things, that if the parties wish to rely on documents not yet submitted during the oral hearing, these must be sent to the District Court and the other parties no later than four weeks before the oral hearing.



The oral hearing in this case was scheduled for 22 October 2026 at 12.30 pm.

In the correspondence exchanged with your court following the delivery of this interim judgment, a number of further questions arose regarding procedural and practical matters.

On 22 September 2026, I sent a document to your court and to the opposing parties' solicitors, accompanied by a revised Exhibit 91 and new Exhibits 147 to 161. Exhibits 157 and 161 are in the form of video files. In the aforesaid document, I also commented on the aforementioned procedural and practical matters, an apparent clerical error in the claimants' statement of claim, and, on the claimants' instructions, I once again made an explicit offer of evidence.

From the court notice cited above, I gather that the court has accepted the document I submitted, but has rejected Exhibit 157, which forms part of it.

I may assume that this decision was taken after the court had taken note of the contents of this exhibit. This exhibit comprises a video submission which addresses the substance and context of this case and in which a number of the experts called by my clients testify under oath, in response to questions from the plaintiffs' solicitor, regarding facts and circumstances relevant to the assessment of the case.

**Exhibit 157 therefore serves not only to clarify my clients' arguments, but above all to substantiate those arguments. Crucially, this video submission serves as evidence for the claimants' assertion that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project (Covid-19: The Great Reset) and that the Covid-19 injections are a biological weapon being deployed as part of this project, which is crucial to the project that is still being carried out to this day. It therefore constitutes crucial evidence for the factual basis of the claimants' assertions that the defendants are implementers of the aforementioned project and, in that capacity, have acted and continue to act unlawfully towards the claimants by inducing them, through deception, to receive a Covid-19 injection.**

Exhibit 157 is therefore clearly a document which my clients wish to rely on at the hearing. It is not only my clients who have a legally recognised interest in this matter. Given the subject matter to which this evidence relates, the



rule of law has a paramount interest in taking note of this. Within a state governed by the rule of law, the judiciary is the highest and most appropriate authority for this purpose.

I note that none of the defendants' solicitors raised any objection to the course of events described above, nor did the court, in its procedural ruling, provide any reasons as to why Exhibit 157 was refused. I also note that there were 30 days between the date of dispatch (22 September 2026) and the date of the oral hearing (22 October 2026), meaning that the deadline for submission (four weeks before the hearing) did not expire until two full days after the document was submitted.

Yesterday, I made enquiries with your court regarding the receipt of the document. I subsequently received the following response by email.

[REDACTED]

I hereby confirm receipt of the documents in triplicate.  
Please refer to the case register; this will be available from tomorrow.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Available: Monday to Thursday – Monday to  
Wednesday for commercial matters,  
Thursday for the information desk

I am therefore unaware of the reasons why this submission (No. 157) was rejected by your court. The court has not communicated these to me, nor have the opposing parties' solicitors raised any objections to this with me.

The court published its case management order today, 25 September 2026, thereby bringing it to my attention, after the two-day period had elapsed during which – had I been aware of the court's objections – I might still have been able to address them.



The objections to the case management order, which are interrelated and must be assessed in conjunction with one another, are therefore as follows:

1. This order is contrary to the judgment of 11 March 2026, which gave the parties the opportunity to submit documents on which they wished to rely at the oral hearing.
2. No reasons have been given for the decision.
3. No opportunity for rectification was afforded, even though this would have been possible and, in view of the interests involved in the proper conduct of proceedings and also the interests of the rule of law in the broadest sense, should have been afforded
4. This procedural ruling means that a piece of evidence of great importance to the claimants – namely the video submission, given the information it contains and, in particular, the statements made under oath by the experts regarding the classification of the Covid-19 injections as a biological weapon deployed against the claimants and humanity as a whole, and the Great Reset plan in which this biological weapon plays a crucial role – is excluded from the proceedings, thereby preventing a fair trial within the meaning of Article 6 of the ECHR.
5. This decision undermines the functioning of the rule of law.

It is for the above reasons that, on behalf of the claimants, I urgently request that you reconsider the aforementioned order on the admission of evidence and accept the submission of Exhibit 157, or at the very least issue an order on the admission of evidence that safeguards the claimants' interests in a fair trial within the meaning of Article 6 of the ECHR.

Peter Stassen,  
Solicitor