

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: handel.leeuwarden@rechtspraak.nl

With a copy to

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date	1 October 2026
Our reference	KD100607
Your reference	Case reference C/17/190788 Case number 23/172
Re	[REDACTED] et al. v. The State et al.

Your Honour,

In the aforementioned case, I received by post on 30 September 2026 the written case management decision dated 23 September 2026, accompanied by a letter of the same date. I was therefore unable to take note of the grounds for this decision at an earlier stage.

The grounds set out in the order dated 23 September 2026 give me cause to supplement the objections I had already raised against it on 25 September 2026. All objections already raised therefore remain fully applicable and are maintained.



The argument that this video submission does not, to a significant extent, constitute evidence within the meaning of paragraph 5.7 of the National Rules of Procedure is, in the plaintiffs' view, irrelevant. After all, in its judgment of 11 March 2026, the court issued a ruling in the interests of the proper conduct of the proceedings. Insofar as is relevant here, I quote from that judgment:

'... The court considers that it may assume that all relevant documents have now been submitted. In the event that a party nevertheless wishes to introduce further documents into the proceedings, the court will, in the interests of the proper conduct of the proceedings, rule as follows: that party must submit the relevant documents no later than four weeks before the oral hearing. If another party wishes to introduce further documents in response to this, it must do so no later than ten calendar days before the oral hearing...'

The issue therefore concerns the submission of 'relevant documents'. These documents are not limited to evidence as referred to in paragraph 5.7 of the applicable rules of procedure, which merely set out general rules, from which the court has, on valid grounds, departed in this case.

The claimants therefore take the *primary* view that the order on the list of cases is contrary to the judgment of 11 March 2026, as I have already explained in my objection of 25 September 2026.

In the alternative, the claimants take the view that all the facts, circumstances and arguments put forward in the video submission serve as evidence and that the entire submission

– that is, both the part in which the solicitor speaks and the part in which the experts give evidence under oath – must be regarded as evidence. The information provided in the submission by the claimants' lawyer is based on facts, is verifiable and serves as evidence of the tort alleged by the claimants in these proceedings. In the claimants' view, this is a further reason why the order on the proceedings cannot be upheld.

In the further alternative, the claimants take the view that, even if the lawyer's own submission cannot be regarded as evidence, this does in any event apply to the statements made by the experts in the video submission. These statements make up the vast majority of the entire video, which lasts four hours and 36 minutes, so the argument that 'a significant part is not evidence' cannot be accepted for this reason alone. The section in which the experts give evidence under oath begins at the 47-minute mark of the video and continues until the video has been running for four hours and six minutes. The lawyer therefore speaks for the first 46 minutes and the last 30 minutes of the video, totalling 1 hour and 17 minutes. The experts



speak for a total of (4 hours and 36 minutes minus 1 hour and 17 minutes) 3 hours and 19 minutes. This therefore constitutes the vast majority.

These 3 hours and 19 minutes during which the experts give evidence under oath are therefore, as I gather from the grounds for the case management decision, also considered by the court itself to be evidence.

As stated in my objection, it is remarkable that, on 24 September 2026, an email from your court referred me to the case register published on 25 September 2025 so that I might take note of your decision on the case. Had I been aware of that decision and the grounds for it earlier, I could have made a (subsidiary) request to the court, within the time limit set for the submission of documents in the judgment of 11 March 2026, to take into account only the part in which the experts state that (Exhibit 157), which would have removed all the objections apparent from the grounds of your case management decision – quite apart from the question of whether they are justified. I would also have been able to submit only this part of the video as a separate exhibit in good time.

The expert evidence submitted is of great significance in the context of the claimant's assertions that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project, and that the Covid-19 injections constitute a biological weapon, or at least are indistinguishable from one. The defendants dispute these assertions. This disagreement forms the crux of the proceedings. Naturally, this evidence is not only of interest to the claimants but is also of great public interest, which should also be in the interests of the rule of law itself.

In view of the foregoing, I respectfully request, as a primary matter, that you now admit my entire video submission as Exhibit 157 to my statement of case. In the alternative, I respectfully request that you at least admit as evidence the part in which the experts give evidence under oath (from minute 47 of the video until the video has lasted four hours and six minutes). In the further alternative, I request that you make a decision which safeguards the right to a fair trial.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Stassen